European Aviation Safety Agency — Rulemaking Directorate

Comment-Response Document 2012-17

'Part-M General Aviation Task Force (Phase I)'

CRD TO NPA 2012-17 — RMT.0463 (OPINION) AND RMT.0547 (DECISION) — 07/10/2013
Related Opinion 10/2013

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Following a survey letter sent by the Agency to stakeholders and NAAs on 04 July 2011 and a workshop organised in Cologne on 27 October 2011, the Agency decided to create a 'Part-M General Aviation Task Force' representing the diversity of General Aviation sectors, with the objective of discussing appropriate actions that would reduce the burden on the General Aviation community. Two separate phases were established:

— Phase I: Covering a first set of alleviations for which an extensive Regulatory Impact Assessment was not required (Maintenance Programmes and Airworthiness Reviews).

— Phase II: Covering other areas where further action was needed (rulemaking, standardisation, change management, etc.) but where more technical discussions and an extensive Regulatory Impact Assessment are required.

On 29 October 2012, NPA 2012-17 was published addressing the issues of Phase I.

This CRD contains the comments received by the Agency during the external consultation of the NPA and the corresponding responses.

In general, the comments received to the changes proposed in Phase I show the following:

— Wide support from the aircraft owner community, especially the declaration of the maintenance programme by the owner.
— Support from maintenance organisations and continuing airworthiness management organisations, except for the option of declaration of the maintenance programme by the owner.
— Support from manufacturers, with certain comments from balloon manufacturers questioning the introduction of the Minimum Inspection Programme.
— Support from NAAs, with mixed opinions on the option of declaration of the maintenance programme by the owner.
— General request for clarifying which specific activities would not fall under the definition of 'commercial operations'.

In addition, there was a general request for further alleviations during Phase II.

Based on the comments and responses, Opinion No 10/2013 has been developed.

Applicability		**Process map**	
Affected regulations and decisions:	Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 ED Decision 2003/19/RM	Concept paper:	No
		Rulemaking group:	No
		RIA type:	Light
Affected stakeholders:	Aircraft owners, maintenance organisations, continuing airworthiness management organisations, manufacturers, competent authorities	Technical consultation during NPA drafting:	Task Force
		Publication date of the NPA:	2012/Q4
		Duration of NPA consultation:	3 months
		Review group:	No
		Focussed consultation:	Task Force
Driver/origin:	Proportionality and cost effectiveness	Publication date of the Opinion:	In parallel with this CRD.
		Publication date of the Decision:	2014/Q4

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Table of Contents

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

1. Procedural information

This CRD provides the summary of comments and responses as well as the full table of comments received to NPA 2012-17 and the corresponding responses. Appendices I through VII to this CRD include the draft Opinion and Decision.

The Agency has published this CRD in parallel with Opinion No 10/2013.

The Opinion contains proposed changes to European Regulations. The Opinion is addressed to the European Commission, which uses it as technical basis to prepare a legislative proposal.

The Decision containing AMC and GM will be published by the Agency when the related Implementing Rules are adopted by the Commission.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

2. Summary of comments and responses

NPA 2012-17 was published for consultation on the EASA website (http://www.easa.europa.eu) on 29 October 2012. By the closing date of 29 January 2013, the European Aviation Safety Agency (hereinafter referred to as the 'Agency') had received 350 comments from 30 National Aviation Authorities, professional organisations, and private individuals.

Although this NPA only proposed the changes related to Phase I, there was a significant number of comments requesting further alleviations during Phase II of the task. This will be taken into account by the Task Force during the corresponding discussions in Phase II.

In addition, there was a general comment related to the interpretation of the term 'commercial operation', requesting, in particular, the development of a list of specific activities which would not fall under this definition.

It is important to note that the term 'commercial operation' is defined in Article 3 of Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Basic Regulation') and cannot be altered through a lower ranking implementing rule. Furthermore, the Agency is not entitled to issue AMC/GM material for provisions of the Basic Regulation.

Nevertheless, the Agency acknowledges the paper issued by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy group and the actions recommended in this paper. In particular, action A.1 invites Member States to provide their feedback on the activities which they do not classify as commercial operations in their current system, and the Agency and the Commission to consider proposing changes to the definition in the Basic Regulation following such a feedback.

Regarding the 7 proposals contained in the NPA (related to Phase I), the summary of comments and responses is the following:

PROPOSAL 1: Possibility for the owner to contract the development and approval of the Maintenance Programme to a maintenance organisation (ELA2 aircraft not involved in commercial operations):

— **COMMENT:** Request for a formal nomination of the persons responsible for the Maintenance Programme in the maintenance organisation.

RESPONSE: Provisions have been added for the need of qualified personnel (M.A.606(e) and (j), 145.A.30(e) and (i)) and for the need to list these persons in the exposition (M.A.604 and 145.A.70). These persons will be responsible for the development and approval processing of the maintenance programme. However, the possibility for indirect approval procedures within maintenance organisations has been removed (only possible for CAMOs) (see M.A.302(c)).

— **COMMENT:** Create a template for the limited contract between the owner and the maintenance organisation.

RESPONSE: Acceptable criteria for the limited contract have been introduced in AMC M.A.201(e).

— **COMMENT:** The limited contract should not be restricted to maintenance organisations located in the State of Registry if the Maintenance Programme is self-declared by the owner.

RESPONSE: This limitation has been removed. However, the possibility for indirect approval procedures within maintenance organisations has been removed (only possible for CAMOs) (see M.A.302(c)).

PROPOSAL 2: Possibility for the owner to issue a declaration for his/her own Maintenance Programme (ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations):

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

— **COMMENT:** One Member State asked whether this option complies with the ICAO requirements of having a maintenance programme acceptable to the State of Registry.

RESPONSE: The position of the Agency is that this option complies with the ICAO requirement because the adoption of the rule makes compliance mandatory in all Member States, which automatically renders the option acceptable to every Member State.

— **COMMENT:** The owner is not competent to develop and declare a maintenance programme.

RESPONSE: The current rule already allows the owner to completely manage the continuing airworthiness of his/her aircraft under his/her own responsibility. In addition, the option of self-declaration has been limited to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations and compensating measures have been introduced, such as the introduction of Minimum Inspection Programmes and the review of the effectiveness of the maintenance programme at the time of the airworthiness review. Furthermore, GM M.A.201(e) clearly reminds the owner to carefully self-assess his/her competence.

— **COMMENT:** Clarify the responsibilities of the owner, the CAMO, the maintenance organisations, the airworthiness review staff, and the competent authority when dealing with declared maintenance programmes:

RESPONSE: This has been clarified in AMC M.A.201(e), GM M.A.302(h), and GM M.A.710.

— **COMMENT:** Clarify the responsibilities when reviewing the effectiveness of the maintenance programme and the actions to be taken by the owner, airworthiness review staff, and competent authority.

RESPONSE: This has been clarified in M.A.302(h)5, M.A.710(h), M.A.710(i), M.A.901(l)7, AMC M.A.302(h), GM M.A.302(h), GM M.A.710(i), and GM M.A.901(l)7.

— **COMMENT:** Make clear that the deviations to the maintenance programme have to be recorded.

RESPONSE: This has been made clear in the template contained in AMC M.A.302(e) (see Table 2 and fields 5, 10 and 13).

— **COMMENT:** One Member State proposed that the owner should be obliged to send a copy of the declared maintenance programme to the competent authority, so it can prioritise the risks associated to the modification of maintenance recommendations.

RESPONSE: GM M.A.302(h) has been added with the following content:

- When the competent authority is notified of deficiencies linked to the content of the maintenance programme for a particular aircraft, the competent authority should contact the owner, request a copy of the maintenance programme (if it was declared), and use the information received for the adequate planning of the ACAM programme. Based on the reported deficiencies and the risks identified, the competent authority will adapt accordingly the ACAM programme. This notification will also allow that the competent authority agrees on the changes required to the maintenance programme as required by point M.A.302(h)5.
- Although there is no requirement for the owner to send a copy of the declared maintenance programme to the competent authority, this does not prevent the competent authority from requesting a copy to the owner at any time, even if deficiencies have not been reported.

PROPOSAL 3: Introduction of Minimum Inspection Programmes (ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, except airships):

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

— **COMMENT:** The use of the Minimum Inspections Programmes should be mandatory. However, its content should be in AMC.

RESPONSE: The requirements for the content of the Minimum Inspection Programmes has been introduced in M.A.302(i) and the specific tables with acceptable Minimum Inspections Programmes have been transferred to AMC M.A.302(i). However, the use of the Minimum Inspection Programme is not mandatory and the owner still has the option of using Design Approval Holder data as the only source (as long as the maintenance programme does not go below the Minimum Inspection Programme).

— **COMMENT:** Provide a 10 % tolerance also for the calendar of the annual inspection (not only for the 100 hours).

RESPONSE: This proposal has been accepted and included in M.A.302(i).

— **COMMENT:** Design Approval Holder data should be used in all cases (no need for Minimum Inspection Programmes).

RESPONSE: The 'Minimum Inspection Programme' establishes a minimum under which it cannot be passed (see M.A.302(h)2). This is a way to solve the problem created by inadequate maintenance schedules (for some older aircraft) and a compensating measure to avoid that the owner, when declaring the maintenance programme, decides not to implement too many recommendations from the Design Approval Holder.

In addition, even if the owner decides to use the 'Minimum Inspection Programme', he/she still needs to take into account other recommendations of the Design Approval Holder (see Table 2 and fields 5, 10 and 13 of the template contained in AMC M.A.302(e)).

— **COMMENT:** Concern that if the owner selects to use only Design Approval Holder data, he/she could decide not to implement so many recommendations that the final maintenance programme is much simpler than the Minimum Inspection Programme.

RESPONSE: In M.A.302(h)2 it has been required that the maintenance programme cannot be less restrictive than the Minimum Inspection Programme.

— **COMMENT:** Consistency should be ensured in the content of the Minimum Inspection Programmes for the 3 categories of aircraft.

RESPONSE: Taking into account the urgency to issue the Opinion for the changes to the regulation, and since the content of the proposed Appendix IX has been moved to AMC M.A.302(i), the Agency will use the time taken by the Comitology process to perform a full review in order to ensure consistency between the 3 different programmes before adopting the applicable AMC

PROPOSAL 4: Introduction of a template for the customised Maintenance Programme (all aircraft except complex motor-powered aircraft):

— **COMMENT:** The template for the Maintenance Programme should be in the rule and not in the AMC.

RESPONSE: The Agency does not agree with the comment. The template is just a tool to improve standardisation.

— **COMMENT:** What happens with existing Maintenance Programmes.

RESPONSE: Article 3 of Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 has been amended to state that the existing maintenance programmes (those complying with the previous rules) and considered to comply with the new requirements.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

PROPOSAL 5: Possibility for maintenance organisations to perform an airworthiness review and issue the ARC at the same time as the annual inspection contained in the MIP (ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations):

— **COMMENT:** Maintenance organisations should be allowed to perform the airworthiness review in all cases where it is performed together with the annual inspection contained in the maintenance programme (even if the maintenance programme is not based on the Minimum Inspection Programme).

RESPONSE: The proposal has been changed to allow the maintenance organisation to perform the airworthiness review regardless of who develops/approves/declares the maintenance programme and regardless of whether it based on the Minimum Inspection Programme or not. The only condition is to meet the requirements of M.A.901(l).

— **COMMENT:** Require an airworthiness review under supervision before receiving the authorisation as airworthiness review staff.

RESPONSE: The comment has been accepted and the text in M.A.707(f)1(f) and M.A.901(l)1(f) has been amended.

— **COMMENT:** Align the qualification requirements of the airworthiness review staff as much as possible with those for CAMOs.

RESPONSE: M.A.707(f)1 and M.A.901(l)1 have been aligned as much as possible.

— **COMMENT:** Independent certifying staff should be allowed to issue not only recommendations but also the ARC.

RESPONSE: This will be analysed in Phase II.

— **COMMENT:** Allow unlimited ARC (no expiration, no airworthiness review) when the aircraft is in a controlled environment.

RESPONSE: The Agency does not agree with the proposal because the Certificate of Airworthiness has already an unlimited validity. The Agency considers that a periodic review of the airworthiness of the aircraft must be performed by a person who was independent of the continuing airworthiness management process (or with full authority). The advantage of being in a controlled environment is that the airworthiness review may be performed every 3 years.

PROPOSAL 6: Clarification that, depending on the scope of work, the Subpart F maintenance organisation may not need to have a hangar and may use alternative suitable facilities (All aircraft maintained by Subpart F maintenance organisation):

— **COMMENT:** Further clarify the meaning of 'alternative suitable facilities' to a hangar.

RESPONSE: AMC M.A.605(a) has been amended to make it more clear and to include a specific paragraph for ELA2 aircraft.

PROPOSAL 7: Guidance related to the use of the indirect approval procedure by a CAMO in order to introduce new type ratings in the scope of work (All aircraft):

— **COMMENT:** Extend the proposal to Subpart F maintenance organisations for ELA2 aircraft.

RESPONSE: AMC M.B.603 and AMC M.B.703 have been amended, including also specific paragraphs for ELA1 aircraft.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

3. Individual comments and responses

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

(a) **Accepted** — The Agency agrees with the comment and any proposed amendment is wholly transferred to the revised text.

(b) **Partially accepted** — The Agency either agrees only partly with the comment, or agrees with it but the proposed amendment is only partially transferred to the revised text.

(c) **Noted** — The Agency acknowledges the comment but no change to the existing text is considered necessary.

(d) **Not accepted** — The comment or proposed amendment is not shared by the Agency.

CRD table of comments, responses and resulting text

(General Comments)	-

comment	*7* comment by: *Michael Powell* LIGHT AIRCRAFT INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE SERVICES 4 Chapel Road Upton Norwich NR13 6BT UK. Tel: 01493 752232 Dear Sir/Madam, I operate a small aircraft maintenance business dealing with light aircraft generally below 2730 kg. Prior to Part M I would complete all the necessary work on an aircraft including the inspection and any necessary maintenance work. Part of this work included a check of all the Airworthiness Directives and Service Bulletins published by the CAA and FAA and the manufacturer. I would then complete all the necessary document records and apply to the CAA for the issue of a new CofA. After Part M I am not permitted to issue an ARC (the equivalent of the old recommendation for a new CofA) and this has to be done by a separate organisation at a cost of between E500/E800 euros for each a/c. Why ? The licensed engineer is familiar with the a/c and receives regular updates of ADs and SBs himself. It is his responsibility to carry out all the necessary work and complete the log book records. What purpose is served by interposing an additional layer of bureacracy to no safety or other identifiable purpose. It simply adds to the owner's running costs and discourages people from owning and flying light aircraft. If the ARC cannot be taken out of the system then the appropriately licensed engineer should be authorised to issue ARCs on all light aircraft, at least those under 2730 kg. Kiind regards, Michael Powell.
response	*Noted* M.A.901(l) allows to issue the ARC to the maintenance organisation (for ELA1

aircraft not involved in commercial operations)

comment *43* comment by: *CAMO - Klaus Lehmköster, DE.MG.1016*

General remark from my experience with the situation in Germany:
Many manager and certifying staff in small workshops, especially for ELA1/2 (glider, powered glider, small single engine aircraft) do not have the education to fulfill the Part-M/145 requirements.
In the old German system for certifying staff for glider and powered glider, the staff only needs a minor school education, some years experience in an aircraft workshop and a test to get the licence for a certifying staff. These personal did not have the ability to read and understand the full Part-M/145 with the AMC in English language. These personal are workman (and really good workman)! And they are not able to do all the required paper work. Biggest obstacle is to write the handbooks for a MF and MG organisation. So, many workshops do not have a CAMO. (I have had to type a CAME with more than 100 pages to get a CAMO and to check one powered glider! Since that day I never looked in this book again; only paper work without any need.)
What will be the educational requirements for the future? Degreed engineer? Language ICAO level 6? Part-66 does not give an answer.
Part-M/145 including AMC must be written in a language that any personal can understand and can act according the rules. Juridical words are not a solution as well a paper-tiger.
Compare the requirements of Part-M/145 with the worthiness checks for the vehicles on our roads! The vehicles are much more complex than any ELA1/2 aircraft, but the requirements for the airworthiness of an aircraft are not in ratio to the requirements for an vehicle.
Painful impressions from the maintenance programs
The EASA has audited and certified the several competend authorities of the member states in case of their management of the maintenance programs. The results are fantastic:

- In Germany, in the matrix the for pilot-owner maintenance we can certify keys and locks for all kinds of doors, bicycles up to safety systems for warships and submarines. Reason is that the LBA tried to define a company for standard fasteners, but they choose a wrong one. Now, thousands of aircrafts have this risible failure in their maintenance program ...
- In France, you can certify commercials in the maintenance program ...
- In Finland, you have to clean weekly your aircraft with a vacuum cleaner ...

This cannot be the correct understanding for a maintenance program. With this, the EASA never will get an understanding by the pilot-owners.
And, there are no safety improvements for all technical issues!

response *Noted*

The qualification for maintenance certifying staff and for airworthiness review staff will be, for ELA1/ELA2 aircraft, a simple Part-66 L-licence.

A template for the maintenance programme has been proposed (AMC M.A.302(e)) in order to improve standardisation across Europe.

Translation of AMC/GM material should be supported by NAAs and associations.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

comment	*52* comment by: *LHT* Lufthansa Technik AG (LHT) strongly objects any changes in Part-145 adding privileges in respect of determination of airworthiness. Reason(s): (1) A clear separation of performance of maintenance (Part-145 and Part-M Subpart F) and the responsibility for the management of airworthiness (Part-M Subpart G and I) shall be maintained in order to avoid any mixing of responsibilities. (2) In commercial maintenance (Part-145) the suggested changes could lead to misinterpretation of privileges since those are only applicable to non-commercial aviation. Therefore Part-145 is not an appropriate place for the proposal. LHT suggestion: Instead of using maintenance parts EASA should propose a new subpart within Part-M which describes new privileges for the determination of airworthiness for non-commercial aviation. The approval under this new subpart could be subject to an existing EASA Part-145 or Subpart-F approval. This approach would allow using of the benefits of existing personnel qualification and organisational framework. Thus the general idea of this NPA could be maintained without mixing the responsibilities under Article 3 (Annex I) and Article 4 (Annex II).
response	*Not accepted* Although these provisions are only applicable to light aircraft, Part-145 organisations have already expressed their interest in maintaining such aircraft. The Agency does not find it reasonable to request 2 approvals (Subpart F and Part-145) in order to maintain light aircraft which may be involved in Commercial Air Transport or not (it should be enough with the Part-145 approval).

comment	*61* comment by: *Wilfried Teckentrup* I am the owner of an ELA1 plane, i.e. a CTLS by Flight Design with serial no. F 10-12-12. The maximum load for this plane is 600 kg. It belongs to E-class in Germany. The same plane from the same manufacturer exists also in the Ultralight segment up to 472,5 kg. I am a pilot for 32 years now with 800 hours of flying. It is very well that maintenance programs for this kind of plane are simplified. What it needs in addition, however, is an Approved Model List for any equipment that can go into the cockpit to help the pilot. I would like to see EASA approved models of a) anti-collision-systems (e.g. PowerFlarm) b) weather information in the cockpit. This would be really helpful for the pilot and increase the security in flying considerably. The point is that the people flying CTLS as ultralight can install what they want in their plane. There is no legislation at all to prevent them from installing e.g PowerFlarm or Garrecht TRX etc. I know a lot of people who have installed anti-collision-systems in their ultralight plane. However, since I am flying the same plane as an ELA1 plane, it is impossible for me to install new equipment without prior individual, time-consuming and costly approval. The effect is that I do not have anti-collision systems or weather information systems installed although this would greatly increase the

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	safety of flying and greatly reduce the 2 most important dangers: a) not to know where other traffic is. b) not to know which weather you are going into.
response	*Partially accepted* The approval of the installation of certain equipment is aircraft specific and it is a Part-21 issue which is not part of Phase I of this task. However, it could be analysed during Phase II. In addition, some modifications will be covered in the future by the Certification Specification for Standard Changes and Repairs which is currently being developed by task MDM.048.

comment	*76* comment by: *Luftsport Verband Bayern / Germany* In general we appreciate all changes which the EASA proposes now. Question: **M1, paragraph 4:** Is it required to adopt this paragraph to reflect the approvals of maintenance programmes by CAMOs and MOs?
response	*Noted* In the revised proposal, only CAMOs can use the indirect approval procedure for the approval of the maintenance programme. However, this is still an approval by the competent authority (via indirect approval procedure). As a consequence, there is no need to amend M.1.

comment	*86* comment by: *Schroeder fire balloons GmbH* Comment to Nr. 22: for me as a private/sports balloonist it´s essential and important to know how a private/sports balloonist can act under new regulation in the future. - a sports balloonist who takes part in competitions whichis a very expensive venture (journey and accomodation for crew etc) has to be sponsored (each sports club and it´s members are supported by local and/or nationwide sponsors) - for private/sports purposes a branded balloon envelope should be allowed incl. payment for running cost - cost effective flights should further be allowed (see German system/ tax offices never found balloon flights with max. 4 occupants to be commercial) to avoid that wonderful balloon sport can only be practiced by some rich and priviliged - a transition period will not help to solve this discussion but a clear decision which does not frustrates and prohibits private/sports ballooning should be issued by EU Werner Wäschenbach / 28.01.2013
response	*Noted* The term 'commercial' operation is defined in Article 3 of the Basic Regulation and cannot be altered through a lower ranking implementing rule. Furthermore, the Agency is not entitled to issue AMC/GM material for provisions of the Basic Regulation.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Nevertheless, the Agency acknowledges the paper issued by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy group and the actions recommended in this paper. In particular, action A.1 invites Member States to provide their feedback on the activities which they do not classify as commercial operations in their current system, and the Agency and the Commission to consider proposing changes to the definition in the Basic Regulation following such a feedback.

comment *87* comment by: *Luftfahrt-Bundesamt*

Please note that the LBA is generally content with the intention to simplify the current technical regulations for General Aviation (GA) aircraft operators and owners. However, we do not share the way how EASA is proposing to achieve this goal.
It is obvious, and this was highlighted by the LBA during the rule making phases of the current technical regulations since the beginning, that both, the rule structure and its content are difficult to understand and to follow, possibly leading to unsafe situations. The owner/operator often is not fully aware of the applicable rules for keeping up the airworthiness of his aircraft. This circumstance was discussed at length within AGNA and it was agreed to simplify the rules as it was obvious that there is an overregulation in the field of GA aircraft.
EASA did establish a "GA Task Force" which was tasked to prepare a corresponding amendment proposal.
We feel that, finally, the solution presented does not correct the mistakes made in the past when developing the current set of rules. Instead of modifying the current requirements by simplifying those, a third option of issuing ARCs is proposed. In addition another way of "approving" a maintenance programme by the aircraft owner/operator himself is offered.
In our view, the whole system gets even more complicated than it currently is. Consequently, we must state the NPA 2012-17 does not serve the purpose and it is proposed to reject this NPA entirely.
As it must be taken into account that our general comment as stated above will not be accepted, we nevertheless would like to take the opportunity to provide some specific comments for amending the NPA proposals. We did split these specific comments in two groups, a first set, listed below, will deal with the Table providing general options of proposals on pages 9 and 10 of the NPA. A second set of comments on specific paragraphs will be put at the corresponding places in the CRT.
Finally, we again would like to highlight the mishap in many of the Part M/145 requirements when making use of the term "owner". In many instances, this should be replaced by "operator" or, at least, the term "operator" should be added. Often, the owner of an aircraft is a bank or an insurance company, so a maintenance programme sent to a bank may not serve the purpose. We raised this issue many times and would like to remind EASA of this more or less editorial omission.
Proposals 1 and 2 of Table on page 9:
In our view these proposals are not sufficient as far as simplifying the current requirements is concerned. The requirement for a maintenance programme for non-complex aircraft in non-commercial should be removed. Instead the requirement for the use of corresponding MIP should be set in place.
Justification:
A "self-approval" by the owner/operator is, legally speaking, a senseless method of regulating an issue which should be, by meaning, an administrative act. So, the rule should concentrate on the technical verification of an aircraft by a corresponding maintenance organisation with qualified personnel. In this

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	case an owner/operator is provided with a clear and defined way how his aircraft is handled technically as it is obvious that an owner/operator may, in many cases, not be technically competent, even in case of a non-complex aircraft. So, the rules should guarantee that, after a one year period, the aircraft is technically fit. We very much doubt that this is achieved by "approving" a maintenance programme by the owner/operator, declaring to cope with this programme and the applicable rules. As already said above, the addition of a third option does not help to solve the problems generated with the first two options. So, if it is intended to simplify the current requirements, it is essential to consider a thorough reduction of the current rule amount. **Proposals 3 of Table on page 9:** We agree to the "MIP-idea". Details should be regulated in AMCs. Specific comments on the relevant paragraphs can be found in the CRT. **Proposals 4 of Table on page 9:** The template for the maintenance programme should be, for legal reasons, part of the rule material. AMCs are not "strong" enough to regulate such an issue. It must be feared that, if the issue is kept in an AMC, a harmonised application cannot be guaranteed by the NAAs. Specific comments on the relevant paragraphs can be found in the CRT. **Proposals 5 of Table on page 9:** We agree to proposal no. 5, allowing a Part 145 or M.A. Subpart F maintenance organisation to perform an annual inspection according to MIP and to issue corresponding ARCs. **Proposals 6 of Table on page 9:** We see some need for a hangar. The use of alternative methods should be exceptionally possible. The NAAs should be involved in this decision. **Proposals 7 of Table on page 10:** We do not support this option. Notwithstanding any substantial changes that would be warranted based on our basic concerns as stated above, we did comment on detailed paragraphs in the CRT.
response	*Noted* **<u>Complexity of the rule</u>** The Agency does not agree that introducing an option for self-declaration of the maintenance programme further complicates the rule. The General Aviation community has already expressed that it is a welcome simplification. Nevertheless, Phase 2 of this task will analyse possible options in order to make the rule more simple and understandable. **<u>Terms 'owner' and 'operator'</u>** Please note that M.A.201(b) already considers the case where the owner has leased the aircraft, transferring the responsibilities of the owner to the lessee. **<u>Proposals 2 and 3</u>** Your proposal of removing the need for a maintenance programme is against the Basic Regulation. In addition, the opinion of the Agency is that the existence of a maintenance programme is essential to ensure that the owner/operator has evaluated the maintenance requirements for his/her aircraft, for which he/she has to take into account not only the manufacturer's recommendations but also the specific situation of the particular aircraft (operational environment, repairs, modification, life-limited parts, pilot-owner maintenance, etc.). The Agency does not support to make the MIP mandatory (it is only the minimum). Any owner may decide to apply higher requirements.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Proposal 3

The text has been changed to include in the rule the basic requirements for the MIP, and to detail in the AMC an acceptable MIP.

Proposal 4

The Agency does not agree. Paragraph M.A.302(h)3 already contains the requirements for the customised maintenance programme. The template has been provided in order to show an acceptable format.

Proposal 5

Noted.

Proposal 6

The guidance introduced in AMC M.A.605(a) has the objective of providing flexibility for the maintenance of ELA2 aircraft as long as certain conditions are met. Requiring a hangar for most of these activities is not reasonable.

Proposal 7

The Agency still thinks that there is a need for some flexibility in the approval of the scope of work for this category of aircraft.

Please see our reply to your detailed comments in the corresponding paragraphs of this CRD.

comment *94* comment by: *Konekorhonen Oy 145-org. and G-org.*

Yleisesti on varmasti hyvä, että yleisilmailu on tunnistettu erilleen kaupallisesta käytöstä ja siihen liittyen ollaan lieventämässä vaatimuksia. Esitetyt muutokset ovat kuitenkin joiltain osin sekavia ja perusteluista huolimatta jopa huonoja.
Mielestämme asiaa valmistelleessa työryhmässä ei ollut kaikkia tarpeellisia sidosryhmiä mukana. Olisi ollut parempi jos työryhmässä (task force) olisi ollut edustettuna myös 145-organisaation, F-organisaation sekä CAMO:n toiminnassa mukana olevia henkilöitä.

response *Noted*

The group composition was (other than EASA):

— 2 representatives of Competent Authorities (Austria and France);
— 4 representatives of Manufacturers: EGAMA, GAMA, LAMA-Europe and European Sailplane Manufacturer Association;
— 1 representative of licensed engineers (AEI);
— 2 representatives from associations of owners/operators (EAS and IAOPA);
— 1 representative of the helicopter industry (EHA); and
— 1 representative of owners/operators and general aviation industry (ECOGAS).

The Agency considers this a balanced composition, which clearly incorporates 2 organisations representing maintenance organisations and CAMOs (EHA and ECOGAS) and 3 representing owners/operators (EASA, IAOPA and ECOGAS).

comment *141* comment by: *Hans KORDEL*

Betrifft: NPA 2012-17 Punkt 22 Gewerblichkeit Ballone (u. Flugzeuge) von Hans Kordel, Geschäftsführer der Ballonfabrik Schroeder fire balloons

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	Eine Werbedarstellung auf einem Ballon stellt nach meiner Meinung keine Voraussetzung für den gewerblichen Betrieb dar. Diese Annahme wäre ein weiterer Baustein im Zuge der allgemein fortschreitenden Reglementierung, um viele Menschen von diesem schönen Sport abzuhalten. Das Gleiche gilt für den Wegfall der Möglichkeit, durch Selbstkosten-beteiligung den Sport auch einem nicht so kapitalkräftigen Personenkreis zu ermöglichen. Fast jeder Fußballverein macht an seinem Sportplatz Bandenwerbung, um Kosten für den Betrieb, einschl. Trainerkosten, Reisekosten etc. bezahlen zu können, und das finde ich gut so. Sportler sowie auch Privatpersonen zeigen Firmenlogos auf ihrer Kleidung. Nach meiner Meinung war auch das Ergebnis der Gesetzesvorschläge des Europaparlamentes in Bezug auf die alle 2 Jahre erforderliche Fahrt mit einem Lehrer ein Hemmschuh für die sportliche Ballonfahrt. Ich muss es an dieser Stelle erwähnen, obwohl dieses Thema schon abgeschlossen ist. Nach dieser Entscheidung habe ich viele Stimmen gehört, denen diese Regelung einfach viel zu bürokratisch und aufwendig ist und dass erfahrene Piloten den Sport an den Nagel hängen wollen. Das Gleiche gilt für den Wegfall der Selbstkostenbeteiligung. Ich muss aber an meine eigene Brust schlagen und zugeben, dass ich leider damals keinen Kommentar abgegeben habe. Diese Fahrten mit Lehrer sind nicht erforderlich, da die Unfallzahlen im Ballonsport sehr klein geworden sind. Ich kenne die Zahlen aus meiner Tätigkeit als Beauftragter der BFU. Es war gut, dass die Mindestfahrtenzahl pro Jahr erhöht wurde. Warum muss man denn alles bis zum Exzess übertreiben? Gibt es solche Regelungen bei anderen Sportarten oder z.B. im Straßenverkehr? Der Ballonsport befindet sich bereits auf massiver Talfahrt. Wir erfahren die Meinungen und Nöte in der Ballonszene natürlich zeitnah durch die vielen Besuche von Kunden aus ganz Europa und können so ein realistisches Bild wiedergeben, ohne übertreiben zu müssen. Der gesunde Menschenverstand reicht aus, um zu wissen, dass die Anwendung einer Selbstkostenregelung keine Geschäftsabsichten erkennen lässt. Ein Geschäft setzt eine Gewinnabsicht voraus. Wenn nachgewiesen werden kann, dass nach Abzug aller Kosten kein Überschuss erwirtschaftet wird, liegt eine nichtgewerbliche Betriebsart vor. Zu den Kosten gehören, wie in einem anderen Geschäftsbetrieb auch, nicht nur die direkt auftretenden Kosen, sondern auch Fixkosten, wie Versicherung, Instandsetzung, Nachprüfung etc. Bei der alten Regelung in Deutschland bleibt sowohl genügend Freiraum für die nichtgewerbliche wie auch gewerbliche Ballonfahrt, sofern eine wirksame Kontrolle vorhanden ist. Langfristig und nachhaltig gesehen ist der Wegfall der Selbstkostenregelung auch für die gewerbliche Ballonfahrt schlecht. Der Nachwuchs rekrutiert sich hauptsächlich aus dem Vereinsleben heraus. Allerdings bin ich auch der Meinung, dass die Abgrenzung zwischen gewerblicher und sportlicher Ballonfahrt eindeutig kontrollierbar sein muss. Die gewerbliche Ballonfahrt hat mit höheren Auflagen und Kosten zu tun und ihr darf die Grundlage für eine profitable Geschäftspraxis nicht entzogen werden. Man braucht die bestehenden Vorschriften nicht zu ändern und zu verschärfen, sondern muss deren Einhaltung besser überwachen. Man sollte unbedingt bei Vorschlägen für neue Regeln bedenken, dass sich beschränkende Faktoren multiplizieren und dass sich einmal vorgestellte Entwürfe meist nur geringfügig durch Kommentare ändern lassen. Nach meiner Meinung sollte die Selbstkostenregelung mit 4 Insassen beigehalten werden, und zwar bis mind. 3.600 m³.
response	*Noted*

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

The term 'commercial operation' is defined in Article 3 of the Basic Regulation and cannot be altered through a lower ranking implementing rule. Furthermore, the Agency is not entitled to issue AMC/GM material for provisions of the Basic Regulation.

Nevertheless, the Agency acknowledges the paper issued by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy group and the actions recommended in this paper. In particular, action A.1 invites Member States to provide their feedback on the activities which they do not classify as commercial operations in their current system, and the Agency and the Commission to consider proposing changes to the definition in the Basic Regulation following such a feedback.

comment *144* comment by: *UK CAA*

Page No: General
Comment:
The proposed changes although aimed at simplifying the regulatory framework are overly complicated. Consideration should be given to developing a separate Annex to (EC) 2042/2003 that only applies to smaller GA aircraft. This would substantially simplify the contents of the requirements and thus aid understanding and compliance. It is widely recognised that one of the major complaints regarding Part M is how difficult it is to understand, mainly as a result of the use of multiple derogations and exceptions to account for smaller simpler aircraft types. The proposed changes have not improved clarity and have increased the level of complication. It is likely that this will lead to further compliance issues for aircraft owners and operators who typically have minimal understanding of the applicable regulations.
For the purposes of the work being done by the Part-M General Aviation Task Force, consideration should be given to provide the targeted GA community with a simple, easy to read set of regulations, separate from those for complex aircraft or for those used for Commercial Air Transport.

response *Noted*

This issue will be analysed during Phase II of this task.

comment *169* comment by: *FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation*

Attachment #1

The NPA 2012-17 introduces many changes in comparison with
- The Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003;
- The Decision No 2003/19/RM;
- The Guidance Material to Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003.
The comments hereafter SHALL BE considered as an identification of some of the major issues the GIPAG France asks EASA to discuss with third-parties before any publication of the proposed regulation, consistently with the woks led by the General Aviation Task force.
In consequence, the comments hereafter SHALL NOT BE considered:
-As a recognition of the third-parties consultation process carried out by EASA
- As an acceptance or an acknowledgement of the proposed regulation, as a whole or of any part of it;
- As exhaustive: the fact that some articles (or any part of them) are not commented does not mean the GIPAG France has (or may have) comments about them, neither the GIPAG France accepts or acknowledges them All the following comments are thus limited to our understanding of the effectively

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

published proposed regulation, not withstanding their consistency with any other pieces of regulation, including with the Basic Regulation 216/2008, giving mandate from the Commission and Parliament to EASA.
General comments:
The GIPAG France established a "maintenance" working group constituted of its members in order to
- Feed the "Part-M General Aviation Task Force (Phase I)" with the opinion of the French GA operators;
- To comment the NPA 2012-17.
The main underlined comment made by the GIPAG France, is to have a clarified definition of the "Commercial Operation" regarding General Aviation. As definition, the GIPAG France is considering as a commercial transaction any services giving rise to a financial contribution. France is particularly impacted by many flight training association which are considered as non-making profit organization. Their activities should be considered as a "Commercial Operations"
The second main comment is related to privileges of the approved organisation. The GIPAG France wants to warn EASA on the point that it is mandatory that the privileges granted to the approved maintenance organization have to be maintained higher than those given to the independent mechanics. The controlled environment has to remain an attractive option.
The GIPAG France is suggesting a certain number of ideas to answer to the proposals of this NPA:
- The advantage of an unlimitted Certificate of Airworthiness with a renewal of the ARC at each annual visit for the aircraft they maintain,
- The ability to switch from an approved framework to another without loss of privileges,
- The integration of the G + I approval within the Part F or Part 145 agreement (only one approval),
- The limitation of the number of audits,
- The implementation of a direct control of the independent mechanics,
- The lightening of the Maintenance programme.
The GIPAG France, through its following comments, is suggesting also the clarification of certain new items introduced in the NPA.
These general comments are developed and explained article by article, in the further relevant sections of the CRT associated to the NPA 2012-17.

response

Partially accepted

Definition of Commercial Operation

The term 'commercial operation' is defined in Article 3 of the Basic Regulation and cannot be altered through a lower ranking implementing rule. Furthermore, the Agency is not entitled to issue AMC/GM material for provisions of the Basic Regulation.

Nevertheless, the Agency acknowledges the paper issued by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy group and the actions recommended in this paper. In particular, action A.1 invites Member States to provide their feedback on the activities which they do not classify as commercial operations in their current system, and the Agency and the Commission to consider proposing changes to the definition in the Basic Regulation following such a feedback.

Privileges of approved organisations

Certainly, the Agency will maintain higher privileges for approved organisations than for individuals.

Unlimited Certificate of Airworthiness

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Our understanding is that you are proposing that the ARC is renewed without the need of an airworthiness review for those cases where the aircraft is in a controlled environment.

In the current system, this is possible during 3 years (at least once every 3 years there is a need for airworthiness review). The Agency is of the Opinion that this is a reasonable minimum.

Changing between approved frameworks

When changing organisations, there is always a transfer of Technical Records and information between both organisations. In addition, there is also a transfer of liabilities. That's why the Agency has considered this as a loss of the controlled environment and a full airworthiness review is required.

Integration of the G + I approval

This issue will be analysed in Phase II.

Limitation of number of audits

This issue will be analysed in Phase II.

Direct control of independent mechanics

This issue will be analysed in Phase II for the case of allowing independent certifying staff to issue the ARC.

Lightening of the maintenance programme

Already accomplished in this proposal through the MIP and the self-declared maintenance programme.

comment *184* comment by: *SVFB/SAMA*

2012-17 NPA Part M by ECOGAS
130129-1650
ECOGAS is the European Federation of national General & Business Aviation representative bodies cooperating across the continent and representing General Aviation within the European Aviation with the European Authorities.
We are indeed very much appreciating that EASA after a long ignorance of the needs of General and Business Aviation is recognizing that there are different risk potentials, different needs and different structures which should lead to much fewer allocation of supervising resources.
We hope that this is a first step of a truly innovative process, which will increase competitiveness of GA **and BA** for the sake of providing jobs for the European Youth.
ECOGAS supports the content of NPA 2012-17
There are three issues greatly reducing the effect of this NPA:
For this reasons the "lighter" less complex Part M/F is applied by MRO's only in 5% of all cases. The definition(s) of "commercial" should be drafted in a manner that 100% of the operations which involve aircraft up to and including group 3 aircraft would in any case fall under another (lighter) definition of commercial. This definition should be constructed in a form and manner to allow 100 % of the maintenance of such aircraft to be accomplished by Part M Sub F approved MRO's. This would allow to work with really well adapted structures and simple process for a majority, in the best case of most of SME MRO's as opposed to the present regime.
Another category of commercial definition should be available to all aircraft between group 3 and aircraft <5.7 t which would make Part M/F eligible to maintain this aircraft.
Part 145 would be required and be reserved for all Aircraft >5.7t and CAT: licensed Air Carriers. All legal text in 145 not concerning aircraft >5.7t would be

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

removed; a lot of "scatter for the major MRO's would go out of their main regulation.
Such division would make the alleviation now addressed through several initiatives ,WG's , NPA's opinions etc. **effective** but will need a **substantial change** of basic regulation.

response *Noted*

The term 'commercial operation' is defined in Article 3 of the Basic Regulation and cannot be altered through a lower ranking implementing rule. Furthermore, the Agency is not entitled to issue AMC/GM material for provisions of the Basic Regulation.

Nevertheless, the Agency acknowledges the paper issued by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy group and the actions recommended in this paper. In particular, action A.1 invites Member States to provide their feedback on the activities which they do not classify as commercial operations in their current system, and the Agency and the Commission to consider proposing changes to the definition in the Basic Regulation following such a feedback.

comment *198* comment by: *Volker Loeschhorn*

Technisch unterscheidet sich ein Ballon mit Werbeaufschrift von einem Ballon ohne Werbeaufschrift nicht in der Weise, dass hier eine unterschiedliche Handhabung der Nachprüfung notwendig wäre. Auch der Betrieb eines Ballons mit Werbeaufschrift unterscheidet sich nicht von der eines Ballons ohne Werbeaufschrift. Daher ist von der technischen Seite her eine Unterscheidung nach der Aufschrift oder der Gestaltung des Hülle in gewerblich und nichtgewerblich weder notwendig noch gerechtfertigt. Das heißt, eine Werbeaufschrift ist kein Grund einen Ballon als gewerblich betrieben einzuordnen.

response *Noted*

The term 'commercial operation' is defined in Article 3 of the Basic Regulation and cannot be altered through a lower ranking implementing rule. Furthermore, the Agency is not entitled to issue AMC/GM material for provisions of the Basic Regulation.

Nevertheless, the Agency acknowledges the paper issued by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy group and the actions recommended in this paper. In particular, action A.1 invites Member States to provide their feedback on the activities which they do not classify as commercial operations in their current system, and the Agency and the Commission to consider proposing changes to the definition in the Basic Regulation following such a feedback.

comment *205* comment by: *EFLEVA*

The EFLEVA cofirms that we are pleased to see any ameliorating measures that come out of the review of Part M. Particularly in the area of light aircraft not used for commercial purposes. We would however recommend that any measures suggested should be tested against the Six Priciples outlined in EASA's GA Safety Policy Document, in order to ensure trully proportionate regulation.
We would further suggest that since this is Phase 1 of this initiative, that the outcome from later phases is also tested againt the Six Principles of EASA's GA Safety Policy Document.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

response | *Partially accepted*

This will be done for Phase II.

However, for Phase I the objective was to introduce urgent measures that would alleviate the General Aviation community without the need of an in-depth Regulatory Impact Assessment. As a consequence, Phase I does not introduce any revolutionary changes.

comment | *209* comment by: *DGAC France*

- DGAC France is broadly in favour of all changes that can be introduced in Regulation (EC) n°2042/2003 in order to reduce the burden on the General Aviation community. Nevertheless, the related aircraft must still hold a certificate of airworthiness delivered and maintained in accordance with ICAO annexes. In annex 6 linked to operation of aircraft Part II International General Aviation – Aeroplanes, the following is specified:
« 2.6.1 Owner's maintenance responsibilities
2.6.1.1 The owner of an aeroplane, or in the case where it is leased, the lessee, shall ensure that, in accordance with procedures acceptable to the State of Registry:
a) the aeroplane is maintained in an airworthy condition;
b) the operational and emergency equipment necessary for an intended flight is serviceable; and
c) the certificate of airworthiness of the aeroplane remains valid.
2.6.1.2 The owner or the lessee shall not operate the aeroplane unless it is maintained and released to service under a system acceptable to the State of Registry.
2.6.1.3 When the maintenance release is not issued by an approved maintenance organization in accordance with Annex 6, Part I, 8.7, the person signing the maintenance release shall be licensed in accordance with Annex 1.
2.6.1.4 The owner or the lessee shall ensure that the maintenance of the aeroplane is performed in accordance with a maintenance programme acceptable to the State of Registry. »
DGAC France therefore wonders if all the proposed alleviations in this NPA do not go too far and still allow the aircraft to be considered in conformity with ICAO standards, especially in the case of the declaration for the aircraft maintenance programme (MP) introduced for ELA 1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations. When the MP conformity is just based on a declaration from the aircraft owner (without any review) and based on his/her choice of deviations to the type certificate holder recommendations, it is not obvious that this MP is acceptable to the State of registry, as required by ICAO.
DGAC France would highly appreciate to have EASA's views on this issue.

response | *Noted*

The position of the Agency is that the self-declared maintenance programme meets the ICAO requirements. The reason is that once this option is adopted (after the Comitology Process), it will be applicable in all Member States and will be considered as being acceptable to all Member States.

comment | *210* comment by: *DGAC France*

- As regards this specific case of declaration for the aircraft maintenance programme introduced for ELA 1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, DGAC France also wonders what responsibility is exactly given to the personnel

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	in charge of the aircraft airworthiness review. These personnel are only likely to check the MP defined by the aircraft owner is adequately implemented and that the physical exam does not show abnormal obvious deficiencies but they should not be given a responsibility that is obviously the owner's. DGAC France would highly appreciate to have EASA's views on this issue.
response	*Noted* Please refer to the new GM M.A.302(h).

comment	*211* comment by: *DGAC France* Since this NPA includes revision proposals on different subjects, it may be necessary to consider the possibility to have it validated in several steps in case some items raise too many remarks/discussions (in order to validate as soon as possible the topics on which there is a consensus). For instance, proposal 4 (template of the Maintenance program) and proposal 7 (use of the indirect approval procedure by the CAMO to introduce new type ratings to their scope of work) are likely to be dealt with more easily and therefore could be introduced quickly, while the discussion on other issues could last longer. Therefore, DGAC France has tried to gather all the comments linked to a specific proposal.
response	*Not accepted* The Agency cannot anticipate how the discussions in the Comitology Process will develop. As a consequence, the intention of the Agency is to issue a single Opinion for Phase I.

comment	*212* comment by: *DGAC France* The NPA often uses the wording "commercial operations" to allow alleviation to ELA2 or ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations. It is therefore necessary to define clearly what could be considered as non commercial operations for general aviation.
response	*Noted* The term 'commercial operation' is defined in Article 3 of the Basic Regulation and cannot be altered through a lower ranking implementing rule. Furthermore, the Agency is not entitled to issue AMC/GM material for provisions of the Basic Regulation. Nevertheless, the Agency acknowledges the paper issued by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy group and the actions recommended in this paper. In particular, action A.1 invites Member States to provide their feedback on the activities which they do not classify as commercial operations in their current system, and the Agency and the Commission to consider proposing changes to the definition in the Basic Regulation following such a feedback.

comment	*232* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency* **Swedish Transport Agency comments to NPA 2012-17 "Part-M General Aviation Task Force"** The general impression is that STA (Swedish Transport Agency) supports the proposed alleviations for the General Aviation. A notice is that the current

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

regulation will not be changed. The proposed changes will add more alternatives for the General Aviation and keep an acceptable safety level with a possibility to reduce the cost for the aircraft owner.

Proposal of changes to the NPA

STA propose a "concept" that will simplify the text of the proposed changes to the rules and by that make it easier for the user to understand and learn, and to reduce the complexity of the rules.

The proposals are:

- The ARC 15c (not extendable) should be connected to ELA1 not involved in commercial operations with a declaration-AMP (MIP/DAHD) instead of being connected to the issuer MF/145 as in the NPA.

  The ARC 15c should be issued by CAMO/MF/145 after an airworthiness review of an ELA1 not involved in commercial operations with a declaration-AMP (MIP/DAHD).

  When NAA receives the copy of the ARC 15c, the NAA will know that there is a declaration-AMP and therefore does not need to require a copy of the AMP. This will reduce administration for the owner and the NAA.

  The existing ELA1-ARS (acc to M.A.901(g)) should be embraced to have this privilege as explained above (to issue the ARC 15c) instead of being restricted to issue recommendations.
- The airworthiness review privilege for an MF/145 should not only be limited to declaration-AMP (MIP) as in the NPA.
  The MF/145 should also have the privilege to perform the airworthiness review and the yearly review of declaration-AMP (DAHD), the same privilege as for CAMO.

  This alleviation will make it easier for everybody to understand and learn. It will reduce the complexity of the rules.

- The existing ELA1-ARS (acc to M.A.901(g)) should be embraced by these new alleviations. They should also have the privilege to perform the airworthiness review and the yearly review of the declaration-AMP (MIP/DAHD) on all ELA1 not involved in commercial operations, including the issuance of ARC 15c. Since they are not under direct surveillance, they should be obliged to send all supporting documents together with the copy of the ARC 15c to the NAA.

- The rules should contain a clarification that aircraft in commercial operation (M.A.201(h)(i)) should not be permitted to use an ARC 15c.

  If an aircraft with ARC 15c is to be used in commercial operations it should be to "transferred" to an ARC 15a. It should be necessary to perform some actions such as:
  - Develop and approve an AMP in accordance with M.A.302(a-g).
  - Perform a bridgecheck to meet the requirements to the approved AMP (M.A.302(a-g)).
  - Perform an airworthiness review and send a recommendation report to the NAA that will issue an ARC 15a.

Explanations:

- Declaration-AMP (MIP/DAHD) = M.A.302(h)
- Declaration-AMP (MIP) = M.A.302(h)2 bullet 1
- Declaration-AMP (DAHD) = M.A.302(h)2 bullet 2

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

- Approved AMP = M.A.302(a-g)

Other comments:

- This NPA will exclude CAMO with ARS that don't have personnel with Part-66 AML to perform airworthiness review on aircraft with declaration-AMP (MIP).

response *Partially accepted*

EASA Form 15c

The NAA does not need to receive an EASA Form 15c in order to know that there is a self-declared maintenance programme. The NAA should assume that there is a self-declared maintenance programme for any registered aircraft for which they have not approved the maintenance programme (directly or indirectly).

Airworthiness review privileges

The Agency agrees with your comment. The maintenance organisation will be able to perform the airworthiness review together with the annual inspection, regardless of who approved the maintenance programme and regardless of whether it is based on the MIP or not. The only condition is that the airworthiness review has to be performed together with the annual inspection.

Privileges for independent certifying staff to perform airworthiness reviews

This option will be analysed during Phase II.

Clarification on the use of EASA Form 15c

The opinion of the Agency is that in M.A.901(l) it is absolutely clear that EASA Form 15c can only be used for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations.

Transfer from 'non-commercial' to 'commercial'

The Agency agrees that when this transfer occurs there may be a need to change (and approve) a new maintenance programme, including the performance of an airworthiness review and the issuance of an EASA Form 15a or 15b. See GM M.A.901(l)5.

Privileges of CAMO airworthiness review staff

Please note that the CAMO can perform the airworthiness review at any time regardless of whether the maintenance programme is self-declared or not and regardless of whether it is based on a MIP or not. The airworthiness review staff do not need to have a Part-66 licence (other qualifications are possible according to M.A.707).

comment *253* comment by: *Poul Hoerup, DSvU*

The Danish Gliding Association (DSvU) fully recommend the proposal from Eurepean Gliding Union (EGU).

response *Noted*

comment *280* comment by: *MF: AOPA Denmark & Danish Powered Flying Union (DMU)*

From an overall perspective MF: AOPA Denmark and Danish Powered Flying

	Union (DMU) warmly support the initiative to reduce the burden on General Aviation community. It is essential especially for ELA1. This NPA is considered to be an important step forward in the right direction. We propose that the action taken by the Part-M General Aviation Task Force and EASA to alleviate the regulation of General Aviation community should be applicable for all non-complex aircrafts below 5.700 kilos not involved in commercial operations.
response	*Noted* Extensions of the proposed amendments to other aircraft categories will be analysed during Phase II.

comment	*285* comment by: *Schroeder fire balloons GmbH* comment to Nr.22: Schroeder fire balloons GmbH as the only hot air balloon manufacturer in Germany is very much interested that both commercial and private balloon flying can be done under acceptable conditions in the future. Not only that a spectacular and unique sport would (nearly) die but also nearly 30 employments just in our company would be jeopardized in a region which economically is very weak. More than 90% of balloons which are flown e.g. in Germany are carrying a branding on their envelopes and this fact makes ballooning affordable for everybody interested. We argue that it will be very hard to lead new blood to ballooning if just some privileged are able to carry all upcoming costs. So our proposal is to allow cost effective private flights(see German system/ tax offices never found balloon flights with max. 4 occupants to be commercial) to avoid that wonderful balloon sport can only be practiced by some rich and privileged Head of Schroeder fire balloons GmbH: Friedhelm Schroeder and Hans Kordel
response	*Noted* The term 'commercial operation' is defined in Article 3 of the Basic Regulation and cannot be altered through a lower ranking implementing rule. Furthermore, the Agency is not entitled to issue AMC/GM material for provisions of the Basic Regulation. Nevertheless, the Agency acknowledges the paper issued by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy group and the actions recommended in this paper. In particular, action A.1 invites Member States to provide their feedback on the activities which they do not classify as commercial operations in their current system, and the Agency and the Commission to consider proposing changes to the definition in the Basic Regulation following such a feedback.

comment	*298* comment by: *IAOPA Europe* AOPA Europe has contributed to a significant extent to this NPA through the good offices of its representative on the EASA GA Task Force, Mr Dan Åkerman, and hence has no items of detail to comment upon. IAOPA Europe supports the NPA and finds that it is a step in the right direction

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

to remove overregulation of GA.

IAOPA Europe recommends moving ahead quickly to Phase 2 where the GATF will look at possibilities for extending the regulation to ELA 2 aircraft and further up to all non-complex aircraft below 5,700 kg. IAOPA Europe finds that such an extension could and should be made.

response *Noted*

comment *330* comment by: *Aero-Club of Switzerland*

The Aero-Club of Switzerland (AeCS) and the European Powered Flight Union (EPFU) are, among others, members of Europe Air Sports, representing some 680'000 European holders of pilots licences, organised in clubs, national aero-clubs and European federations.
We thank the Agency for the publication of NPA 2012-17, we appreciate very much the effort made and encourage the Agency to maintain heading, speed, and altitude.
Europe Air Sports, our "parent organisation" is one of the main representatives asking for a Part-M adapted to our operations for a long time now, always having had our full support. Our arguments are heard, our voices are listened to and a great many within the aeronautical community support our position.
AeCS and EPFU will continue to support the Agency creating provisions adapted to the sports and recreational aviation. A well balanced Part-M for General Aviation as is presented with NPA 2012-17 lays a solid foundation for the future of our clubs where thousands of individuals deliver a great job, mostly unpaid, within the framework of "not for profit"-organisations.
Other organisations, e.g. EGU, will submit more detailed, more technical comments. We kindly invite the Agency to consider these contributions. Many thanks.

response *Noted*

comment *333* comment by: *European Sailplane Manufacturers*

The European sailplane manufacturers appreciate the time and efforts spent by EASA and several stakeholders on the proposed improvements regarding application of Part-M in small aviation.
Even more appreciated is that the promise given at the workshop on 27.10.2011 to react fast for getting some improvements was held.
The according new Task Force was assembled really fast and the members of this group certainly form a viable cross-section through all parties concerned with this matter.

Being a member of this task force of course allowed us to bring in several insights and ideas, but it has to be realized that this group was set into certain limitations right from the beginning - at least during the phase 1 with this NPA 2012-17 being the result.

In separate general and specific comments we will summarize the many comments received in the last weeks about this NPA.

Here a kind of reality check shall be given with the aims set out in our presentation during the workshop from 2011 as comparison:

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

...Part-M too complex and difficult to understand...
Here our NPA will hardly bring any improvement.
With the limitation to not change the fundamentals of Part-M given to the Task Force, it was not "allowed" for this group to create something as a "Part-M ELA" which might be the best solution.
All points critizised before still apply - many cross-references, many abbreviations, partition into rule and AMC, AMC only in English.
Sadly no improvement in phase 1.

...AMP are too complex...
Critique was that the concept of an AMP (which comes from the world of commercial air transport) is too complex and often not suited to the small aviation communities.
The consequent solution would have been to eliminate the need for an AMP (e.g. for ELA aircraft).
Again this was "forbidden" in phase 1 and the result is the new proposed self-declaration of the aircraft owner for his AMP.
This will help to alleviate the efforts and costs which have resulted from the need to approve an AMP today.
Nevertheless this self-declaration is a workaround.
This is an improvement (even a major one), but not a consequent and elegant one.

...standard changes & repairs are too difficult...
An easy way to get an aproval for a standard change and/or repair is still missing.
Admittedly with the new consolidated version of Part 21 in 748/2012 the possibility for a CS-standard change / repair has been implemented. But now we (at least the small aviation communities, but certainly also other stakeholders as well) need a fast editing of this CS. Sadly we have been told repeatedly, that limitations within EASA do not allow faster drafting of such documents.
The repeated offers to give direct input (on a budget certainly much below the typical EASA hourly fee) were not embraced by EASA.
In the end this has been put outside the scope of phase 1 and therefore this NPA brings not improvement in this issue.

...too restrictive pilot-owner maintenance...
Critique here was that no help by fellow pilots or non-pilots is allowed by existing rules and that the AMC list of maintenance tasks is misused by NAAs as a strict catalogue which cannot be amended.
Here certainly some improvement could be still possible as mostly changes in the AMC material would be sufficient.
Hopefully this could be done after end of the commenting period of this NPA.

...limitation to use existing personnel as certifying staff...
With the decision to put all Part-66 licencing topics into another rulemaking task, this topic was put outside the scope of the Task Force.
Nevertheless the problem remains that due to the large numbers of gliders (and other ELA aircraft) and pilots involved, we certainly need a layered system of certifying staff.
The critique given during the comitology process for the limited-L and full-L licences should be an incentive to make such a layered approach better understandable, but not to drop that concept.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Sadly in the moment (i.e. in NPA 2012-15) only a L licence is proposed, which will exclude a large number of qualified persons to take part in supervising and releasing lighter maintenance tasks.
No progress in this issue, actually it is getting worse.

...EASA and NAA loose their good reputation due to implementation of Part-M rules...
Hopefully the fast reaction of EASA and the publication of this NPA has helped to improve the perception of European standardized rules and authorities within the small aviation communities.
Nevertheless the lack of success in the fields listed above will still lead to more and more frustration.
This is even more true as in other fields EASA and the EU commission still try to delight small aviation with processes and concepts straight out of the commercial air transport world.
The already visible topics of OPS (e.g. to state that aerotow operations should be considerd as special operations), SMS, medicals for LAPL, organisations requirements and much more still undermine the respect and belief, that this is all good for safety.
In the end this all will lead to no improvements but to many more complaints.
The proposal - to detach regulations below a certain boundary (e.g. ELA 1 or ELA 2) and/or to create a dedicated part within EASA to coordinate ALL rulemaking efforts for these aircraft - is still not heard at EASA or European levels.
Again - no improvement made (and again because this was not inside the scope of the Task Force).

In summary it can be said, that within the scope of work defined for the Task Force, this NPA shows some steps into the right direction.
But this is not a leap for small aviation, more a very small step....

Nevertheless let us all help together to make the next way forward!

response

Noted

The issue related to Standard Changes and Repairs is currently being addressed by task MDM.048.

The issue related to a possible layered system for certifying staff of small aircraft (limited-L and full-L) is currently being addressed by task 66.027.

The other issues that you are referring to will be analysed during Phase II.

comment

334 comment by: *Alex Plein*

Ich bin zur Zeit in Ausbildung für meinen PPL-D Schein für Heißluftballone. Der Sport hat mich seit ich damit in kontakt gekommen bin begeistert. Ich habe vor über einem Jahr mit der Ausbildung angefangen und stehe kurz vor der praktischen Prüfung.
Da alles was mit Luftsport zu tun hat seinen stolzen Preis hat und ich nicht genug verdiene um mir den Sport als Pilot leisten zu können werde ich darauf angewiesen sein, die ein oder andere Fahrt mit zahlenden Gästen zu gestalten um ein Teil der anfallende Kosten wie Gas, Versicherung, Verschleiß etc. decken zu können.
Die meisten privaten Piolten, und es sind in der Zeit die ich den Sport begleite nicht wenige, finanzieren ihre luftsportliche Tätigkeit durch sponsoring und dem ein oder anderen zahlenden Gast. Nur aufgrund der Tatsache, dass sie über den

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Sport etwas Geld einnehmen bedeutet nicht, dass sie ein Gewerbe betreiben, da der Sport oft wesentlich mehr Kostet als man mit den Hüllengrößen der privaten Ballonfahrt einnimmt. Wäre die Möglicheit ein wenig Geld für einen Gast zu verlangen oder sich ein Teil der Kosten durch sponsoring bezahlen zu lassen nicht gegeben, könnten sie ihren Sport nicht ausführen und viele wie ich erst garnicht antreten.
In vielen Sportarten die nichts mit der Luftfahrt zu tun haben wird dieser durch externe Geldgeber und Werbung finanziert und trotzdem nicht als Gewerbe angesehen.
Ich denke die Regelung der Selbstkostendeckung durch Sponsoring und Gästefahrten, wie sie bislang in Deutschland gehandhabt wurde und von den Behörden abgesegnet ist für fair und weiterführbar. Wenn diese Regelung durch Europäische Gesetzgebung gekippt wird, ist ein weiteres Feld der freien Entfaltung für den normalen Menschen nicht mehr zugänglich und nur noch den gehobenen Schichten der Gesellschaft vorbehalten. Desweiteren hätte ich etliche tausend Euro für die Ausbildung bezahlt und könnte nicht einmal den Sport ausüben.

response *Noted*

The term 'commercial operation' is defined in Article 3 of the Basic Regulation and cannot be altered through a lower ranking implementing rule. Furthermore, the Agency is not entitled to issue AMC/GM material for provisions of the Basic Regulation.

Nevertheless, the Agency acknowledges the paper issued by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy group and the actions recommended in this paper. In particular, action A.1 invites Member States to provide their feedback on the activities which they do not classify as commercial operations in their current system, and the Agency and the Commission to consider proposing changes to the definition in the Basic Regulation following such a feedback.

comment *336* comment by: *European Sailplane Manufacturers*

Within this general comment, a summary is given about all comments heard within the last weeks regarding NPA 2012-17.

First of all and foremost a lot of positive reactions has been perceived by pilots, aircraft owners, maintenance organisations and CAMOs and authorities as well.

The basic concepts of giving some of the responsibilities back to the persons / organisations concerned directly (the owners and the certifying staff) has been well received.

Additionally it was appreciated, that here a clear signal was given by EASA that improvements shall be made.

On the negative side it was heard often, that the proposal in itself is not easy to read and that Part-M will becoming even more complex with the proposed amendments.

As a conclusion it can be said, that the proposed changes to existing rules seem to hit the most pressing topics, which was also the aim for phase 1.
Nevertheless it can be seen clearly that much more needs to be done, before the people concerned and working with Part-M will really express happiness, when being asked about continuing airworthiness regulation.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

response

Noted

Phase II of this task will analyse further improvements.

comment

344 comment by: *reinhold SCHAAK*

moin,
als pilot, eigentümer und instandhalter von 2 cessnas hier mein kommentar zum vorschlag 2012-17:
vor mehr als 20 jahren hat es die europäische union mit der **jaa** versäumt, die geplante harmonisierung/synchronisierung der europäischen vorschriften mit denen der **faa** umzusetzen.
alle nachfolgenden versuche einer harmonisierung sind - aufgrund national-egoistischer forderungen der mitgliedsstaaten – seither gründlich mißlungen.
die „spiegelung" der vorschriften für die gewerbliche großluftfahrt auf die general aviation, insbesondere den privaten teil war und ist völlig praxisfremd, zu kompliziert, zu aufwändig , zu kostenintensiv und geht daher zulasten der sicherheit.
dieses hat die allgemeine luftfahrt in deutschand und europa in den vergangenen jahren schwer belastet und u.a dazu geführt, daß diverse kleinere betriebe sowie zahlreiche luftfahrzeughalter aufgegeben haben.
camo in der aktuellen fassung „verbrennt" sinnlos resourcen, energieen, geld und vor allem vertrauen, und führt keineswegs zu mehr sicherheit !
dieses hat die easa inzwischen erkannt und versucht mit der aktion, ich nenne es mal „back to the roots", zurück auf den boden der praktikabilität zu führen. gut so !
aber warum nimmt man jetzt nicht die chance wahr, die regulations der faa (1:1), zu übernehmen, die sich über jahrzehnte in dem größten luftraum der welt zweifelsfrei bewährt haben,
sondern doktert an der mißgeburt der easa part „m" weiter herum ?
mein vorschlag für die privaten, d.h. nicht gewerblich genutzten flugzeuge:
· abschaffung der camo ! es ging auch 50 jahre ohne, und nachweisbar ohne sicherheits-einbußen.
· instandhaltung liegt in der **verantwortung** des eigentümers/halters
· daher: **owner**-maintenance * kann und muß die 100-std-kontrolle umfassen.
das ist schließlich kein teufelswerk, und hat daher in der vergangenheit auch seinen angemessen stellenwert gehabt.
(* nicht **pilot**-owner-maintenance, denn wieso soll das über jahrzehnte erworbene fachwissen/erfahrung mit dem verlust der piloten-lizenz z.b. wg. medical „in die tonne" ?)
p.s.: dasselbe gilt übrigens auch für
· zulassung (siehe hierzu richtungsweisend „bilateral aviation safety agreement – basa" v. 15.03.2011) ! wäre durch übernahme der us-far ebenfalls obsolet.
· lizensierung , umschreibung von lizenzen. eine einheitliche klassifizierung und lizensierung in europa und usa wäre für alle beteiligten ideal.

response

Partially accepted

The legal system in Europe is very different from the US. As a consequence, it is not possible to just transpose the FAA rules. Nevertheless, the objective of this task is to alleviate the requirements as much as possible (especially during Phase II).

Please note that a CAMO is not required with the current rules for this category of aircraft.

The text has been changed in AMC M.A.803 in order to allow Pilot-owner

maintenance with an expired medical examination.

However, the annual/100h inspection contained in the Minimum Inspection Programme has been excluded from the Pilot-owner maintenance.

Your comments related to a common pilot licensing system is outside the scope of this task (only deals with airworthiness issues)

comment *345* comment by: *bst-langenfeld*

nachfolgend mein kommentar ,respective stellungnahme , zu den noch vorzubereitenden änderungen:
heissluftballone,gasballone bzw aerostaten.
die zukünftigen änderungen werden m.e. eine gravierend negative auswirkung auf die sportlich betriebene ausübung von ballonsport innerhalb europas haben .
wenn es nicht mehr möglich sein soll , gegen selbstkostenbeteiligung 1 bis max 3 passagiere mitzunehmen, werden sich ausschliesslich großballone von gewerbebetrieben
und nicht mehr sportler , amateure und auch ausbilder innerhalb und ausserhalb von vereinen oder zugehörigkeitsgemeinschaften möglich gemacht, freiballonsport
zu betreiben.
sportliche veranstaltungen, wettbewerbe, ballon-festivals, freundschaftstreffen, gordon-bennett-rennen können unter dieser prämisse nicht mehr stattfinden oder werden zu gewerblichen luftspektakel abgewertet.
die für vereine lebensnotwendige sponsoren-hilfe in form von beworbenen hüllen etc ., kommt auch explizit der jugendarbeit innerhalb der vereine und gruppen zugute.
ohne eine bereitstellung von entsprechendem equipment wird luftsportlich keine ausbildung und weiterbildung von jugendlichen und die sportlichen inübunghaltung von leistungssportlern (gb-rennen, langzeitflüge ,nationalen und internationalen meisterschaften und wettbewerbe) möglich sein.
der luftsport - insbesondere ballonsport wird zugunsten der von luftfahrunternehmen s t e r b e n .
appr.lösung : bestehende regelung in deutschland beibehalten !
hl-ballone bis max 3400 m3 (max . 4 personen) und wasserstoff oder heliumballone bis max 1050 m3 (max 5 personen) als n i c h t g e w e r b l i c h
einzuklassifizieren.
dies war in deutschland in den letzten 20 jahren eine praktikable lösung und alle - selbst die gewerblichen luftfahrunternehmer konnten damit auskommen und leben.
bitte nehmen sie meine gedanken und überlegungen in ihre weitere entscheidungsfindung mit auf.
ps.: der erste hl-ballon der gebr. montgolfier im jahre 1783 hatte auch schon eine werbebotschaft ! L für ludwig , könig von frankreich.
mit ausdrücklich sportlichem gruß
Glück ab und gut Land,
Roland h. Kordes

response *Noted*

The term 'commercial operation' is defined in Article 3 of the Basic Regulation and cannot be altered through a lower ranking implementing rule. Furthermore, the Agency is not entitled to issue AMC/GM material for provisions of the Basic

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Regulation.

Nevertheless, the Agency acknowledges the paper issued by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy group and the actions recommended in this paper. In particular, action A.1 invites Member States to provide their feedback on the activities which they do not classify as commercial operations in their current system, and the Agency and the Commission to consider proposing changes to the definition in the Basic Regulation following such a feedback.

comment *346* comment by: *Rudolf Gloeggler*

der in der NPA Nr. 2017-17 vorgeschlagene Ratschlag, dass das Management Board ausgewiesene Fachleute der betroffenen Mittgliedstaaten zu einem Gedanken- und Erfahrungsaustausch einlädt, ist sehr wichtig.
In einigen Mitgliedstaaten ist die Abgrenzung zu kommerziellen "Operatonen" teilweise durch Finanzgesetze klar geregelt und dementsprechend auch überprüfbar. In manchen Ländern wird das nicht so dezidiert der Fall sein. Diesbezüglich scheint es dort Unklarheiten und deshalb vermutlich auch viele Unstimmigkeiten zu geben.
Das " Handling" von Luftfahrt-Aktionen(hier Ballonfahrten) kann durch den Austausch von schon angewandten guten Regelungen einiger Mitgliedstaaten zufriedenstellend definiert werden.

response *Noted*

TITLE PAGE p. 1

comment *75* comment by: *Ken Dickenson*

Attachment #2

response *Noted*

Fleet size

Please note that the Basic Regulation only requires that an organisation manages the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft in the case of complex motor-powered aircraft and aircraft involved in commercial operations. There is no limit to the fleet size.

As a consequence, the Implementing Rules (such as Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003, including Part-M) follow the same principle.

Airworthiness code requirement standards

The purpose of the Minimum Inspection Programme is to set a minimum for this category of aircraft:

- If the maintenance instructions from the DAH are poor, the requirement states that the maintenance programme cannot go below the Minimum Inspection Programme.
- It the maintenance instructions from the DAH are adequate, there are 2 options:
  - If the owner chooses to follow those instructions, this is adequate.
  - If the owner chooses to follow the Minimum Inspection Programme, the proposal states that the recommendations from the DAH still need to be considered (see fields 5, 10 and 13 of the template in

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

AMC M.A.302(e)).

Example of NPA 2012-17:

Please note that the proposal of allowing the owner to declare the maintenance programme is accompanied by several compensating measures such as the following:

— There is a review of the effectiveness of such programme at the time of the airworthiness review. Defects linked to an inadequate maintenance programme must be notified to the NAA to ensure that the maintenance programme is amended.

— Guidance has been introduced (GM M.A.201(e)) to remind the owner of the importance of proper self-assessment of their competence.

— The introduction of a Minimum Inspection Programme setting the minimums.

In addition, we don't agree that 'establishing and maintaining a high uniform level of safety' means having the same rules independently of the category of aircraft. The requirements must be proportional to the associated risks and liabilities. Furthermore, the level of safety is always related to the level of risk that the Member States are willing to face.

That's why in the Basic Regulation the requirements are different depending on the aircraft category and type of operation.

NPA 2012-17 Objective

Yes, the objective is to ensure proportionate and cost-efficient rules for General Aviation while maintaining an acceptable level of safety.

This is also the objective of the Basic Regulation, which does not impose the same requirements on all stakeholders, basing them on the associated risks and the level of risk that the Member States are willing to accept.

In addition, the Agency would like to note that any new privilege granted to maintenance organisations (development of maintenance programme and performance of airworthiness reviews with issue of the ARC) is limited to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations and has included appropriate compensating measures, such as:

- Proper qualification procedures for the personnel.
- Proper oversight by the Competent Authority.

Regarding Opinion 06/2010 related to single and multiple release, the issue is currently being discussed in task M.029. However, the objective of this task is related to complex maintenance operations, where coordination between different teams and the CAMO is critical. That's why this issue is limited to Part-145 organisations.

On the other hand, the new privileges proposed for maintenance organisations, do not go beyond ELA2 aircraft not used in commercial operations, which means a CAMO is not required at all and the maintenance events are quite simple. It is difficult to imagine several organisations performing complex maintenance simultaneously on an ELA1/ELA2 aircraft. Furthermore, the risks associated to the commercial air transport environment (time pressure, etc.) cannot be extrapolated to this category of aircraft.

Protection against fluctuations in human performance or decisions – Authority side

The Agency agrees that the level of expertise of the NAA inspectors may be different depending on the Member State. However, this is an issue which needs to be addressed through standardisation measures and not by rulemaking activities.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

In addition, the Agency would like to point that, as opposed to what you mention, a recommendation from the aircraft manufacturer to lubricate the door seals every 30 days is not mandatory continuing airworthiness information, unless it is covered by an Airworthiness Directive.

NPA2012-17 Proposed changes

The Agency completely disagrees with your comment. Introducing, for example, the option of having the maintenance programme developed by a maintenance organisation cannot be done in the AMC material because the current rule does not allow it. The same can be said about the option to have the airworthiness review performed by the maintenance organisation or the option to have the maintenance programme declared by the owner.

All these options must be in the rule.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY p. 2

comment *38* comment by: *René Meier, Europe Air Sports*

Europe Air Sports, representing some 680'000 European holders of pilots licences, organised in clubs, national aero-clubs and European federations, thanks the Agency for the publication of NPA 2012-17.
We appreciate very much the effort made and encourage the Agency to maintain speed and altitude.
Europe Air Sports is one of the main representatives asking for a Part-M adapted to our operations for a long time now. At last, we believe, our arguments are heard, our voices are listened to and a great many within the aeronautical community support our position of not just being treated as negligible number of aviators easily to be forced in a regulations regime that does not fit.
Europe Air Sports will continue to support the Agency creating provisions adapted to the sports and recreational aviation. As well as in the past, also today and in future, good airmanship is the keyword, covering all aspects of flight operations, independent of the size of the aircraft, good "craftmanship" is the keyword for maintenance personnel working in small as well as in large organsiations. Ours normally are among the smaller ones, very often depending on individuals. A well balanced Part-M for General Aviation as is presented here lays a solid foundation for the future.
Members of our organisation will submit more detailed comments. We kindly invite the Agency to consider these contributions.

response *Noted*

comment *98* comment by: *British Gliding Association*

British Gliding Association
General,
The BGA welcomes the NPA resulting from the EASA part M task force phase 1 and simplification/clarification of Part M as related to the operation and maintenance of sailplanes and associated aircraft.

response *Noted*

comment *199* comment by: *SVFB/SAMA*

	2/129 we appreciate that the need for deep redesign is accepted We propose that EASA and/or the supervising commission rethinks to **make substantial changes in the BASIC REGULATION** in order for GA and Business aviation to become competitive after a long period where competitiveness was lost. Less volume and simpler regulation is needed.
response	*Noted*

A. Explanatory Note - I. General p. 4

comment	*185* comment by: *SVFB/SAMA* 5/129 indeed the alleviations are very welcome and the work of the WG is appreciated. Unfortunately, they are: - rater late - not going far enough - hence to limited
response	*Noted* Further alleviations will be analysed during Phase II of this task.

comment	*322* comment by: *Royal Danish Aeroclub* Royal Danish Aeroclub has carefully studied the NPA, which overall responds to our expectations, and we thank you for the work done so far. We still find there are unnecessary burdens laid on the voluntary community in General Aviation and Air Sports, but this NPA is a huge step into the right direction. However, we look forward to further improvements in phase II. European Gliding Union (EGU) will reply on this NPA, and please notice, that we give our full support to the EGU reply. We therefore don't see any point in repeating remarks already submitted.
response	*Noted*

comment	*324* comment by: *Andre Jansen* Zunächst möchte ich meine grundsätzliche Unterstützung für diesen Versuch zu neuen/einfacheren Regeln für die allgemeine, "kleine" Luftfahrt zu kommen, ausdrücken. Für jemanden, der sich seit bald 25 Jahren in der "Leichtaviatik" bewegt, sehen viel-zu-viele EASA-Regeln danach aus, als ob sie im Hinblick auf kommerziellen Flugbetrieb in großen Firmen und mit großen Flugzeugen geschaffen wurden. Das mag für deren Flugbetrieb passend sein, für die allgemeine Luftfahrt sind sie es nicht. Insofern müßte das Ziel - genauso wie es die CS-25, CS-23, CS-22... als Bauvorschriften gibt - auch entsprechend angepaßte Entwicklungs-/Wartungs- und Betriebsvorschriften für kleine und ganz kleine Flugzeuge sein und nicht nur - im Vergleich - einige kleine Vereinfachungen in der CS-25 für CS-22 Flugzeuge.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Das in diesem NPA vorgestellte ist ein Schritt in die richtige Richtung, aber bei weitem noch nicht ausreichend.

First of all I'd like to to express my support for the proposed new or revised rules.

From the view of someone working or "just" flying in light aviation for nearly 25 years too many things in EASAs current rules look as intented for "big commercial operation" and "big aircraft".

They may be adequate for this kind of operation - I don't know - but they are to complex and/or just bureaucratic for small aviation.
So the goal should be - like CS-25, CS-23 and CS-22 are different codes for different kind of aircraft - adopted rules for development/maintenance and operation of small and very small aircraft and not - as analogy - just a little simplification here and there in the CS-25 code for CS-22 aircraft.

The rules presented in this NPA are definitely a step in the right direction, but they are not even sufficient to heal the damage EU/EASA-rules have done to small aviation in Europe, let alone make growth of general aviation easier or in some areas even possible at all.

response *Noted*

Further simplifications will be analysed during Phase II.

A. Explanatory Note - IV. Content of the draft Opinion/Decision - a) Background p. 5-8

comment *30* comment by: *CAMO - Klaus Lehmköster, DE.MG.1016*

Page 5: Certifying staff
In Germany we have the situation that we have insufficient personnel as certifying staff (about 3000 less). These were the former workshop superviser (Werkstattleiter) certifyed by the German Aero Club. For this staff it is not allowed to certify a maintenance by a CRS like before the EASA rules. The presently licenced Part 66 certifying staff cannot do this job. In my experience a lot of aircrafts are flying without a valid CRS.
Page 7: "Generic" maintenance programme:
Any aircraft, ELA1/2, has a maintenance programme (see CS 22,23,25...)! There is no need for a "generic" maintenance programme.
How has the owner to customise such a programm? Has he to copy it (no sense)? Or, has he to invent something new? Who will licence this? New STC?
The owner of an aircraft has to follow the maintenance programm of the aircraft manufacturer, nothing else.
Page 7: Simplify the functioning of the Airworthiness Review Certificate (ARC)
Compare it with any vehicle on our roads: Any passenger car is much more complex than any ELA1/2 aircraft. For this, the German TÜV needs 20 minutes for the physical inspection, paper work and paying. This must be a goal to simplify the ARC process.

response *Partially accepted*

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

The issue of the personnel certified by the German Aero Club is an issue which has to be addressed through the applicable German Law. The current provisions of the EU regulations allow converting national certifying staff to Part-66 licences while maintaining the privileges (see also GM 66.A.70, paragraph 1, for further clarifications).

Please note that a maintenance programme is not only the instructions from the manufacturer. Several other aspects specific to the particular aircraft have to be considered (operational environment, repairs and modification, life-limited parts, pilot-owner maintenance, etc.). Please refer to the template contained in AMC M.A.302(e).

Phase II of this task will analyse further alleviations.

comment *167* comment by: *Federal Office of Civil Aviation FOCA*

As a general remark, FOCA welcomes the proposals made in NPA 2012-17 and linked with it the alleviations it foresees for the GA. By granting alleviations for certain categories of aircraft, mainly in the field of maintenance programmes and airworthiness reviews, these proposals can be considered as a first step to further regulatory improvements. As a next step, further rulemaking needs to follow a more comprehensive approach which needs to establish a concept for all areas in the field of airworthiness, design and production keeping in mind the principles proposed in the GA Roadmap of the Commission presented during the last EASA Management Board meeting on 11 December 2012.
While reducing or eliminating the complexity of the current regulation the aim for future regulation in the field of GA should be to maintain a legal certainty for the stakeholder as not to change the proposed alleviations in future rulemaking.

response *Noted*

Phase II of this task will analyse further alleviations.

comment *181* comment by: *Deutscher Freiballonsport Verband e.V.*

Bei der Abgrenzung gewerblich / nicht gewerblich im Bereich des Luftfahrzeugs Freiballon gibt es die Besonderheit des Sponsorings durch die zu Werbezwecken nutzbare großflächige Hülle. Geschätzte mehr als 95% aller Ballone in Deutschland tragen eine Aufschrift auf der Hülle, unabhängig davon, ob die Ballone privat, in Vereinen, als Wettkampfballon oder in Luftfahrtunternehmen eingesetzt werden.
Diese verschiedenen Einsatzgebiete/Nutzungsarten müssen berücksichtigt werden und dürfen nicht dazu führen, dass eine Werbeaufschrift auf der Hülle automatisch bedeutet, dass damit eine gewerbliche Nutzung verbunden ist.
Die geplanten Vereinfachungen bei der Wartung und Aufrechterhaltung der Lufttüchtigkeit auch von nicht kommerziell genutzten Freiballonen, würde den Haltern nicht nutzen, wenn Ballone mit Werbung grundsätzlich als gewerblich eingestuft werden würden. Die vereinfachten Regelungen würden jene nicht erreichen für die diese Vereinfachungen gedacht waren.
Hier einige Beispiele an denen sich der Schaden der für den Ballonsport entstehen würde erkennen lässt.
In Vereinen gefahrene Ballone die von Sponsoren unterstützt wurden oder noch werden ermöglichen auch Jugendlichen ohne entsprechende finanzielle Mittel den Zugang zur Luftfahrt. Dies wäre ohne Sponsoren so nicht möglich.
Ein privater Pilot der einen gesponserten Ballon gebraucht kauft und keine

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Verbindungen zum ehemaligen Sponsor des Ballons unterhält, müsste plötzlich ein Luftfahrtunternehmen gründen , um den Ballon weiterhin fahren zu können. Für viele würde das das Ende ihres Hobbys bedeuten und ein finanzieller Verlust durch die nicht mehr mögliche Nutzung ihres Ballons.
Ein Pilot mit einem Ballon mit Werbeaufschrift der das Alter 65 erreicht hat dürfte auf seinem Ballon nicht mehr fahren.
Ein Freiballon der zu Zwecken von Wettfahrten einem Piloten als Halter überlassen wird und im Eigentum eines Sponsors verbleibt, wird dadurch nicht zu einem gegen Vergütung fahrenden gewerblichen Piloten, ebenso wenig wie ein Dorf-Fußballverein der von einem Sponsor durch Bandenwerbung und Werbung auf den Trikots zu einem gewerblichen Unternehmen wird, die Spieler nicht zu Profispielern.
In vielen Bereichen des Sportes und der Vereine bleibt es wenigen besser Verdienenden vorbehalten diese Sportarten auszuüben, wenn keine Unterstützung von Sponsoren mehr möglich ist. Der Luftsport sollte nicht dazu gehören. In Deutschland gibt es eine lange Tradition der Sport-, Vereins- und Jugendförderung durch die Wirtschaft, neben der Förderung durch den Staat. Um die Unabhängigkeit des Sports, der Vereine und insbesondere der Jugendarbeit vom Staat zu gewährleisten, ist der Pluralismus in der Finanzierung notwendig. Wenn man jedes Bekenntnis eines Förderers zu seiner Förderung als kommerzielle Werbung wertet, würde das gesellschaftliche Engagement von Institutionen, Privatleuten und Firmen gefährdet und damit letztlich auch die Vereinskultur in Deutschland und anderen EU-Staaten. Nicht zuletzt der Hinweis, dass "Werbung" ja nicht nur für Firmen gemacht wird, sondern die Werbeaufschrift ja durchaus auch ideellen Zwecken dienen kann (Jugendorganisationen, Conseil Departementale, Rotes Kreuz, Leberkrankes Kind, etc.)."

response *Noted*

The term 'commercial operation' is defined in Article 3 of the Basic Regulation and cannot be altered through a lower ranking implementing rule. Furthermore, the Agency is not entitled to issue AMC/GM material for provisions of the Basic Regulation.

Nevertheless, the Agency acknowledges the paper issued by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy group and the actions recommended in this paper. In particular, action A.1 invites Member States to provide their feedback on the activities which they do not classify as commercial operations in their current system, and the Agency and the Commission to consider proposing changes to the definition in the Basic Regulation following such a feedback.

comment *183* comment by: *Ernst Hauenstein*

Sehr geehrte Damen und Herren,
meine persönliche Situation:
Ich bin Mitglied des Deutschen Freiballon Sportverbandes, 64 Jahre alt, fahre seit 1992 nichtgewerblich Ballon und mit Mercedes-Autohaus-Werbung auf der Hülle.
Wegen Verbrauches der alten Hülle bestellte ich im Jahre 2011 und mit Lieferung 2012 unter finanziellem Zuschuß des Autohauses eine neue, welche bislang noch nicht genutzt wurde und ab 2013 zum Einsatz kommt.
Da das Ballonfahren gegen Entgelt und/oder mit Werbehülle ab Frühjahr 2015 als gewerblich gilt, ich aber dort bereits älter als 65 Jahre bin und nicht mehr gewerblich fahren darf, bedeutet dies für mich das zwangsweise Ende meiner "Ballonkarriere", es sei denn, ich würde dann mir noch eine neutrale Hülle

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

anschaffen und damit unentgeltlich fahren.
Dies bedeutet aber auch, daß die 2012 gelieferte Hülle im Jahre 2015 gerade zwei Jahre im Einsatz war, vielleicht 100 Stunden sich in der Luft befand, eine Veräußerung an gewerbliche Unternehmer schon wegen der kleinen unrentablen Größe von 3.400 cbm unmöglich ist, es andere Kaufinteressenten nicht mehr gibt, also vernichten und gleichzeitig unter hohem Kostenaufwand eine neue neutrale erworben werden müsste und das ganze in meinem fortgeschrittenem Alter.
D.h., um nicht aufhören zu müssen Sportballon zu fahren, bedarf es zumindest einer großzügigen Übergangsregelung für vor Gesetzesbeginn angeschaffte Werbeballone, z.B. bis zu deren Luftuntüchtigkeit.
Außerdem ist eine Gewerblichkeit (wie im übrigen Geschäftsleben auch) erst dann gegeben, wenn eine Gewinnerzielungsabsicht vorliegt. D.h. wenn ich keine höheren Einnahmen erziele, als ich Ausgaben habe, liegt nach eindeutiger langjähriger Finanzrechtsprechung keine Gewerblichkeit vor, sondern es handelt sich steuertechnisch um Liebhaberei, bzw. Hobby. Die Finanzämter lehnen in solchen Fällen die steuerliche Verrechnung von hieraus erlittenen Verlusten mit anderen positiven Einkünften ab = totale Konfrontation von EU
-Vorschriften mit deutschem Steuerrecht. Und dies selbst dann, wenn eine Gewerbeanmeldung vorliegt, Werbung betrieben wird usw.
Also warum lässt man eine Sportballonfahrerei nicht zu, wenn das Entgelt maximal die hierfür entstandenen Kosten abdeckt, bzw. nicht einmal erreicht (frühere Selbstkostenregelung) ?
Es drängt sich die Vermutung auf, hinter der neuen EU-Verordnung steckt eine Lobby, nämlich die gewerblichen Ballonfahrer, welche immer mehr hinsichtlich ihrer Fahrgästezahlen unterversorgt sind !
Mit den neuen EU-Vorschriften wird vorgegeben, das sinkende Interesse am Flugsport allgemein (außer vielleicht Gleitschirm, Gyrocopter) wieder anzuheben. Gerade das Gegenteil wird erreicht werden. Was hilft mir die Erleichterung des sogen. LAPL, wenn ich die vollen Aufwendungen des Ballonfahrens alleine zu tragen habe und kein Entgelt zur Kostendeckung verlangen darf ?
Oder sollen nur noch reiche Leute Flug- und Ballonsport betreiben dürfen ?
Oder soll es so gehen, wie dem kleinen Bäcker- oder Metzgermeister oder auch kleinen Gastwirt, die man durch überbordente EU-Vorschriften zum Aufgeben gezwungen hat ?
Im übrigen werden die Ballonhersteller, insbesondere die überwiegend kleine Ballone produzieren, in größte wirtschaftliche Schwierigkeiten geraten, da Sponsoren nur noch für die Großballone der gewerblichen Ballonfahrer zur Verfügung stehen und die Sportballonfahrer ihre neutralen Hüllen alleine finanzieren müssen, was aber ein großer Teil der jetzigen Piloten wegen Einnahmeverbotes dann nicht mehr kann und damit der von der EU abgestrebte Zweck für erleichterte Bedingungen zu sorgen, ad absurdum geführt wird.
Meine Forderungen daher:
a) Weiterhin Werbehüllen für die nichtgewerblichen Ballonfahrer zuzulassen und Wiedereinführung der sogen.
Selbstkostenregelung mit Nachweis keiner Gewinnerzielung, bzw. mindestens
b) großzügige Übergangsregelung für bestehende Werbehüllen und wie bei a) Wiedereinführung der sogen.
Selbstkostenregelung mit Nachweis keiner Gewinnerzielung.
Nur so kann der Ballonsport auch für finanziell minderbemittelte Bürger überleben !
Freundliche Grüße
Ernst Hauenstein, Jochsberg, Lämmerbuck 1, D-91578 Leutershausen, Tel. 09823/1530, Fax. 09823/926169

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

response | *Noted*

The term 'commercial operation' is defined in Article 3 of the Basic Regulation and cannot be altered through a lower ranking implementing rule. Furthermore, the Agency is not entitled to issue AMC/GM material for provisions of the Basic Regulation.

Nevertheless, the Agency acknowledges the paper issued by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy group and the actions recommended in this paper. In particular, action A.1 invites Member States to provide their feedback on the activities which they do not classify as commercial operations in their current system, and the Agency and the Commission to consider proposing changes to the definition in the Basic Regulation following such a feedback.

comment | *186* comment by: *SVFB/SAMA*

5/129 Para 13.
Unfortunately, this comes late, even if we see the progress.
Why: because with the introduction of the CAMO concept for ALL sectors of aviation, a "tertiary business" sector has developed. Now the correction of this earlier rulemaking of EASA will understandably provoke resistance from those who have heavily invested into setting up and getting CAMO approvals. This could endanger the necessary substantial reform towards simpler and user-friendly rulemaking even if the need for change seems to be accepted meanwhile by EASA and the Commission.
The damage through increased costs for EASA, NAA's, investors by setting up CAMO's, etc. and of course for owners and operators has already taken it's toll.

response | *Noted*

comment | *187* comment by: *SVFB/SAMA*

6/129 Para 16
and as above, most of this alleviations are not going far enough.
The statement by DG Transport M. Ruete is ignored: **„May be the best rule would be no rule at all".** It seems that whatever the Agency does, regardless of its undoubtedly best intentions, more often then not the result is more volume and more complicated regulation.

response | *Noted*

Phase II of this task will analyse further alleviations.

comment | *188* comment by: *SVFB/SAMA*

7/139 **Phase I**
Feedback from our Part M/F and SME 145 members: the CAMO system is producing a lot of paper with little if any value added.
the present regulatory environment leads to a "show business-like" virtual reality, where Part M/F or 145 SME's are preparing a show for the inspector, far from a reality. This seems to be ignored by EASA as well as the NAA compliance staff. The task is completed, if all boxes are properly ticked.
Simplify the approval process
there should only be one approval process for this: at certification. Certification

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

should be uniform and valid for all aircraft up to 5.7T within EU, FAA , TCCA. " Simplification is the ultimate sophistication" should be the main principle for all authority bodies.
Airworthiness review
Part M subpart F and part 145 organisations to issue the ARC if they are organised to provide this service.
The necessary changes in their manuals should be minimal, straigthforward and as simple as possible.

response *Noted*

Phase II of this task will analyse further simplifications.

Please note that the issuance of the ARC by maintenance organisations is already included in the proposals.

comment *225* comment by: *Düsseldorfer Aero Klub, Abtlg. Freiballon, e. V.*

Düsseldorfer Aero Klub, Düsseldorf, den 27.1.13
Abteilung Freiballon, e. V.
/co.
Volker Kuinke
(2. Vorsitzender)
Neusser Weg 12
40474 Düsseldorf
Sehr geehrte Damen und Herren,
Mit großer Sorge und Bestürzung verfolgen wir seit längerem die Planungen und damit verbundenen Verschärfungen der Bestimmungen für uns Sport-Ballonfahrer.
Wenn es so kommt wie geplant, bedeutet das das sichere „aus" für unseren schönen Gasballonsport!
Unser Verein in Düsseldorf besteht seit nunmehr 110 Jahren! Die Düsseldorfer Ballonfahrer sind eine kleine, aktive Ballonabteilung mit 34 Mitgliedern. Wir betreiben den Ballonsport wettkampfmäßig, nehmen auf Sportfahrten auch schon mal Gäste mit und bilden Freiballonführer für Gas- und Heißluftballone aus.
Um als Verein überhaupt existieren zu können, sind wir auf Sponsoren (Werbung auf der Ballonhülle) angewiesen. Es wäre nicht möglich, die Anschaffung eines Gasballons aus der Vereinskasse zu finanzieren! Sollte es dazu kommen, dass Werbung auf der Ballonhülle + die Mitnahme von Passagieren generell als „gewerblich" eingestuft werden, so wird in Deutschland das Gasballonfahren aussterben und die Vereine werden allesamt ihren Betrieb einstellen müssen. Das darf nicht passieren!
Auch die geplante Limitierung auf 4 Personen im Korb ist nicht sinnvoll für uns Ballonsportvereine. Es gibt in Deutschland und weltweit überwiegend Gasballone mit 1.000 Kubikmetern Inhalt. Dieser Ballon trägt gut eine Tonne Gewicht. Wenn die Personenzahl auf vier limitiert wird, so sind wir bei jeder Fahrt gezwungen, mehr als 30 Sandsäcke mit 15 kg Ballast im Korb unterzubringen und mitzunehmen, statt 1-2 Sportkameraden zusätzlich!
Wir handhaben es momentan so, dass wir überwiegend Kameradenfahrten durchführen, bei denen fünf Personen im Korb sind. So kommen wir auf eine Anzahl von 20-25 Sandsäcken, was für eine „normale" Sport-Ballonfahrt von 4-6 Stunden Dauer ideal ist.
Wir regen hiermit an, eine für alle gerechte Lösung zu erarbeiten, die es den Ballonsportlern weiterhin ermöglicht, ihren Sport dauerhaft ausüben zu können.
Früher gab es eine Selbstkostenregelung für Ballonsportler. Es wurden

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

sämtliche im Jahr anfallenden Kosten ermittelt und die Einnahmen durch die Mitnahme von Passagieren gegenüber gestellt. Diese Gegenüberstellung wurde dann bei der jeweiligen Bezirksregierung (in unserem Fall Düsseldorf) eingereicht, welche auch die Selbstkostengenehmigung ausstellte. Da die Vereinsballone kaum mehr als 20-30 Fahrten jährlich durchführen, kommt man damit so eben auf die anfallenden Kosten. Warum wird nicht wieder eine solche Selbstkostengenehmigung eingeführt, wo z. B. auch durch eine sachgemäße Buchführung erkennbar wird, dass keine Gewinnerzielungs-Absicht vorliegt?! Auch eine zusätzliche Limitierung der jährlichen Fahrten (auf z. B. 25-30 Stück pro Ballon) wäre eine vertretbare Lösung.
Wir würden uns sehr freuen, auch weiterhin unseren schönen Sport ausüben zu dürfen und bitten Sie hiermit nachdrücklich darum, eine vertretbare und gerechte Lösung für alle Betroffenen zu erarbeiten. Gern stehen wir für weitere Rückfragen zur Verfügung!
Mit freundlichen Grüßen
(Volker Kuinke)

response

Noted

The term 'commercial' operation is defined in Article 3 of the Basic Regulation and cannot be altered through a lower ranking implementing rule. Furthermore, the Agency is not entitled to issue AMC/GM material for provisions of the Basic Regulation.

Nevertheless, the Agency acknowledges the paper issued by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy group and the actions recommended in this paper. In particular, action A.1 invites Member States to provide their feedback on the activities which they do not classify as commercial operations in their current system, and the Agency and the Commission to consider proposing changes to the definition in the Basic Regulation following such a feedback.

comment

228 comment by: *Düsseldorfer Aero Klub, Abtlg. Freiballon, e. V.*

Düsseldorfer Aero Klub, Düsseldorf, den 27.1.13
Abteilung Freiballon, e. V.
/co.
Volker Kuinke
(2. Vorsitzender)
Neusser Weg 12
40474 Düsseldorf
Sehr geehrte Damen und Herren,
Mit großer Sorge und Bestürzung verfolgen wir seit längerem die Planungen und damit verbundenen Verschärfungen der Bestimmungen für uns Sport-Ballonfahrer.
Wenn es so kommt wie geplant, bedeutet das das sichere „aus" für unseren schönen Gasballonsport!
Unser Verein in Düsseldorf besteht seit nunmehr 110 Jahren! Die Düsseldorfer Ballonfahrer sind eine kleine, aktive Ballonabteilung mit 34 Mitgliedern. Wir betreiben den Ballonsport wettkampfmäßig, nehmen auf Sportfahrten auch schon mal Gäste mit und bilden Freiballonführer für Gas- und Heißluftballone aus.
Um als Verein überhaupt existieren zu können, sind wir auf Sponsoren (Werbung auf der Ballonhülle) angewiesen. Es wäre nicht möglich, die Anschaffung eines Gasballons aus der Vereinskasse zu finanzieren! Sollte es dazu kommen, dass Werbung auf der Ballonhülle + die Mitnahme von Passagieren generell als „gewerblich" eingestuft werden, so wird in Deutschland

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

das Gasballonfahren aussterben und die Vereine werden allesamt ihren Betrieb einstellen müssen. Das darf nicht passieren!
Auch die geplante Limitierung auf 4 Personen im Korb ist nicht sinnvoll für uns Ballonsportvereine. Es gibt in Deutschland und weltweit überwiegend Gasballone mit 1.000 Kubikmetern Inhalt. Dieser Ballon trägt gut eine Tonne Gewicht. Wenn die Personenzahl auf vier limitiert wird, so sind wir bei jeder Fahrt gezwungen, mehr als 30 Sandsäcke mit 15 kg Ballast im Korb unterzubringen und mitzunehmen, statt 1-2 Sportkameraden zusätzlich!
Wir handhaben es momentan so, dass wir überwiegend Kameradenfahrten durchführen, bei denen fünf Personen im Korb sind. So kommen wir auf eine Anzahl von 20-25 Sandsäcken, was für eine „normale" Sport-Ballonfahrt von 4-6 Stunden Dauer ideal ist.
Wir regen hiermit an, eine für alle gerechte Lösung zu erarbeiten, die es den Ballonsportlern weiterhin ermöglicht, ihren Sport dauerhaft ausüben zu können.
Früher gab es eine Selbstkostenregelung für Ballonsportler. Es wurden sämtliche im Jahr anfallenden Kosten ermittelt und die Einnahmen durch die Mitnahme von Passagieren gegenüber gestellt. Diese Gegenüberstellung wurde dann bei der jeweiligen Bezirksregierung (in unserem Fall Düsseldorf) eingereicht, welche auch die Selbstkostengenehmigung ausstellte. Da die Vereinsballone kaum mehr als 20-30 Fahrten jährlich durchführen, kommt man damit so eben auf die anfallenden Kosten. Warum wird nicht wieder eine solche Selbstkostengenehmigung eingeführt, wo z. B. auch durch eine sachgemäße Buchführung erkennbar wird, dass keine Gewinnerzielungs-Absicht vorliegt?!
Auch eine zusätzliche Limitierung der jährlichen Fahrten (auf z. B. 25-30 Stück pro Ballon) wäre eine vertretbare Lösung.
Wir würden uns sehr freuen, auch weiterhin unseren schönen Sport ausüben zu dürfen und bitten Sie hiermit nachdrücklich darum, eine vertretbare und gerechte Lösung für alle Betroffenen zu erarbeiten. Gern stehen wir für weitere Rückfragen zur Verfügung!
Mit freundlichen Grüßen
(Volker Kuinke)

response *Noted*

The term 'commercial' operation is defined in Article 3 of the Basic Regulation and cannot be altered through a lower ranking implementing rule. Furthermore, the Agency is not entitled to issue AMC/GM material for provisions of the Basic Regulation.

Nevertheless, the Agency acknowledges the paper issued by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy group and the actions recommended in this paper. In particular, action A.1 invites Member States to provide their feedback on the activities which they do not classify as commercial operations in their current system, and the Agency and the Commission to consider proposing changes to the definition in the Basic Regulation following such a feedback.

comment *271* comment by: *Howard Torode*

EUROPEAN GLIDING UNION
GENERAL COMMENTS ON CONDUCY OF GA TASK FORCE

The composition of the working group could be criticised as not containing anyone who will actually have to implement and/or operate these requirements. Only three owner group representatives (all at policy level) were combined with 4 manufacturers' representatives and four regulators. From the point of view of actual maintenance operatives, only the AEI were represented,

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	and no-one directly involved with a CAMO or Subpart F organisations who will have to make these measures work, justify their approvals or make economic sense of these requirements.
response	*Not accepted* The group composition was (other than EASA): — 2 representatives of Competent Authorities (Austria and France); — 4 representatives of Manufacturers: EGAMA, GAMA, LAMA-Europe and European Sailplane Manufacturer Association; — 1 representative of licensed engineers (AEI); — 2 representatives from associations of owners/operators (EAS and IAOPA); — 1 representative of the helicopter industry (EHA); and — 1 representative of owners/operators and general aviation industry (ECOGAS). The Agency considers this a balanced composition, which clearly incorporates 2 organisations representing maintenance organisations and CAMOs (EHA and ECOGAS) and 3 representing owners/operators (EASA, IAOPA and ECOGAS).

comment	*273* comment by: *Howard Torode* EUROPEAN GLIDING UNION GENERAL COMMENT ON CONDUCT OF GA TASK FORCE The measures in this NPA appear to relate entirely to the role of approved organisations, and in no place is reference made to the Part 66 licensed engineer. Given that NPA 2012-15 on the licensing of individuals to carry out engineering function, be it individually or under the umbrella of a Subpart F organisation, can we be reassured that the developments in NPA2012-15 have been properly considered in this present NPA? If not, then surely there should be some further consideration of the likely interaction and the consequences to the economic operation of the GA maintenance industry.
response	*Noted* NPA 2012-15 relates to the licensing of general aviation mechanics and it only contains qualifications necessary to perform maintenance (not continuing airworthiness management tasks). Privileges for independent certifying staff related to airworthiness reviews will be reviewed during Phase II of this task.

comment	*323* comment by: *Klaus HARTMANN* Ballonfahrer kann man grob in 3 Gruppen einteilen: Hobbypiloten mit oft eigenen Ballonen, gewerbliche Piloten in einem Luftfahrtunternehmen mit den gewerblich zugelassenen Ballonen und Vereine mit ihren Ballonen. Allen 3 genannten Gruppen gemeinsam ist, dass sie fast ausschließlich Ballone mit Aufschrift eines Sponsors auf ihren Ballonhüllen fahren. In Ballonsportvereinen sind oft engagierte Mitglieder die sportliches Ballonfahren betreiben das Vereinsleben leben und Jugend- und Nachwuchs- und Ausbildungsarbeit leisten. Sie stellen in der Regel auch die international sehr erfolgreichen Wettfahrtpiloten bei Heißluft- und Gasballon Wettfahrten. In den Vereinen können auch Piloten mit kleinerem Geldbeutel das Ballonfahren

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	betreiben. Ähnlich ist es auch bei vielen Hobbypiloten in kleineren Ballonsportgruppen. Das ist allerdings nur möglich, wenn ein Sponsor gefunden wurde, der den Verein / die Gruppe unterstützt, so wie es bei vielen Vereinen in anderen Sportarten auch üblich ist. Würde man alle diese Ballone als gewerblich einstufen, würden sofort alle Hobby-/Sportpiloten und Vereinspiloten diese Ballone mangels gewerblicher Lizenz und Luftfahrtunternehmen nicht mehr nutzen dürfen. Die allermeisten Vereine und Gruppen würden sich folglich auflösen da ihnen ihre Grundlage, der Ballon, nicht mehr zur Verfügung steht. Nachwuchs und Jugendliche würden nicht mehr ausgebildet werden oder nur noch gewerblich zu erheblich höheren Kosten. Hoher finanzieller Schaden entstünde durch nicht mehr nutzbare selbst angeschaffte Ballonkomponenten und Ausrüstung die in diesem Szenario auch nicht mehr verkäuflich wären. Camo-Betriebe, Ballonhersteller und Zubehörhersteller würden viele Kunden und Arbeit verlieren. Es ist kaum anzunehmen, dass mit der Begriffsbestimmung in der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 216/2008 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates wo es heißt: "Im Sinne dieser Verordnung bezeichnet der Ausdruck „gewerbliche Tätigkeit" den Betrieb eines Luftfahrzeugs gegen Entgelt oder sonstige geldwerte Gegenleistungen, der der Öffentlichkeit zur Verfügung steht oder der, wenn er nicht der Öffentlichkeit zur Verfügung steht, im Rahmen eines Vertrags zwischen einem Betreiber und einem Kunden erbracht wird, wobei der Kunde keine Kontrolle über den Betreiber ausübt" das Sport- und Vereinssponsoring gemeint sein könnte oder gewollt war mit den genannten Folgen.
response	*Noted* The term 'commercial operation' is defined in Article 3 of the Basic Regulation and cannot be altered through a lower ranking implementing rule. Furthermore, the Agency is not entitled to issue AMC/GM material for provisions of the Basic Regulation. Nevertheless, the Agency acknowledges the paper issued by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy group and the actions recommended in this paper. In particular, action A.1 invites Member States to provide their feedback on the activities which they do not classify as commercial operations in their current system, and the Agency and the Commission to consider proposing changes to the definition in the Basic Regulation following such a feedback.

A. Explanatory Note - IV. Content of the draft Opinion/Decision - b) Changes proposed for Phase I p. 8-10

comment	*5* comment by: *Andreas Keiser* Phase 1 or Phase 2 should also include a proposal which provides a MEL requirement for all aircraft categories, regardless of operation.
response	*Noted* This issue is outside the scope of Phase I. It will be analysed during Phase II.

comment	*8* comment by: *John DAVIES* 22. It is important to point out that flying a balloon with artwork advertising a

company or product should not necessarily be classed as a commercial operation. Many private individuals are given a balloon envelope displaying a company logo or product (artwork) and require nothing in return other than the balloon being flown as much as possible (no contract exists to fly passengers or attend events for payment).
For private individuals who are entering the sport and cannot afford new equipment, an envelope with artwork which has finished a commercial contract but is still perfectly airworthy is often a cheap first balloon.
A good example is that many competition balloons are sponsored by a well-known German brewery. This should not make all competition pilots commercial operators.

response

Noted

The term 'commercial operation' is defined in Article 3 of the Basic Regulation and cannot be altered through a lower ranking implementing rule. Furthermore, the Agency is not entitled to issue AMC/GM material for provisions of the Basic Regulation.

Nevertheless, the Agency acknowledges the paper issued by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy group and the actions recommended in this paper. In particular, action A.1 invites Member States to provide their feedback on the activities which they do not classify as commercial operations in their current system, and the Agency and the Commission to consider proposing changes to the definition in the Basic Regulation following such a feedback.

comment

31 comment by: *CAMO - Klaus Lehmköster, DE.MG.1016*

Page 8: Definition of ELA1 aircraft
There is no logical rule in this definition. Why are aircrafts like Piper PA18 no ELA1 aircrafts, but a sailplane like Ka6 is it? Same age!
We have now so called "micro light aircrafts" with MTOW up to 750kg and v_{ne} up to 330km/h. How does this match the ELA rules?
Page 9: Commercial operations
Please look here very carefully on clubs and charter companies.
Proposal 1 to 7:
There is no need to make a contract with a Subpart F/G or Part-145 organisation to do the maintenance or the ARC. The owner of an aircraft is responsible by his own that the aircraft is airworthy. Compare it with the situation with our automobiles. They are much more complex than any ELA1 aircraft and nobody is forced to make a contract with a maintenance or certifycation organisation. Optional, an aircraft owner can do it.
No automobile has a maintenance programm. Why it is necessary to have such progrogramm for e.g. a sailplane? It has no engine and is much less complex than any other vehicle on our roads.
M.A.302 says, that all aircrafts must have a maintenance program. That's the law. The EASA has to define how to handle it. The easiest way is to say that the maintenance manuals for each aircraft is the maintenance programm. Could this proposal be wrong? For excample: The 100h-inspection list for a C172 is about 35 pages long. Is it not enough? Must it be longer with more details? What is forgotten?
Final rule: Maintenance Manual = Maintenance programm
With this definition we do not need more discussions in Part-M/145.
To proposal 5:
It is also necessarry that a MF/145 organisation may be able to certificate a "Permit to Fly".

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	In Germany we have the situation that only the LBA can certificate a PtF. If I need a PtF it will take up to two weeks to get the allowence from the LBA for e.g. a short flight for the airworthiness. Two weeks AOG, not acceptable! Or, as a minimum, a CAMO will provide the opportunity to certificate a PtF.
response	*Noted* — The definition of ELA1 was the subject of detailed discussions within previous rulemaking task MDM.032 and has been recently adopted. Changing this definition is outside the scope of this task. — In the current rule it is not mandatory to make a contract with Subpart F/G or Part-145 organisations (for non-large aircraft not used in commercial operations). — Please note that a maintenance programme is not only the instructions from the manufacturer. Several other aspects specific to the particular aircraft have to be considered (operational environment, repairs and modification, life-limited parts, pilot-owner maintenance, etc.). Please refer to the template contained in AMC M.A.302(e). — The current rule allows the CAMO to issue the Permit to Fly if they have the flight conditions.

comment	*40* comment by: *Ballon Team Ammersee* Sehr geehrte Damen und Herren, Ich betreibe ein gewerbliches Luftfahrtunternehmen für Heissluftballone und möchte mit folgenden Punkten zu der Diskussion, **ob gewerbliche Tätigkeit vorliegt oder nicht**, beitragen: Zum einen bin ich der Meinung, daß es für die Führung eines gewerblich betriebenen Luftfahrzeuges (auch gewerblicher Ballon !) eine CPL Lizenz (commercial pilot licence) für den Pilot, der den Ballon führt, geben müsste. Zum anderen ist die Durchführung und Inszenierung von Werbemaßnahmen mittels einer Ballonhülle im Auftrag eines „Sponsors" eine gewerbliche Tätigkeit. So wird z.B. oft eine Werbeballonhülle gezielt über bestimmten Gebieten eingesetzt um möglichst effektiv Werbung zu platzieren. Oder der Ballon als Statik Display stundenlang z.B. bei Sportveranstaltungen (Skirennen, Skispringen und ähnliches), aufgestellt. Oft erwartet der Sponsor, dass der Ballon an möglichst vielen Montgolfiaden teilnimmt. Wobei das Ballon Team vom Sponsor oftmals eine Nightglow-Pflicht auferlegt bekommt, um den Werbeballon in Medien (Zeitung, Fernsehen usw.) platziert zu wissen. Das vorgeschobene Argument, der Luftsportjugend und Wettkampfpiloten den Ballonsport erst ermöglichen zu können, kann mit der großen Menge der in Deutschland betriebenen Werbeballons nicht glaubhaft gemacht werden. **Begründung warum eine CPL Lizenz:** Es kann eigentlich nicht sein, wenn ich z.B. Hobby-Fotograf bin und mit meinem eigenen Kleinflugzeug (z.B. Cessna150 o.ä.) einmal im Jahr 12 Luftbilder mache und diese Fotos anschliessend als Luft-Bildkalender verkaufe, hierfür eine CPL Lizenz zum Führen meines Luftfahrzeuges brauche. Und wenn ich gleichzeitig (z.B. als Fotograf...) mit meinem eigenen Heissluftballon (der ja genau wie meine Cessna 150 ein Luftfahrzeug ist, oder ?) 100 Ballonfahrten pro Jahr durchführe und dabei 300 Passagiere " (1+3) zum "Selbstkostenpreis" befördere, eine ganz normalen PPL-D oder LAPL oder

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

wie die privat Piloten Lizenz auch immer in der EU Zukunft genannt wird, ausreicht ??

Zur Durchführung von gewerblichen Rundflügen mit einer kleinen Cessna (1+3 Sitze) (z.B. sightseeing Flüge) brauche ich als Pilot eine CPL Lizenz.
Zur Durchführung von gewerblichen Ballonfahrten "*genügt*" ein PPL. (teilweise mit Ballons von der Größe von bis zu 19 !! Passagieren)

Hier auch das Thema Werbung an der Ballonhülle:
Wenn ich einen Werbe-Banner hinter meiner eigenen Cessna 150 herziehe und stundenlang damit übers Land fliege, brauche ich hierfür eine CPL Lizenz.
Zudem betreibe ich ein Gewerbe mit der Tätigkeit Luftwerbung an den Himmel zu bringen. Hierzu muß ich wie es jedermann als selbstverständlich erachtet, ein Luftfahrtunternehmen mit entsprechender Gewerbeanmeldung betreiben.
Oder etwa nicht ??
Wenn ich stundenlang mit meinem eigenen Ballon, der mit einem Werbebanner versehen ist, oder die Hülle selbst die Werbung ist, (Sonderform etc.) am Himmel fahre und Luftwerbung (für den Sponsor) betreibe, brauche ich lediglich eine PPL Lizenz und muß kein Luftfahrtunternehmen betreiben !

Hier wird mit unterschiedlichem Maß für die gleichen Dinge in der Luftfahrt gemessen und das kann niemand verstehen.

Anderes Beispiel:
Wenn ich an einer vielbefahrenen Bundesstrasse wohne und in meinem Garten eine Werbetafel aufstelle und diese mit Werbeplakaten beklebe, brauche ich hierfür eine Gewerbeanmeldung und zahle Gewerbesteuern. Das dürfte sofort jedem klar sein.
Warum können dann in der Luftfahrt (speziell Ballonfahrt) Privatpersonen ohne Gewerbeanmeldung, Werbetätigkeiten mittels einer Ballonhülle durchführen ?
Werbetätigkeit, auch die Werbung mit einer Ballonhülle, zielt immer darauf ab (für den Sponsor) den Umsatz zu steigern und Produkte des Sponsors zu verkaufen. (Sonst müsste ja der Sponsor auch keine Werbung betreiben)

Hinzu kommt, daß der Staat zweimal um seine Steuern „betrogen" wird.
Zum einen kann der Sponsor, der eine Ballonhülle mit seinem Werbeaufdruck finanziert, diese Ausgaben steuerlich als Betriebsausgaben geltend machen und absetzen. (soweit ist das ja auch in Ordnung)
Zum anderen werden durch den steuerlich abgesetzten Ballon durch die Mitnahme von zahlenden Gästen Umsätze erzielt, von denen unter dem Deckmantel der "Selbstkosten" keine Umsatz und Einkommenssteuern abgeführt werden.

Wenn man von den ca. 1400 in Deutschland zugelassenen Ballonen 500 abzieht, die gewerblich in einem zugelassenen Luftfahrtunternehmen betrieben werden und von den 900 privat betriebenen Ballons davon ausgeht, daß 2/3 davon Werbung tragen, also ca. 600 privatbetriebene Ballons mit Werbung versehen sind und jede Ballonhülle einen Anschaffungspreis (noch wenig geschätzt..) von ca. 25.000 EUR hat, so wurden mindestens 15 Millionen EUR als Werbekosten für die Anschaffung von ca. 600 Werbeballonhüllen steuerlich abgesetzt.
Wenn man davon ausgeht, daß jeder dieser privat betriebenen Ballons im Durchschnitt pro Jahr
(auch wieder wenig geschätzt) 40 Ballonfahrten durchführt und somit 120 Personen pro Jahr und pro Ballon zu einem "Selbstkostenpreis" von 200 EUR

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

pro Person mitfahren, wird hier ein steuerfreier Jahres Umsatz von ca. 24.000 EUR generiert.
Bei 600 privat Ballons wären das 14,4 Millionen Euro Umsatz pro Jahr.
Legt man eine Lebensdauer pro Ballonhülle von (wenig geschätzt) 5 Jahren zu Grunde, wird pro Ballonhülle in 5 Jahren ein steuerfreier Umsatz durch die Mitnahme von Gästen gegen "Selbstkosten" von ca. 120.000 EUR generiert.
Bei 600 privat betriebenen Ballons in Deutschland sind das in 5 Jahren (=Lebenszeit einer Ballonhülle) 72 Millionen Euro !!
Hinzu kommen die 15 Millionen EUR die steuerlich durch die Anschaffung abgesetzt wurden.
Es entsteht ein volkswirtschaftlicher Schaden allein in Deutschland von geschätzten 87 Millionen EUR in 5 Jahren (Lebensdauer einer Ballonhülle) durch alle privat betriebenen Ballons mit Werbeaufdruck.
Und dies betrifft nur die Anschaffung von Hüllenmaterial.
Oft werden ganze Ballonsysteme (Korb, Brenner, Hülle einschliesslich allradgetriebenem Zugfahrzeug), im Gesamtpaket von schnell über 100.000 EUR "gesponsert".

Nicht zuletzt entsteht durch die Vergabe von Sponsorhüllen an Privatpersonen jedem gewerblichen Ballonfahrer ein finanzieller Schaden, indem er unter Umständen keine Sponsor Ballonhülle auf dem durch Privatballonfahrer abgegrasten Sponsorenmarkt "ergattert" und seine eigene Hülle von seinem hart erarbeiteten (und versteuertem) Geld selbst kaufen muß.

Schlussfolgerung:
1) Sponsoring nur noch um Jugendarbeit und Wettkampfpiloten zu fördern und zwar mit neutralen Ballons die der Sponsor steuerlich absetzen kann. Wird Werbung platziert, besteht eine steuerpflichtige Tätigkeit, die der Verein oder Pilot als geldwerten Vorteil z.B. als Einkommenssteuer abführen muß.

2) Werbung in der Luft ist Luftarbeit (siehe Beispiel Werbebanner hinter einem Sportflugzeug) Die Durchführung von Werbemassnahmen (insbesondere Werbung mit Ballonhüllen) in der Luft dürfen nur hierfür von den Aufsichtsbehörden zugelassene, lizensierte Luftfahrtunternehmen und hierfür zugelassene gewerblich betriebene Ballone durchführen.
3) Eine CPL Lizenz ,wie sie in allen anderen Bereichen der gewerblichen Luftfahrt immer schon Bedingung ist, auch für gewerbliche Ballonpiloten.

4) Antrag an die Finanzbehörden: Sponsoren dürfen ihre Werbekosten zur Anschaffung von Werbeballons nur dann absetzen, wenn sie mit einem zugelassenen, lizensierten Luftfahrtunternehmen zusammenarbeiten.
(Gegebenenfalls wäre juristisch zu prüfen, ob Beauftragung illegaler Schwarzarbeit durch den Sponsor an Privatpersonen vorliegt und Schwarzarbeit durch die verrichtete „Luftarbeit" des privaten Ballonpiloten gegeben ist)

Dies alles dient nicht zuletzt dem Schutz der gewerblich arbeitenden (und Steuer zahlenden... !) Luftfahrtunternehmen.
Mit freundlichen Grüßen,
Jürgen Fels,
Ballon Team Ammersee

response

Noted

The term 'commercial operation' is defined in Article 3 of the Basic Regulation

and cannot be altered through a lower ranking implementing rule. Furthermore, the Agency is not entitled to issue AMC/GM material for provisions of the Basic Regulation.

Nevertheless, the Agency acknowledges the paper issued by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy group and the actions recommended in this paper. In particular, action A.1 invites Member States to provide their feedback on the activities which they do not classify as commercial operations in their current system, and the Agency and the Commission to consider proposing changes to the definition in the Basic Regulation following such a feedback.

Regarding your comments related to pilot licensing, unfortunately, they cannot be addressed within this task (it is limited to airworthiness issues).

comment *44* comment by: *sebastianPa28*

Dear Members,
as an new holder of an ELA 1 classified Piper ArcherII aircraft, I must say, that all the seven proposals are necessary and will determine a new way of maintanance safety and freedom.
I am a private user of may aircraft, so I am extremly interrested in safety questions and security of maintanance, this is one of my assurances of security. This changes give more space and unnecessary steps in maintaining my aircraft will decrease.
I think you are on a good way to do so, this is for me as an ELA 1 user, perhaps for the other pilots and holders your changes are too minimal, I hope in the nearest future, that we all can fly safe in our own interest and that the owners have greater choice how to carry out with the own aircraft.
This is what we need: Safety in term of own responsibility, with own determinations getting increasing safety
Thank you!

response *Noted*

The Agency thanks for the feedback.

comment *49* comment by: *Christian TANK*

Sehr geehrte Damen und Herren,
die Möglichkeit des Eigentümers Instandhaltungsprogramme zu entwerfen und zu genehmigen übersteigt in der Regel die Fachkompetenz dieses Personenkreises. Weder das Wissen noch die notwendigen Herstellerunterlagen sind hier normalerweise vorhanden. Im Vordergrund wird hier ein mögliches Einsparpotential von Instandhaltungsarbeiten stehen. Ich nehme nicht an, daß der Eigentümer sich in jedem Fall seiner Verantwortung bewußt ist. Dieser Teil der NPA 2012-17 ist nicht geeignet um die Luftfahrt sicherer zu machen.
Viele Grüße
Christian Tank

response *Not accepted*

The current rule already allows the owner to completely manage the continuing airworthiness of his/her aircraft under his/her own responsibility. In addition, the option of self-declaration has been limited to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations and compensating measures have been introduced, as the review of the effectiveness of the maintenance programme at the time of the airworthiness review.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Furthermore, GM M.A.201(e) clearly reminds the owner to carefully self-assess his/her competence.

comment

99 comment by: *British Gliding Association*

British Gliding Association
Proposal 1
This proposal will have little effect for established subpart F maintenance organisations that also have subpart G CAMO approvals but may be useful for smaller organisations who wish to rationalise and reduce the regulatory burden and for new companies starting up as they will only need subpart F.

response

Noted

comment

101 comment by: *CAA-NL*

General comments:
The combination of a number of these proposals will bring the GA private sector in the Netherlands almost back to the situation before the introductions of Part M and the CAMO. This means that a number of organisations who were approved maintenance organisations (JAR-145) at that time had to invest a serious amount of time and money not only to transfer to PART 145, but also to become a CAMO to continue the work they were already doing to the satisfaction of customers and authority.
We acknowledge that with these proposals the flexibility for the private owner who does not use his aircraft (let it be used) for commercial operations is increased. However the proposals add to the complexity of the regulation, what is an other objection largely heard in the field. Maybe a split in the CAW rules, like a similar split within the OPS rules (NCC and NCO), will help the private owner to have a better overview of the CAW rules applicable.
Further we see these proposals for ELA1 an occasionally for ELA2 aircraft as a first step in this process and are looking forward to the 2nd phase of this project.

response

Noted

Phase II will analyse further simplifications

comment

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

The GIPAG France is asking to EASA to define which activities regarding General Aviation are considered as "Commercial Operation". All the organisations operating flights with a transfer of cash should be defined as "Commercial Operation" especially within the flight association. Today in France, an Association can realise commercial activities even if they are considered by the administration as a non-making profit. With this new regulation, the GIPAG France is demanding to EASA that these associations have to be considered as an organisation making "commercial operation". These organisations have to be legally responsible of their acts and shouldn't transfer their responsibilities to the approved organisation (Part G, Part-145 or Part-M subpart F). As a reminder, in the Council Directive 2003/96/EC of 27 October 2003 (concerning Restructuring the Community framework for the taxation of energy products and electricity) the commercial operations are difined as "the carriage of passengers or goods or for the supply of services for

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

consideration or for the purposes of public authorities".

response *Noted*

The term 'commercial operation' is defined in Article 3 of the Basic Regulation and cannot be altered through a lower ranking implementing rule. Furthermore, the Agency is not entitled to issue AMC/GM material for provisions of the Basic Regulation.

Nevertheless, the Agency acknowledges the paper issued by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy group and the actions recommended in this paper. In particular, action A.1 invites Member States to provide their feedback on the activities which they do not classify as commercial operations in their current system, and the Agency and the Commission to consider proposing changes to the definition in the Basic Regulation following such a feedback.

comment *171* comment by: *FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation*

The GIPAG France is asking to EASA to define which activities regarding General Aviation are considered as "Commercial Operation". All the organisations operating flights with a transfer of cash should be defined as "Commercial Operation" especially within the flight association. Today in France, an Association can realise commercial activities even if they are considered by the administration as a non-making profit. With this new regulation, the GIPAG France is demanding to EASA that these associations have to be considered as an organisation making "commercial operation". These organisations have to be legally responsible of their acts and shouldn't transfer their responsibilities to the approved organisation (Part G, Part-145 or Part-M subpart F).

response *Noted*

The term 'commercial' operation is defined in Article 3 of the Basic Regulation and cannot be altered through a lower ranking implementing rule. Furthermore, the Agency is not entitled to issue AMC/GM material for provisions of the Basic Regulation.

Nevertheless, the Agency acknowledges the paper issued by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy group and the actions recommended in this paper. In particular, action A.1 invites Member States to provide their feedback on the activities which they do not classify as commercial operations in their current system, and the Agency and the Commission to consider proposing changes to the definition in the Basic Regulation following such a feedback.

comment *189* comment by: *SVFB/SAMA*

7/129
The final composition of the task force....
We have the impression that stakeholders with a primary business interest into CAMO are unhappy that they have not been part in the workgroup. We understand this. At the same time we request that rulemaking must not be driven by lobby groups, like HF, CRM, SMS and other providers of consultancy businesses.It's fair that such consultancies can make their business case, but the business case must be based on the option, to get a good service for money and not creating a business forced upon MRO's by the regulator. SME's in aviation on the other hand, whom are providing first hand maintenance services, have neither time nor resources for lobbying. It is just not possible for

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	the majority of the stakeholders to take up an active role in this complex and time consuming process and therefore the result of the rulemaking process may be far from representing the opinion of the experienced and dedicated front line service providers.
response	*Not accepted* SAMA is represented by ECOGAS.

comment	*190* comment by: *SVFB/SAMA* 8/129 Para 19…**to significantly reduce the burden on the GA community** late and not enough due to the **basic regulation** badly adapted to general and business aviation. Para 21. **..the term commercial operations** the lack of a useful definition of the terms : **Commercial air transport (should be: scheduled airlines according EU law, as indicated in 2042/2003 Article 1.3 which is a good start)** **commercial operations,** an undertaking which includes at least this two conditions: a business with the primary goal to make money and access to order the service and buy it publicly at **any time at any place worldwide.** The present interpretation of this terms by some or many of the NAA's makes probably 95% of alleviations **useless** because the less stringent requirements of Part M subpart **F cannot be used and applied by most of the SME MRO organisations.** The complex structures of 145 must be applied because a sightseeing flight or a towing operation of a glider are considered as "commercial" and are forcing the MRO to fully work along part 145. The NAA inspector on site in order to avoid any MAST team finding, is unable to use any kind of interpretative flexibility in most cases and we can't blame him fort hat. **We believe that this lack of a smart definition is one of the major reasons for the rejection of EASA regulation by the stakeholder of GA and Business aviation.** Of course progress can only be made if the conservative NAA's are willing to accept the liberal version of other NAA's as a base for smart EU/EASA regulation. This resistance to slaughter holy cows is one of the main obstacles delaying progress towards a modern, well adapted user-friendly and truly smart regulation.
response	*Noted* — A change to the Basic Regulation is outside the scope of this task. — The term 'commercial operation' is defined in Article 3 of the Basic Regulation and cannot be altered through a lower ranking implementing rule. Furthermore, the Agency is not entitled to issue AMC/GM material for provisions of the Basic Regulation. Nevertheless, the Agency acknowledges the paper issued by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy group and the actions recommended in this paper. In particular, action A.1 invites Member States to provide their feedback on the activities which they do not classify as commercial operations in their current system, and the Agency and the Commission to

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

consider proposing changes to the definition in the Basic Regulation following such a feedback.

— Please note that a Part-145 organisation is only required for large aircraft and for aircraft involved in commercial air transport. However, it is not required for aircraft involved in other commercial operations.

— Standardisation (EASA) is putting significant efforts not only on the application of the rule but also on not exceeding the existing requirements. Nevertheless, more guidance is being produced to improve standardisation across Europe, like it is the case of the template for the maintenance programme (AMC M.A.302(e)).

comment *191* comment by: *SVFB/SAMA*

9/129 Para 22
for the sake of progress, proportionality and performance based surveillance, such undertakings as
- glider towing
- sightseeing flights
- and similar undertakings
should be exempted or moved in another set of "commercial very light" as they are not true business models with the goal to make money and do not provide a ROI. The number of absolute as well as potential fatalities is not justifying allocation of expensive authority resources. An easy accessible database which is the base of rulemaking is still missing.

response *Noted*

The term 'commercial operation' is defined in Article 3 of the Basic Regulation and cannot be altered through a lower ranking implementing rule. Furthermore, the Agency is not entitled to issue AMC/GM material for provisions of the Basic Regulation.

Nevertheless, the Agency acknowledges the paper issued by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy group and the actions recommended in this paper. In particular, action A.1 invites Member States to provide their feedback on the activities which they do not classify as commercial operations in their current system, and the Agency and the Commission to consider proposing changes to the definition in the Basic Regulation following such a feedback.

comment *249* comment by: *Finnish Transport Safety Agency*

Proposal 2	Possibility (option) for the owner to issue a declaration for his/her own aircraft's maintenance programme (M.A.302(h)). **NOTE:** In this case, the owner takes full responsibility for its content and any deviations from the Design Approval Holder's recommendations.	ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations

Small general aviation G+I organizations will be without work. Big work with maintenance programs in CAAs and G-organizations will be wasted.
Difficult to inspect the effectiveness of alternate methods when deviations from recommended maintenance intervals are used.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

The effectiveness and validity of maintenance program is difficult to check during ACAM inspection.

response

Noted

Although this proposal may negatively impact some NAAs (because of the reduction of work), other NAAs will welcome this reduction of workload.

Regarding the impact on G+I organisations, the impact should not be very large since developing the maintenance programme is only a small portion of their work and, in addition, this has been limited to ELA2 aircraft not involved in commercial operations.

The effectiveness of the maintenance programme will be reviewed during the airworthiness reviews. Please refer to AMC M.A.302(h), AMC M.A.710(h), GM M.A.302(h) and GM M.A.710(i) for more guidance on NAA responsibilities and how to adapt the ACAM inspections.

comment

250 comment by: *Finnish Transport Safety Agency*

Proposal 3	Introduction of 'Minimum Inspection Programmes' (Appendix IX to Part-M) which may be used by the owner as the basis for the declared (by the owner) maintenance programme. Applicable to: • ELA1 aeroplanes not involved in commercial operations • ELA1 sailplanes and ELA1 powered-sailplanes not involved in commercial operations • ELA1 balloons not involved in commercial operations	ELA1 aeroplanes, ELA1 sailplanes, ELA1 powered-sailplanes and ELA1 balloons not involved in commercial operations

MIP is OK for aircrafts with old instructions for continuous airworthiness (ICA), but is it possible to use with new aircrafts with good ICA.

response

Not accepted

The MIP covers inspection requirements for the full aircraft. In any case, additional recommendations from the Design Approval Holder (DAH) must be identified in the maintenance programme, even if the owner decides not to comply with them.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

comment *251* comment by: *Finnish Transport Safety Agency*

Proposal 5	Possibility for a Part-145 or M.A. Subpart F maintenance organisation to perform the airworthiness review and issue the corresponding ARC (airworthiness review certificate) at the same time they perform the annual inspection contained in the 'Minimum Inspection Programme'. **NOTE:** A new Form 15c (ARC) has been introduced to cover this case.	ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations

Phase II

Possibility for independent certifying staff to perform airworthiness reviews and issue the ARC, subject to individual approval by the competent authority.	ELA2 aircraft not involved in commercial operations

Not good idea. 145- and F- organizations could make ARC only to MIP aircrafts, but not to aircrafts, that they have made MP and approved via indirect approval. Better system would be Phase 2 system to give "possibility for independent certifying staff to perform airworthiness reviews and issue the ARC, subject to individual approval by the competent authority" directly. These persons could work under 145-, F- or G-organizations, but perform the ARC as an independent inspector or perform the annual maintenance and ARC as an independent person.
Change will mix the work of CAMO and maintenance organizations and GA-world is mixed again.

response *Partially accepted*

— The text has been revised to allow the maintenance organisation to perform the airworthiness review together with the annual inspection contained in the maintenance programme, regardless of whether it is based on the MIP or not and regardless of whether it is approved by the NAA or self-declared.
— Phase II will analyse the privileges of independent certifying staff.

comment *254* comment by: *Howard Torode*

EUROPEAN GLIDING UNION

OVERVIEW STATEMENT

The EGU sees the fundamental approach of Proposals 2 through 5 as representing a very significant recognition by EASA of the essential difference between CAT and Sport Aviation. We strongly support this option particularly as it now represents an acceptable approach for EASA. The approach is much closer to the sort of relationships we are used to operating in many major gliding nations, all be it that the former may not have had the clarity of responsibility that EASA would now require.
Rationale

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	At first sight this approach may appear to other stakeholders to be something of a 'leap of faith'. The EGU believes this to be a workable approach that is necessary, which also fulfils regulators requirement for a clear and unique responsibility chain. While one could take the view that the owner may not be competent to understand the needs of airworthiness/maintenance, the provisions virtually impel him to seek appropriate advice from organisations that are approved as competent. We applaud this step forward in sensible regulation. It represents a valid and useful development to the extant procedures in the 'uncontrolled environment', which is normally adopted in sport aviation. This might be difficult to accept by some nations where they chose, or are constrained, either by choice or, often by NAAs, to operate the 'controlled environment' approach. Those nations who have to date used the uncontrolled environment will certainly find these measures an economic and useful option.
response	*Noted*

comment	*286* comment by: *AESA* Proposal 1: The development of a Maintenance Programme requires taking into account other Continuing Airworthiness Tasks such as management of modifications and repairs, repetitive airworthiness directives… To extend the relevant privileges to Part 145 and MFs organizations, it is necessary to ensure that these organisations are competent to develop a Maintenance Programme, and this includes the demonstration of capability to manage continuing airworthiness task
response	*Partially accepted* Qualifications requirements have been introduced in M.A.606(j) and 145.A.30(l). However, these requirements only cover the development of the maintenance programme, since it is not necessary to cover all the continuing airworthiness management process.

comment	*288* comment by: *AESA* For Proposal 1: The proposed rule, as it is drafted, is incomplete: Part M Subpart F and Part 145 should contain and article equivalent to M.A.708 in Part M Subpart G saying that *"in case of ELA2 aircraft not involved in commercial Operations, and when the owner makes a limited contract with the organizations for the development of a maintenance programme, the organisation shall develop and control a maintenance programme in accordance with M.A.302"* - The respective EASA forms 6F and 6 should include the articles proposed above, otherwise there is no proper way to report the surveillance of NAAs regarding these new continuing airworthiness task granted to Maintenance Organisations. (Only the points corresponding to the procedures in MOE and MOM are included)
response	*Partially accepted* Regarding the sentence that you propose, this is already included in Part-M (M.A.201(e)(ii))

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	In addition, the EASA Forms 6 and 6F have been amended as you propose.

comment	*289* comment by: *AESA* On Proposal 1: - Management responsibilities. AMCs of 145.A.30 and M.A.606 should to be modified include the figure of a responsible for the Maintenance Programme, with an EASA form 4, although depending the size of the organization that function can be assumed by any of the managers.
response	*Partially accepted* A list of personnel responsible for the maintenance programme has been included in M.A.604(a)5 and 145.A.70(a)6. However, an EASA Form 4 has not been required.

comment	*294* comment by: *AESA* On Proposal 1: - Appendix I to AMC M.A.302 and M.B.301 (b) In point 1.1.4 of this appendix it is said that the maintenance programme must include a statement signed by the owner, operator or M.A. Subpart G organization managing the aircraft airworthiness. When the maintenance programme is prepared by a 145 or MF, Who is the responsible for signing this statement? This point should be modified to include a reference to the person who must sign this statement in this case.
response	*Not accepted* Point 1.1.4 refers to a statement declaring that the aircraft will be maintained to the programme and that the programme will be reviewed and updated as required. This statement cannot be signed by the maintenance organisation (even if the maintenance organisation has developed the maintenance programme) because they are not the ones who have to commit to follow, review and update the maintenance programme.

A. Explanatory Note - IV. Content of the draft Opinion/Decision - b) Changes proposed for Phase I - Proposal 1 p. 10-11

comment	*18* comment by: *BPvL e. V.* The BPvL supports this proposal as there are maintenance specialists involved that know how to handle the airworthiness of an aircraft.
response	*Noted*

comment	*45* comment by: *Graham HALLETT* There can be no objection to this use of a subpart F instead of a subpart G to generate and get approved a maintenance programme. However, I question how necessary it is - many subpart F organisations will also be subpart G organisations anyway. In the case of balloons, the

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	maintenance programme will be virtually identical for all aircraft, whether ELA1 or ELA2 and operating as private, commercial or CAT, so any organisation wishing to deal with commercial balloons for the MP will have to be a subpart G anyway.
response	*Noted* For Phase I, it has been decided to limit the proposals to aircraft not involved in commercial operations due to the lower associated risks and liabilities. Phase II will analyse other options.

comment	*53* comment by: *Klemens* This is a good proposal 1. I support proposal 1.
response	*Noted*

comment	*64* comment by: *BCAA - G. Pierlot* Please, note that the first proposal is acceptable for the Belgian CAA.
response	*Noted*

comment	*95* comment by: *Konekorhonen Oy 145-org. and G-org.* Ilma-aluksen omistajan ilmoitusmenettelyllä käyttöön otettava minimum inspection programme ei ole mielestämme hyvä ratkaisu. Vaikka omistaja olisikin täydessä vastuussa huolto-ohjelman sisällöstä, se ei takaa sitä, että huolto-ohjelmassa olisi huomioitu kaikki tarvittavat kyseisen ilma-aluksen huoltoa koskevat ohjeet. Lisäksi on outoa, että määräysluonnoksessa todetaan monessa kohdassa omistajan olevan vastuussa ilmoitusmenettelyllä käyttöön otetusta huolto-ohjelman sisällöstä mutta silti vaaditaan, että huolto-organisaation tai lentokelpoisuustarkastajan pitäisi ottaa kantaa huolto-ohjelman sisältöön.
response	*Noted* Please note that even if the MIP is used, other recommendations from the Design Approval Holder have to be, at least, taken into account (see fields 5, 10 and 13 of the template in AMC M.A.302(e)). The responsibilities have been further clarified in GM M.A.302(h), GM M.A.710. The airworthiness review staff do not have to review the maintenance programme up-front. Only if the results of the maintenance inspections and airworthiness reviews show defects on the aircraft which may be linked to an inadequate maintenance programme (see AMC M.A.302(h) and AMC M.A.710(h)).

comment	*192* comment by: *SVFB/SAMA* 10/129 Para 24 **Proposal 1** we fully support this proposal 1 , but then the proposed restriction: ...Applicable to ELA2 aircraft not involved in commercial operations ❄he positive effect of proposal 1 is made redundant or obsolete due to glider towing, sight-seeing flights and similar defined as "quasi" commercial purposes. This forces potential Part M /sub F MRO's into the much heavier 145 part

structures and processes.
Para 27 M.A.201 (e)(ii) **for ELA2 aircraft not involved in commercial operations...**
we support this proposal which is a real progress.
remark: avoid to make this progress obsolete due to forcing "quasi" commercial ops the MRO to get an 145 and a Part M/G approval for economical reasons, to retain its customer base.A Part M/F MRO is competent to maintain ELA2 Aircraft for "commercial light" operations any time.
"....the reason fort his limitation is make sure that...."
this is not a valid justification. A condition to choose a part M/G CAMO in case of change of the MRO within 24 months would be good enough.
What is the value of EASA regulation if we still need bilateral agreements within EASA ??

response

Noted

The term 'commercial operation' is defined in Article 3 of the Basic Regulation and cannot be altered through a lower ranking implementing rule. Furthermore, the Agency is not entitled to issue AMC/GM material for provisions of the Basic Regulation.

Nevertheless, the Agency acknowledges the paper issued by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy group and the actions recommended in this paper. In particular, action A.1 invites Member States to provide their feedback on the activities which they do not classify as commercial operations in their current system, and the Agency and the Commission to consider proposing changes to the definition in the Basic Regulation following such a feedback.

comment

193 comment by: *SVFB/SAMA*

11/129 M.A.615(f) we fully support this approach
M.B.301: what is the meaning of this paragraph ?
Proposal 2: we are fully supporting this proposal, but can't see ELA1 aircraft being involved in commercial operations**, or rather** we do not see why the Part M/F organisation cannot maintain any aircraft in commercial operation in group **2 and 3,** without additional burden of a CAMO. The part M/F or more so the 145 is fit to assure continuous airworthiness.If he can do the work, he can as well control the paperwork, steering and planning process for CAW.

response

Noted

The Subpart F maintenance organisations, even with the existing rules, can maintain any aircraft in groups 2 and 3 even if they are involved in commercial operations (other than commercial air transport).

However, a maintenance organisation is not qualified to manage the continuing airworthiness of aircraft, since the requirements to obtain a maintenance organisation approval do not include procedures related to continuing airworthiness management.

comment

213 comment by: *DGAC France*

Proposal 1 – Contracting of the development/process approval of MP

Limited contract combined with owner declaration

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	In case of limited contract for development of an MP combined with declaration by the owner, the respective responsibilities of the owner/contracted organisation are not clear in AMC M.A.201(e). It shall be made clear that: - The contracted organisation is responsible for the content of the MP developed in accordance with its approved procedures and proposed to the owner (contrary to what is stated at the end of § 33 of the NPA). - In case this MP proposal made to the owner includes deviations which should normally be approved by the Authority, the owner shall be informed so that he can assume responsibility for this deviation when signing the MP declaration. - In case the owner deviates from the contracted organisation proposal, he shall assume full responsibility for this deviation. Indirect approval In the current NPA proposal, there are new contracted organisations that can use the possibility of indirect approval for the maintenance programs. There is in MA201(e) (ii) the reference "in accordance with point M.A.302.", but the M.A.302(c) is limited to CAMO as per those terms : "When the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft is managed by a continuing airworthiness management organisation approved in accordance with Section A, Subpart G of this Annex (Part M)". Therefore DGAC recommends to add the case of approval for maintenance contracted organisation as follows: "When the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft is managed by a continuing airworthiness management organisation approved in accordance with Section A, Subpart G of this Annex (Part M), or by a Part-145 or M.A. Subpart F maintenance organisation under a limited contract as per M.A.201.(e) (ii),…" Limited contract to maintenance organisation – Limitation to organisations under the oversight of the state of registry As explained in § 27 of the proposal descriptions, this limitation is linked to the indirect MP approval. Therefore a limited contract to a foreign maintenance organisation should be allowed as long as indirect approval is not used (same as for CAMO). Competence of maintenance organisation staff for developing MPs It is recommended to complete the M.A.606, to refer to the competence for developing a MP by adding a (j) bullet as follows "(j) If the organisation establishes a maintenance program for an ELA2 aircraft not involved in commercial operations and delivers it to the owner of such aircraft, in accordance with M.A.201(e) ii, it shall have appropriate and skilled staff for this activity." A similar modification for Part 145 is also necessary.
response	*Partially accepted* **Limited contract combined with owner declaration** Guidance has been introduced in AMC M.A.201(e), GM M.A.302(h), and GM M.A.710. **Indirect approval** Your proposal is not necessary since M.A.302(c) is only applicable when there is a contract with a CAMO for the continuing airworthiness management of the aircraft. As a consequence, this paragraph is not applicable when there is a limited contract with a maintenance organisation. In addition, this organisation cannot use the indirect approval procedure. **Limited contract with organisation from the State of Registry**

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

This limitation has been removed since the possibility for indirect approval by a maintenance organisation has been removed.

Competence of maintenance organisation staff for developing MPs

Accepted. See M.A.606(j) and 145.A.30(l).

comment *229* comment by: *FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation*

In case of limited contract for development of an MP combined with declaration by the owner, the respective responsibilities of the owner/contracted organisation are not clear in AMC M.A.201(e).
The maintenance organization preempted by the GIPAG France do not agree with taking legal responsibilities in applying an owner MP which would not be approved by the competent authority. A safe level of security has to be kept with the activities of the operator of ELA2 aircraft.

response *Accepted*

See AMC M.A.201(e) and GM.302(h).

comment *337* comment by: *European Sailplane Manufacturers*

The added opportunity for a Subpart F or Part-145 organisation has been naturally welcomed by such organisations.
Nevertheless some air sport organisations and flying clubs expressed their concern that interpretation by the NAAs of M.A.201(i) will still prevent use of such options.

This problem does exist often in conjunction with training organisations (which often are the clubs themselves).
Here a more precise wording (when a CAMO and/or a controlled environment is needed) would be helpful.

response *Noted*

The term 'commercial operation' is defined in Article 3 of the Basic Regulation and cannot be altered through a lower ranking implementing rule. Furthermore, the Agency is not entitled to issue AMC/GM material for provisions of the Basic Regulation.

Nevertheless, the Agency acknowledges the paper issued by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy group and the actions recommended in this paper. In particular, action A.1 invites Member States to provide their feedback on the activities which they do not classify as commercial operations in their current system, and the Agency and the Commission to consider proposing changes to the definition in the Basic Regulation following such a feedback.

A. Explanatory Note - IV. Content of the draft Opinion/Decision - b) Changes proposed for Phase I - Proposal 2 p. 11-12

comment *1* comment by: *Thomas WOLFF*

The new option for the owner of ELA1 not used for commercial operations to issue a declaration for the Maintenance Programme instead of having it approved is very much appreciated. This takes unnecessary administrative

	burden from the owner and is a step in the right direction. By use of the Minimum Maintenance Programme an adequate level of minimum safety is assured. Another positive effect is that because of this new option, there is an incentive for the owner to investigate and learn about best maintenance practices for his aircraft, which will clearly enhance safety because the owner/pilot will thereby become more knowledgable about maintenance of his aircraft.
response	*Noted* The Agency thanks for the feedback.

comment	*19* comment by: *BPvL e. V.* Pt.31) The BPvL cannot believe that this is the real meaning of the group and is totally against it. How can an aircraft owner with no training and skills in aircraft maintenance, no valid documentations and in most cases not able to read and / or understand technical manuals or bulletins declare for his own maintenance programme? Not only the basic aircraft and engine are parts of the programme also installed supplements, national rules and deviations from TC-holder recommendations have to be declared and to justify. The development (approval) must be in the hand of professionals with all the background and capabilities needed for this job. Pt.33) As the owner has to sign an approved maintenance programme he is always fully responsible for the airworthiness of his aircraft as long he has no contracted CAMO. Pt.34) The problem is that a lot of owners are suffering by overestimation of their own capabilities. We can see this within our daily work on aircraft where pilot owner maintenance was performed. Placing this proposal as a rule, the agency will give the last control for a safer sky out of our hands. A complete and correct maintenance programme is the basis for the airworthiness of an aircraft nevertheless if it's commercial or not. The complete proposal 2 has to be eliminated because this really affects the safety of flight in a negative form.
response	*Partially accepted* The current rule already allows the owner to completely manage the continuing airworthiness of his/her aircraft under his/her own responsibility. In addition, the option of self-declaration has been limited to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations and compensating measures have been introduced, as the review of the effectiveness of the maintenance programme at the time of the airworthiness review. Furthermore, GM M.A.201(e) clearly reminds the owner to carefully self-assess his/her competence.

comment	*20* comment by: *BPvL e. V.* Pt.36) This is what we call an uncontrolled environment. How often has a CAMO sent a report as required after finding deficiencies? I believe this will go down very close to zero. During the last EASA workshop I heard discussions like: "I will sign every ARC nevertheless of findings because I do not want to loose a customer" Again, EASA and the competent authorities will give away the "last chance" for

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	a safer sky.
response	*Not accepted* Not introducing a rule with the excuse of thinking that organisations are not going to comply with it, cannot be justified. Once the rule is adopted, Standardisation will check how it is implemented.

comment	*46* comment by: *Graham HALLETT* The proposal to allow the owner to self-declare a maintenance programme is cautiously welcomed. Generally any opportunity to escape the bureaucracy (and hence expense) of CAMO/NAA involvement and approval would seem beneficial. However, I remain unconvinced that this proposal offers any real benefit, certainly to balloon owners. If a self declared unapproved programme is being used, then the MO/CAMO is obliged to check the MP and its suitability at an annual inspection or airworthiness review. This is likely to be more work for the MO/CAMO than using their own approved MP - particulalry for something like a balloon when every MP for every balloon for all types of operation will be virtually identical. In practice, to take advantage of this alleviation, balloon owners are likely to use a template MP, which has been prepared by a MO/CAMO, so the owner is reasonably certain that it will be suitable. In which case, there seems no need to restrict the proposal to ELA1 aircraft, it could also be applied to ELA2 balloons.
response	*Partially accepted* It is not the intent of the rule to require that the maintenance organisation/CAMO performs a full check of the content of the maintenance programme. As indicated in AMC M.A.710(h), the intention is that the results of the maintenance performed during the last year and the results of the airworthiness review are taken into consideration in order to see whether the maintenance programme has been effective and whether the findings may have been avoided by introducing recommendations from the DAH which were initially disregarded by the owner. The possibility for extension of this proposal to ELA2 aircraft will be analysed during Phase II.

comment	*54* comment by: *Klemens* I am against proposal 2/3! The owner is not in the position to declare his own maintenance program. He has no training and experience in aircraft maintenance. Please never do this.
response	*Partially accepted* The current rule already allows the owner to completely manage the continuing airworthiness of his/her aircraft under his/her own responsibility. In addition, the option of self-declaration has been limited to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations and compensating measures have been introduced, as the review of the effectiveness of the maintenance programme at the time of

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

the airworthiness review.

Furthermore, GM M.A.201(e) clearly reminds the owner to carefully self-assess his/her competence.

comment

65 comment by: *BCAA - G. Pierlot*

PAGE / POINT / PARAGRAPH / SECTION OUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

Point 35: Based on all the arguments above, the Agency has decided not to require a copy of the declared maintenance programme to be sent to the competent authority.

PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

Add a point M.A.302 (h) **6** :
A copy of the aircraft maintenance programme shall be sent by the owner to the Member State of Registry of that aircraft within 10 days after any revision.
RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION FOR THE COMMENT:

As the maintenance / airworthiness environment have a strong impact on the general condition of the aircraft, the future regulations should take into account that a constant reduction of the amount of information will not help the authority to fulfill its duties and to oversight the fleet registered in its country.
The NAA cannot be aware of the maintenance / airworthiness environments *chosen by the owner* if a copy of the AMP does not need to be sent to the competent authority. The NAA has to establish an ACAM programme for general aviation, which also needs to take into account the **local** knowledge and airworthiness standards (e.g. DAH deviations, pilot maintenance environment, etc.), and it will be difficult for the NAA to prioritize the risks in small general aviation with this lack of information.
The exchange of information between stakeholders (Agency, NAA, industry, owners) is one of the most basic tool used in any safety programme and should therefore be included in the hard law.

response

Partially accepted

GM M.A.302(h) has been added with the following content:

- When the competent authority is notified of deficiencies linked to the content of the maintenance programme for a particular aircraft, the competent authority should contact the owner, request a copy of the maintenance programme (if it was declared) and use the information received for the adequate planning of the ACAM programme. Based on the reported deficiencies and the risks identified, the competent authority will adapt accordingly the ACAM programme. This notification will also allow that the competent authority agrees on the changes required to the maintenance programme as required by point M.A.302(h)5.
- Although there is no requirement for the owner to send a copy of the declared maintenance programme to the competent authority, this does not prevent the competent authority from requesting a copy to the owner at any time, even if deficiencies

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

have not been reported.

comment 66 comment by: *BCAA - G. Pierlot*

PAGE / POINT / PARAGRAPH / SECTION OUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

Point 36: If the airworthiness review shows discrepancies linked to deficiencies in the content of the maintenance programme, the owner shall amend the maintenance programme accordingly as required by M.A.302(h)5.

PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

Add a provision to M.A.302(h)5: If the airworthiness review shows discrepancies linked to deficiencies in the content of the maintenance programme, the owner shall amend the maintenance programme accordingly. **Furthermore, if the discrepancies are too significant during the airworthiness review, the owner shall contract a CAMO/Part M Subpart F/Part 145 to develop and organise the approval of the maintenance programme**.

RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION FOR THE COMMENT:

If a finding is raised on the AMP during the airworthiness review / ACAM inspection (e.g. really poor maintenance due to an AMP developed by the owner), how can the NAA/approved organizations deal with the situation if the owner is declaring himself responsible but he/she is obviously not competent to develop such AMP? The burden of work by the NAA / approved organizations needed to restore the AMP to an acceptable level in such situation is not the aim of the NPA.
With the proposed text, the agency would let the opportunity to the approved organizations / NAA to require a contract for the development and the approval of the AMP by an approved organization in the case of too significant discrepancies. This proposition should add a new compensating measure for the safety impact to those foreseen in **Point 66**.

response *Partially accepted*

The Agency does not agree on requiring a contract with a CAMO/maintenance organisation.

Nevertheless, M.A.302(h)5 has been amended to require that the NAA needs to agree on the changes to be introduced in the maintenance programme when deficiencies have been reported. See also GM M.A.302(h).

comment 100 comment by: *British Gliding Association*

British Gliding Association
Proposal 3
Guidance material should be added to encourage the owner to consult with his/her subpart F maintenance organisation in producing and customising the maintenance programme to include the minimum inspection programme. The owner should still declare the maintenance programme.
Rationale:
The subpart F maintenance organisation will normally have first hand knowledge of the aircraft and be best placed to provide assistance to the owner

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	in developing the maintenance programme.
response	*Partially accepted* GM M.A.201(e) has been added.

comment	*102* comment by: *British Gliding Association* British Gliding Association Proposal 3, Minimum Inspection Programme Allow existing "Generic" maintenance schedules, programmes or task lists that contain at least the minimum inspection programme tasks as applicable to the aircraft type to be used in place of Appendix IX. Rationale: Many "Generic" maintenance schedules are in use and are completely effective. Using these in combination with the Maintenance Programme template will allow continued effective maintenance and comply with M.A.302.
response	*Accepted* M.A.302(h)2 has been amended to require that the maintenance programme cannot be less restrictive than the MIP. However, going beyond the MIP is always possible.

comment	*103* comment by: *British Gliding Association* British Gliding Association Proposal 3 The 10% tolerance for carrying out the 100 hour should not need to be deducted from the next check, plus this needs expanding to any scheduled routine hour or calendar controlled maintenance check including Annual inspections. 25 hour = 2.5 hours 50 hour = 5 hours 100 hour = 10 hours (if 50 hour check is included in the check cycle it would be 5 hours) Out of phase hour/landing controlled inspections = 10% (not airworthiness limitations) Annual inspection = 1 month Rationale: The required maintenance has been completed, servicing done etc so there is no reason why the aircraft cannot continue for another full check interval. The hour extensions do not effect the annual inspection or TBO or lifed items that are normally out of phase with any operating hour checks. It does not affect the ARC expiry. The extension process is used as a planning tool to allow some flexibility into maintenance and exceptional operational planning. Guidance material should state the reason for the extension should be bona-fide and not used to extend every 100 hours into 110 hours. The reasons for extension could form part of the ACAM audit.
response	*Partially accepted* As you correctly mention, the purpose of the extension process is to allow some flexibility in the planning of the maintenance for next maintenance check. However, it is not a tool to continuously increase the intervals. If an organisation needs a few more hours in order to have the aircraft

available without disrupting the operation of the aircraft, this is fine. However, the next check should be planned as initially scheduled.

Phase II will analyse the general policy for extension of intervals (for other checks), in line with JAA TGL26.

comment *104* comment by: *British Gliding Association*

British Gliding Association
As an addition to proposal 3
Produce AMC to allow ELA 1 powered sailplanes to operate the airframe and engine as separate entities between annuals. This is applicable only to aircraft used for soaring with the engine shut down. The engine, propeller and associated accessories accumulate hours only for the time they are being used. It does mean the airframe and engine elements of the 50 and 100 hour checks will be separated but in most cases that is at a ratio of 2:1 for TMG and usually less than 10:1 for other powered sailplanes. Everything is re-aligned at the annual inspection were both airframe and engine start the check cycle again. ARC and calendar TBO not affected but operating hours, service interval and TBO on the engine etc. are not being consumed whilst they are not operating.

response *Accepted*

See the MIP for TMGs in AMC M.A.302(i).

comment *166* comment by: *Federal Office of Civil Aviation FOCA*

Proposal 2: Possibility (option) for the owner to issue a declaration for his/her own aircraft's maintenance programme (M.A.302(h))**:** FOCA would like to point out following aspects which should be considered when allowing the alleviations as suggested in proposal 2: The introduction of the option for the owner to issue a declaration for his/her own aircraft's maintenance programme might have counter-productive effects if the owner is not sufficiently skilled to develop such a maintenance programme. Not every owner may be able to develop a maintenance programme. Notwithstanding the lack of expertise, some owners might choose to use the declaration option for cost and simplicity reasons. The suggested declaration regime may provoke non-compliance such as differences between the maintenance programme and actually performed maintenance which would eventually be revealed during ACAM inspections. This would finally generate an extra effort to the competent authority and the owner itself.

response *Partially accepted*

The current rule already allows the owner to completely manage the continuing airworthiness of his/her aircraft under his/her own responsibility. In addition, the option of self-declaration has been limited to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations and compensating measures have been introduced, as the review of the effectiveness of the maintenance programme at the time of the airworthiness review.

Furthermore, GM M.A.201(e) clearly reminds the owner to carefully self-assess his/her competence.

comment *207* comment by: *EFLEVA*

The EFLEVA wishes to comment on " Proposal 2: Possibility (option) for the

owner to issue a declaration for his/her own aircraft's maintenance programme (M.A.302(h)).Applicable to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations".

It is the view of the EFLEVA that this proposal should not be limited to ELA1 aircraft. The proposed measure should be extended to cover all aircraft up to 5700kg MTOM, not used for commercial purposes.

response

Noted

The extension of this proposal to other aircraft will be analysed in Phase II.

comment

214 comment by: *DGAC France*

Proposal 2 – Possibility for the owner to issue a declaration for his MP

Responsibilities associated to maintenance and airworthiness review
Having a self declared MP will lead the certifying staff and airworthiness review staff to take some responsibilities regarding the airworthiness status of the aircraft whereas they have no guaranty that the MP is technically pertinent.
For the certifying staff the wording used on the CRS is probably acceptable since it refers to a work order issued by the owner.
However, it is not so clear for an ARS signing an ARC since the current statement on form 15 is: "the aircraft is considered airworthy at the time of the review". We would therefore suggest amending the statement to indicate for example that "the airworthiness review was satisfactory".

Aircraft managed by CAMO
Is it confirmed that the intent of the NPA is to forbid MP declaration by the owner in case of aircraft managed by a CAMO (we do not see a major reason to prevent this option)?

Management of deviations to the MP declared by the owner
It is not clear how deviations from the MP declared by the owner shall be managed. A traceability of the deviations to the MP must be introduced.
Annual review of the MP in the case of self declaration (M.A.302 (h) 5)
Responsibility
It is inappropriate to require that the MP annual review shall be ***performed*** by the Airworthiness Review Staff (in particular when the airworthiness review is performed by the Authority or a CAMO not performing the annual inspection). It shall be the primary responsibility of the owner.
The responsibility of the AR staff should be limited to:
- the verification that the owner has performed a MP review
- a sample check on the root cause analysis and the actions taken

Scope
AMC M.A.302 (h) correctly states that the annual review of the MP shall take into account not only the findings of the airworthiness review but also the results of the maintenance performed during the year (this should also be extended to any M.A.202 occurrence reporting cases, including accident/incident). However M.A.302 (h) 5 and M.A.710 (h) are limited to the deficiencies identified during the airworthiness review. They shall be revised accordingly.
Content of M.A.302 (h)

M.A.302(c) is only an option; therefore M.A.302 (h) is not taken "by derogation

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	to M.A.302(c)" M.A.302 (e) actually contains 2 separate requirements: - the MP shall contain details, including frequency of all maintenance to be carried out - the MP shall include any specific tasks linked to the type and the specificity of operations The first requirement is also applicable to MPs developed in accordance with M.A.302 (h). We therefore suggest moving this requirement to M.A.302 (a) as follows: "Maintenance of each aircraft shall be organised in accordance with an aircraft MP containing details including frequency, of all maintenance to be carried out". The second requirement could be completed to cover specificities of aircraft configuration (not only operations). Taking into account the above proposed modifications to M.A.302 (e), M.A.302 (h) would then be taken "by derogation to M.A.302 (e)" since the obligation stated in § M.A.302 (e) ("shall") is replaced by proposed § M.A.302 (h)(3) which only requires the owner to "take consideration for" the aircraft configuration/operations specificities. As stated above, in our understanding, the objective of § M.A.302 (h) (3) is to list elements that the owner should "take consideration for" with no regulatory obligation to incorporate the concerned elements (contrary to § (h) (2)). Therefore, it is confusing to have ALS included in this list: we propose to move ALS to § (h) (2). In § M.A.302 (h) (2), the sentence "complies with § (d) and (e) above" is not clear since § (d) (iii) allows for additional or alternative instructions proposed by the owner subject ***to approval,*** which is not possible under M.A.302 (h). Our understanding is the following: - the additional tasks are handled according to § (h)(3) - the alternative tasks or deviations are acceptable only if full compliance with the MIP is ensured Is it correct? It would be useful to enable deviations from Design holder/Authority instructions if MIP is complied with ***for the specific item subject to the deviation*** instead without ensuring that the full MP is compliant to the MIP (example: MP compliant with Design holder/Authority instructions except Engine TBO but compliant with MIP for all instructions related to engine airworthiness).
response	*Partially accepted* **<u>Responsibilities associated to maintenance and airworthiness review</u>** GM M.A.710 has been added in order to clarify the responsibilities of the airworthiness review staff. **<u>Aircraft managed by CAMO</u>** Declaration by the owner is also possible when the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft is managed by a CAMO. See GM M.A.302(h). **<u>Management of deviations to the maintenance programme declared by the owner</u>** The deviations are already part of the template for the maintenance programme (AMC M.A.302(e)). **<u>Annual review of the MP in case of self-declaration</u>** Responsibilities of airworthiness review staff have been clarified in AMC M.A.710(h) and GM. M.A.710. **<u>Scope indicated in AMC M.A.302(h)</u>**

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Your proposal has been accepted.

Content of M.A.302(h):

M.A.302(h) has been revised in order to delete the wording 'by derogation' and introduce it as an alternative.

comment *220* comment by: *FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation*

In the case of an aircraft is managed by a CAMO, the GIPAG France would like to know if it is confirmed that the intent of the proposal 2 is to forbid MP declaration by the owner.
Furthermore, it is unclear how the deviations from the MP declared by the owner shall be managed. The GIPAG France is asking for futher detail of this point.

response *Accepted*

Declaration by the owner is also possible when the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft is managed by a CAMO. See GM M.A.302(h).

comment *222* comment by: *AirService Mühldorf*

Pt.31) This is dangerous for the security.

Most aircraft owners have no training and experience in aircraft maintenance as well as they do not have the valid documentations. Also most of them are not able to read and understand technical manuals. How can they so make correct decissions for ther aircraft?

Development (Approval) must be done by professionals with all experiences and capabilities needed for this work.

Pt.33) As long as the aircraft owner has no contracted CAMO he is always fully responsible for the airworthiness of his aircraft, so the owner has to sign an approved maintenance programme.

Pt.34) A lot of owners can not realy estimate their own skills and capabilities. We can see this during our daily work on aircrafts where pilot/owner maintenance was done.

response *Partially accepted*

The current rule already allows the owner to completely manage the continuing airworthiness of his/her aircraft under his/her own responsibility. In addition, the option of self-declaration has been limited to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations and compensating measures have been introduced, as the review of the effectiveness of the maintenance programme at the time of the airworthiness review.

Furthermore, GM M.A.201(e) clearly reminds the owner to carefully self-assess his/her competence.

comment *325* comment by: *Andre Jansen*

Dies ist eine sehr gute Idee, die - wenn schon nicht auf das überflüssige Instandhaltungsprogramm an sich verzichtet werden kann - wenigstens den damit verbundenen bürokratischen Aufwand minimiert.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Man muß wohl daran erinnern, daß große Teile Europas in der "vor-EASA-Zeit" ein Instandhaltungsprogramm für Flugzeuge der nunmehr "ELA-1" getauften Kategorie überhaupt nicht kannten.
Da diese Teile Europas auch keine größere Unfallhäufigkeit aufwiesen als andere Länder und die Unfallhäufigkeit nach Einführung der Instandhaltungsprogramme auch nicht gesunken ist, kann man im Umkehrschluß wohl darauf schließen, daß - in dieser Kategorie von Flugzeugen - ein Instandhaltungsprogramm keinerlei Beitrag zur Flugsicherheit liefert.

Ein Verfahren, das also keinen Nutzen hat, aber einen großen Aufwand und Kosten verursacht (in Deutschland allein vermutlich einen 8-stelligen-EURO-Betrag), sollte am sinnvollsten abgeschafft werden.

Wenn das nicht geht, ist die Minimierung des bürokratischen Aufwands (die mit diesem Vorschlag erreicht werden kann) immerhin die zweitbeste Lösung.

response *Noted*

The Agency does not support the option of removing the maintenance programme for the following reasons:

— The maintenance programme is not just the maintenance schedule from the manufacturer but also contains information which is specific to the configuration and operation of the particular aircraft (see template in AMC M.A.302(e)).
— The objective of having a maintenance programme is to ensure that the owner (or a CAMO/maintenance organisation) have reviewed the maintenance required for the particular aircraft. This is essential in order to properly plan the maintenance.
— In addition, removing the maintenance programme requires a change to the Basic Regulation, which is outside the scope of this task.

comment *338* comment by: *European Sailplane Manufacturers*

The new option for self-declaration of the AMP by the pilot has been applauded by many persons and organisations having contact to the sailplane manufacturers and the manufacturers themselves.

Therefore this option to lessen the effort needed to get an approval for the AMP seems to be a workable solution.

Nevertheless in a phase 2 it still should be looked into the question if the AMP might be completely removed - at least for such cases where everything needed for the operator is already existing either in manuals supplied by the TC holder(s) and/or simple lists as supplied within this NPA.

In summary this proposal has already proven to be a very popular one.

response *Noted*

The Agency does not support the option of removing the maintenance programme for the cases that you describe. The reason is that the maintenance programme not only contains information from the Design Approval Holder but also information which is specific to the configuration and operation of the

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

particular aircraft (see template in AMC M.A.302(e)).

In addition, removing the maintenance programme requires a change to the Basic Regulation, which is outside the scope of this task.

A. Explanatory Note - IV. Content of the draft Opinion/Decision - b) Changes proposed for Phase I - Proposal 3 p. 12-14

comment *15* comment by: *John DAVIES*

Balloons are unique in the fact that many assemblies (cylinders, burners, baskets) can be easily exchanged between different envelopes. A gas cylinder for a single seat sport balloon is also eligible for fitting to a 17 occupant passenger balloon without modification. Due to this fact there has only ever been one technical inspection standard regardless of the intended use.
How does the agency intend to differentiate between major components inspected and released under the minimum inspection programme (which can only be used for ELA1 balloons not involved in commercial operations) and components released using manufacturers data for ELA2 balloons or ELA 1 balloons which are used in commercial operations.

response *Noted*

Components removed in a serviceable condition from an aircraft (in this case from a balloon) have to be issued an EASA Form 1 after they have been appropriately inspected before they can be installed on another aircraft (see AMC M.A.613(a) and AMC No2 to 145.A.50(d)).

This EASA Form 1 identifies the organisation which has issued it and, as a consequence, limits the aircraft where it can be installed.

comment *47* comment by: *Graham HALLETT*

There can be no objection to permitting the use of such non-approved maintenance programmes. However I do not believe that, in practice, any balloon owners (certainly in the UK) will make use of the minimum inspection programme. The manufacturers of all EASA balloons provide clear, detailed and straightforward maintenance schedules in their maintenance documentation. These will surely always be followed in preference to any minimum inspection programme and be used as the basis for the maintenance programme (either self declared or CAMO/MO/NAA approved).

response *Noted*

The Agency is glad that balloon manufacturers provide such clear instructions. Certainly, balloon owners can use them as long as they are not less restrictive than the MIP.

comment *60* comment by: *John DAVIES*

All balloons certified to EASA Certification Specification CS31HB have to be provided with, as part of the ICA, "a maintenance schedule against which the balloon **must** be inspected and maintained" (CS 31HB.82 (d) (5)).
The reference for this schedule is included in the Type Certificate Data Sheet.
Adoption of the Minimum Inspection Programme in place of the prescribed ICA

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	on the TCDS will invalidate the Certificate of Airworthiness as the balloon will not be in compliance with the Type Certificate?
response	*Accepted* M.A.302(h)3 has been amended to require the introduction in the maintenance programme of all specific maintenance requirements contained in the TCDS.

comment	*67* comment by: *BCAA - G. Pierlot* **PAGE / POINT / PARAGRAPH / SECTION OUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:** **Point 38:** the option to use the new 'Minimum Inspection Programmes' contained in Appendix IX to Part-M as the basis to create the aircraft maintenance programme for a specific aircraft registration. **Point 63:** Clarify which is the applicable maintenance data (of the Design Approval Holder) which has to be considered for the development of the maintenance programme. (Proposition for Phase II) **PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:** Postpone the possibility to use the MIP to phase II in order to clarify the content of this option (Cf. Point 63 - Proposition for Phase II - MDM.056) **RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION FOR THE COMMENT:** Except for the responsibilities of each stakeholders, the difference between both AMP types (AMP based on the schedule from the DAH and AMP based on the MIP) is not clear. As explained in point 63, the applicable maintenance data to be incorporated in the AMP have not yet been accurately defined. If the stakeholders do not know what consider as maintenance data for the incorporation in the AMP, how can they customize a "baseline program" with undefined data / limits? In particular, many general aviation aircraft are certified following CAR3 / early FAR23 and include in their maintenance manual only "recommendations" from the DAH. Therefore, a "DAH based" AMP could be alleviated in such a way that it can induce a lighter airworthiness status than a "MIP based" AMP customized with DAH recommendations. The lower limit of an acceptable maintenance programme has to be clearly defined : is it the real purpose of the MIP? This new proposition raises too many basic questions (What is the difference in the content between both type of AMP?) which could have a significant impact on proposal 5. This lack of clarity will not help the standardization and the understanding of the stakeholders. As a consequence, the content is not mature enough and has to be clarified before being incorporated in the hard law.
response	*Partially accepted* The Agency does not agree with postponing the introduction of a MIP. Although there is a current rulemaking task (MDM.056) dealing with Instructions for Continuing Airworthiness, it may take too long until any amendments to the rule are adopted. M.A.302(h) has been amended in order to require that the maintenance programme is not less restrictive than the MIP.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

comment	*96* comment by: *Konekorhonen Oy 145-org. and G-org.* Mielestämme ”minimum inspection programmen” käyttöä tulisi rajoittaa NPA:ssa esitetystä siten, että sitä voisi käyttää ainoastaan ELA1 ilma-aluksille joita ei käytetä ansiolentotoimintaan ja joille tyyppisertifikaatin haltija ei ole julkaissut huolto-ohjeita. Jos TC haltija on julkaissut ohjeet, niitä tulisi noudattaa. Tämä olisi mielestämme selkeämpää.
response	*Noted* Please note that even if the MIP is used, other recommendations from the Design Approval Holder have to be, at least, considered (see fields 5, 10, and 13 of the template in AMC M.A.302(e)).

comment	*111* comment by: *CAA-NL* Proposal 3 We wonder what the benefit for the aircraft owner of the Minimum Inspection Program is when he/she has to consider the following items from the maintenance data: · - specific inspections contained in the maintenance data of the Design Approval Holder with intervals different from 100 and/or annual (see ‘field 5’ of the template) · - other specific maintenance recommendations (see ‘field 10’ of the template). · - additional inspections required by the Design Approval Holder for high utilisation aircraft (see ‘field 13’ of the template)
response	*Noted* M.A.302(h) has been amended to require that the maintenance programme is not less restrictive than the MIP. The benefit is that everybody knows which is the minimum requirement. For everything else, the owner, under his/her responsibility, can introduce deviations.

comment	*195* comment by: *SVFB/SAMA* 13/129 Proposal 3, is supported, but.. Para 38: **or rather** we do not see why the Part M/F organisation cannot maintain any aircraft in commercial operation in group **2 and 3 as well.** This restriction in fact eliminates the possibility to organise SME MRO’s within the lighter structures of Part M/F.
response	*Noted* The Subpart F maintenance organisations, even with the existing rules, can maintain any aircraft in groups 2 and 3 even if they are involved in commercial operations (other than commercial air transport). However, a maintenance organisation is not qualified to manage the continuing airworthiness of aircraft, since the requirements to obtain a maintenance organisation approval do not include procedures related to continuing airworthiness management.

comment	*215* comment by: *DGAC France*

Proposal 3 – MIP
Reference to maintenance instructions
A note has been included in the MIP to clarify that the manufacturers' maintenance manuals must be used when accomplishing the "specific" maintenance instructions. There is an ambiguity on what the term "specific" refers to. It should be obvious that when an item in the MIP refers to something developed in the manufacturer's maintenance manual, all the actions indicated in this MM must be taken in the MIP.
Tolerances defined in the MIP
DGAC France feels like there should also be a tolerance for the calendar interval (proposal: 1 month) to match with the 10% tolerance for the 100h interval.
Detailed content of the MIP
Aeroplanes
AIRFRAME
- Add: "Whilst checking composite structures check for signs of impact or pressure damage that may indicate underlying damage.
- Tow hooks: Add "Check service life, carry out operational test"
- Add a line for pitot / static system: Inspect for security, damage, cleanliness, and condition. Drain any water from condensate drains.
- Add a line for Fuselage structure: Check frames, formers, tubular structure, braces, skin and attachments. Inspect for signs of corrosion.
CABIN & COCKPIT
- Seat and safety belt: Add "harnesses" and Check service life (if applicable)
- Instrument panel assemblies: Add "Check markings of instruments in accordance with flight manual"
LANDING GEAR
- Shock absorbing devices: Add "inspect for wear and deformation of rubber pads, bungees, and springs"
- Hydraulic lines: Add: Check service life (if applicable)
- Brakes: Add: carry out operational test
WING & CENTER SECTION
- Connections: Add "and lack of safetying"
Add a section for FLIGHT CONTROLS
- Add a line for "control circuit /stops ": Inspect control rods and cables. Check that control stops are contacting and secure.
- Add a line for "control surfaces ": Inspect aileron, flap, elevator; air brake and rudder assemblies, hinges, control connections, springs/bungees, tapes and seals. Check full range of movement and free play
- Add a line for "trim systems": Inspect trim surfaces, controls and connections. Check full range of movement.
AVIONICS & ELECTRICS
- Batteries: Add "and spillage and corrosion"
- Radio & electronic equipment: Add "Carry out ground function test"
- Wiring & conduits: Add "and chafing and wear of insulation"
POWERPLANT
- Studs and nuts: Replace "improper torque" by "looseness and signs of rotation"
- Cowling: Add: "Check cooling flaps if installed".
- Add line for fuel tanks: inspect for improper installation and connection
- Complete "inspect for cylinder compression" with "and record measures for each cylinder"
Comment: When asking to "inspect for improper internal condition and improper internal tolerances", the mechanic has to dismantle the cylinder and perform a measurement. Should these operations be authorised to licensed mechanic or rating Ax organisation?

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	PROPELLER - Propeller bolts: Add "looseness, signs of rotation" Sailplanes and powered sailplanes: CABIN & COCKPIT - Instrument panel assemblies: Add "Check markings of instruments in accordance with flight manual" Balloons: GENERAL - Markings: Remove "side and under-wing"
response	*Accepted*

comment	*230* comment by: *FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation* Each airplane has different specific features and variances. Due to this fact, the GIPAG France do not agree that a given aircraft MP can solely comply with a generic "Minimum Inspection Programme" (as described in appendix IX to Part-M in the NPA). Any MP, even simplified has to comply with the one and only relevant MP which is the "Manufacturer MP". The MP should have as reference the only and unique reference of M.A.302 (d) and (e) as following: *"(d) The aircraft maintenance programme must establish compliance with:* *(i) instructions issued by the competent authority;* *(ii) instructions for continuing airworthiness:* *• issued by the holders of the type certificate, restricted type-certificate, supplemental type-certificate, major repair design approval, ETSO authorisation or any other relevant approval issued under Regulation (EC) No 1702/2003 and its Annex (Part-21), and* *• included in the certification specifications referred to in point 21A.90B or 21A.431B of the Annex (Part-21) to Regulation (EC) No 1702/2003, if applicable;* *(iii) additional or alternative instructions proposed by the owner or the continuing airworthiness management organisation once approved in accordance with point M.A.302, except for intervals of safety related tasks referred in paragraph (e), which may be escalated, subject to sufficient reviews carried out in accordance with paragraph (g) and only when subject to direct approval in accordance with point M.A.302(b).* *(e) The aircraft maintenance programme shall contain details, including frequency, of all maintenance to be carried out, including any specific tasks linked to the type and the specificity of operations"*
response	*Not accepted* One of the objectives of the task was to define which is the minimum level for the maintenance programme, and that is why the MIP was introduced. Nevertheless, the recommendations from the Design Approval Holder still need to be considered (although they owner may deviate from them under his/her own responsibility).

comment	*326* comment by: *Andre Jansen* Es gilt für diesen Vorschlag das selbige wie für den vorigen Abschnitt: Wenn der konsequente Schritt (nämlich Instandhaltungsprogramme komplett abzuschaffen) zur Zeit nicht gangbar ist, dann ist jede Vereinfachung des Verfahrens ein Gewinn.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Dies "Minimum Inspection Programme" ist daher sinnvoll.

Wichtig ist, daß möglichst viele Anforderungen durch einfache Verweise auf andere Dokumente (wie Flug- und Betriebshandbücher) abgedeckt werden können.
Denn niemand hat etwas davon, wenn für zehntausende von Flugzeugen die immer gleichen Texte zusammenkopiert werden. Unnötige Arbeit und Verschwendung von Zeit und Material (dieser Text wurde zu 100% mit wiederverwendeten Elektronen gedruckt....)

response *Noted*

The Agency does not support the option of removing the maintenance programme for the following reasons:

— The maintenance programme is not just the maintenance schedule from the manufacturer but also contains information which is specific to the configuration and operation of the particular aircraft (see template in AMC M.A.302(e)).
— The objective of having a maintenance programme is to ensure that the owner (or a CAMO/maintenance organisation) has reviewed the maintenance required for the particular aircraft. This is essential in order to properly plan the maintenance.
— In addition, removing the maintenance programme requires a change to the Basic Regulation, which is outside the scope of this task.
— Please note that working by reference to particular documents (including Revision level) is possible. (See field 5 in the template contained in AMC M.A.302(e))

comment *339* comment by: *European Sailplane Manufacturers*

The minimum inspection programmes are perceived by many people as a useful tool for the owners and the persons involved in writing an AMP.
One question asked repeatedly was, if it could be better to have this lists in the AMC material instead of the proposed Appendix to the rule.

The disadvantage of AMC would be a possible discussion between owners and NAAs as some NAA do not accept AMC (also coupled with the language problem of the English-only AMC).

But the big advantage would be more flexibility to adapt these lists to new technologies (e.g. other propulsion systems) and to avoid the often sub-optimal translation efforts at EU level for the texts of the regulations into other languages.

This AMC versus Appendix question should be considered when going through the comments of this NPA.

response *Accepted*

Competent authorities cannot reject the use of the published AMCs (see Article 8 'Agency Measures' of Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003).

M.A.302(i) has been added to introduce the requirements to be met by the MIP, and the tables with the particular MIPs have been transferred to AMC

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

M.A.302(i).

A. Explanatory Note - IV. Content of the draft Opinion/Decision - b) Changes proposed for Phase I - Proposal 4 p. 14-17

comment

21 comment by: *BPvL e. V.*

The BPvL supports the introduction of a template for a customized maintenance programme as it covers all requirements for a complete maintenance programme.
As a consequence of our rejection of proposal #2 all entries about maintenance programme declared by owners should be removed.
Pt.44) The BPvL hopes that everybody realizes that the responsibility of the owner not only covers his life and health but also the life and health of every other pilot or passenger flying in his aircraft which is possibly not maintained in accordance to TC holders recommendations and therefore not airworthy.
We are wondering how the insurance companies will react about the new situation.
And everything has only one reason: **money**

response

Partially accepted

The current rule already allows the owner to completely manage the continuing airworthiness of his/her aircraft under his/her own responsibility. In addition, the option of self-declaration has been limited to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations and compensating measures have been introduced, as the review of the effectiveness of the maintenance programme at the time of the airworthiness review.

Furthermore, GM M.A.201(e) clearly reminds the owner to carefully self-assess his/her competence.

comment

48 comment by: *Graham HALLETT*

The use of template maintenance programmes is welcomed.

In particular, this should remove the existing problem of some NAAs not accepting maintenance programmes for simple aircraft such as balloons, without insisting on unnecessary detail more suited to large CAT aircraft.

response

Noted

The Agency thanks for the feedback.

comment

57 comment by: *Klemens*

Remove option: ... maintenance programme declared by owner. He is not competently.

response

Partially accepted

The current rule already allows the owner to completely manage the continuing airworthiness of his/her aircraft under his/her own responsibility. In addition, the option of self-declaration has been limited to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations and compensating measures have been introduced, as

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

the review of the effectiveness of the maintenance programme at the time of the airworthiness review.

Furthermore, GM M.A.201(e) clearly reminds the owner to carefully self-assess his/her competence.

comment *69* comment by: *BCAA - G. Pierlot*

PAGE / POINT / PARAGRAPH / SECTION OUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

Point 41: In order to solve this significant standardization problem and to help stakeholders when creating an individual maintenance programme for a particular aircraft registration, it is proposed to create a standardized maintenance programme template, which was supported by all members of the Task Force.

PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

Require to use the AMP template and add a deadline in the hard law (Either with the next revision or with a specific date).

RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION FOR THE COMMENT:

The template itself is a good point to standardize the AMP. However, how shall the NAA and the approved organisations deal with the existing AMP?
In order to limit the unfair competition across Europe in the future, the new template should be used as soon as possible by all Member States.

response *Not accepted*

The Agency does not support making mandatory the use of the template for the maintenance programme. Nevertheless, the opinion of the Agency is that most owners will prefer to use the template since it already implies compliance with the rule.

Regarding the existing maintenance programmes, they are grandfathered as indicated in Article 3 of Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003.

comment *105* comment by: *British Gliding Association*

British Gliding Association
Proposal 4
It does not state in AMC M.A.302 (e) what is to be done with the maintenance programme template used for the maintenance programme including a minimum inspection programme once completed and declared by the owner.
Suggest:
The completed template should reside with the owner and a copy with the organisation that is carrying out the airworthiness review; 145, CAMO or subpart F maintenance organisation as part of the airworthiness review records. A new version of the template should be retained if it is amended.
Rationale;
As there is no duty for the competent authority to approve or audit the owner declared maintenance programme that includes minimum inspection programme there is no reason to provide a copy of the template to the competent authority. However during the airworthiness review the airworthiness review staff have a responsibility to review the effectiveness of the maintenance programme the template should be available to them.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

response | *Noted*

The completed template is the actual maintenance programme. Any organisation performing continuing airworthiness management activities or airworthiness reviews has to have access to such a maintenance programme in order to complete their job. The same is applicable to the competent authority when it performs airworthiness reviews and ACAM inspections.

Please see GM M.A.302(h) for more guidance.

comment | *106* comment by: *British Gliding Association*

British Gliding Association
Proposal 5
Subpart F maintenance organisation staff who also hold subpart G CAMO, M.A.707 airworthiness review staff approval should automatically be deemed approved under M.A.901 as subpart F airworthiness review staff.
Suggest advice to competent authorities that if a CAMO airworthiness review staff authorisation is held (M.A.707) the person is also authorised under subpart F airworthiness review staff for the same organisation without the requirement to submit another Form 4.
Rationale;
CAMO airworthiness review staff in general aviation organisations are almost always the same persons authorised under subpart F maintenance organisation and it would save a huge amount of work re-approving airworthiness review staff for the competent authority and the maintenance organisation.

response | *Not accepted*

It is not possible to introduce it as a general rule because in some cases the airworthiness review staff of the CAMO does not hold a certifying staff authorisation for the applicable aircraft, which means they cannot be nominated airworthiness review staff of the Subpart F organisation. In any case, if they are the same organisation, the airworthiness review can always be performed by the CAMO.

comment | *145* comment by: *UK CAA*

Page No: 17
Paragraph No: 44, top of page 17
Comment:
The text refers to the owner taking full responsibility for any deviations from the recommendations issued by the design approval holder that the owner decides to introduce in the maintenance programme, however this implies that they will include them, although different to the design holders data.
It should be clear that when an aircraft owner decides to deviate from the recommendations issued by the design approval holder, that decision 'should be recorded in the maintenance programme.'
Justification: Clarity.

response | *Noted*

It is already described in the template in AMC M.A.302(e) (see field 10 and Table 2).

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

comment	*194* comment by: *SVFB/SAMA* 17/129 Proposal 5 " Applicable to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations. this should be extended to ELA2 aircraft. We think the regulation and if needed even the basic regulation should be changed in such a manner that all aircraft up to and including group 3 aircraft, and even up to 5.7t, whether they are operated commercial or not, could be maintained by Part M/F organisations. Otherwise, 98% of all SME MRO's are forced under the complex structures of 145 who are not adapted to SME/MRO's. http://www.lsze.ch/images/content/Bilder/Adi_600.JPG It makes no sense, if a small organisation like this one have to have all the structures and process of a 145.
response	*Not accepted* All the aircraft that you describe can already be maintained by Subpart F organisations. In any case, please note that Proposal 5 is not related to maintenance but to airworthiness reviews. In Phase II, it will be analysed whether this option is extended to other aircraft.

comment	*196* comment by: *SVFB/SAMA* The economical effect of the NPA to the aviation community will not so much depend on the well intended NPA but more on the fact that by the present ongoing tendency to declare most flying activities as CAT or commercial, most Small and Medium Enterprises (SME) MRO's must have a Part 145 approval. For example when being a MRO for sightseeing flights or towing operations. This tendency makes most of the eventual alleviations useless for most SME-MRO's and puts all such SME MRO's under the heavy 145 regulation, originally designed rightly for Public Air Transport and requires them to install the heavy structures and processes not adapted to size of operations and risks potential. This is not the promised performance based regulation. The interpretation that CAT is a subset of Commercial operations is an indication of a wrong hierarchy from the start.
response	*Noted* The term 'commercial operation' is defined in Article 3 of the Basic Regulation and cannot be altered through a lower ranking implementing rule. Furthermore, the Agency is not entitled to issue AMC/GM material for provisions of the Basic Regulation. Nevertheless, the Agency acknowledges the paper issued by the European General Aviation Safety Strategy group and the actions recommended in this paper. In particular, action A.1 invites Member States to provide their feedback on the activities which they do not classify as commercial operations in their current system, and the Agency and the Commission to consider proposing changes to the definition in the Basic Regulation following such a feedback.

comment	*216* comment by: *DGAC France* **Proposal 4 – Template of MP (AMC M.A.302(e))**

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Identification of deviations to the applicable data
Table 2 shall not be limited to the tasks referenced in field 10 but should cover any other applicable task (except ALS and ADs).
Authority requirements
There is no field to identify Authority requirements identified in M.A.302 (i).
Use of the template when the MIP is used as a reference
It is not clear how the template should be used when the MIP is used as a reference:
- Records of differences between the manufacturer programme and the MIP?
- Records of potential additional tasks (field 5?)?
Tolerances
It would be useful to identify a field for definition/use of tolerances.
Customisation of MP to aircraft definition
To what level of detail should the customisation of the MP to the aircraft definition be handled and how should it be managed via the template? (***Options included in the manufacturer programme*** depending on the definition of the aircraft, i.e. modifications installed/options related to equipment installed).
Applicability of template
The possibility to extend applicability of the template to complex motor powered aircraft should be studied (in particular, when the aircraft is managed by a CAMO, the organisation has procedures and systems to manage the detailed customisation of MP and scheduling of tasks).

response *Partially accepted*

Identification of deviations to the applicable data

Your proposal has been accepted.

Authority requirements

The only authority requirements which can be introduced are 'national operational and airspace' directives/requirements which have not been superseded by European rules (see field 11 of the template).

Use of the template when the MIP is used for reference

This is covered by fields 10 and 13.

Tolerances:

Customisation of MP to aircraft definition

The level of customisation of the MP will be decided by the owner/operator.

Applicability of the template

Extending the use of the template to complex motor-powered aircraft is outside the Terms of Reference of the task.

comment *227* comment by: *FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation*

The GIPAG France agrees with and supports this proposal.
The current format of the aircraft MP has inflated in too high proportions. The GIPAG France asks the format for the aircraft MP to be revised and deflated. A lighter format seems to be more appropriate and is welcome.
To that extract, the GIPAG France suggests:
- To suppress sections 1 to 6. This would avoid documentary burden and allow to concentrate on safety task.
- To add a field to identify Authority requirements;
- The possibility to extend applicability of the template to complex motor powered aircraft. This option should be studied (in particular, when the aircraft

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	is managed by a CAMO, the organisation has procedures and systems to manage the detailed customisation of MP and scheduling of tasks); - A customisation of MP to aircraft definition.
response	*Partially accepted* The Agency does not agree with suppressing the fields 1 to 6 of the template. This is essential information to identify the owner and the aircraft. There is already a field (field 11) for 'national operational and airspace directives/requirements which have not been superseded by European rules'. No other national requirements can be introduced. Extending the use of the template to complex motor-powered aircraft is outside the Terms of Reference of this task. Regarding the level of customisation of the MP, it will be decided by the owner/operator.

comment	*327* comment by: *Andre Jansen* Im Prinzip die gleiche Anmerkung: Eine Vorlage die hundert- oder gar tausendfach Zeit bei der Erstellung sparen hilft und die andere Dokumente durch einfache Verweise statt rezitieren einbindet ist grundsätzlich sinnvoll und sollte eingeführt werden.
response	*Noted*

comment	*340* comment by: *European Sailplane Manufacturers* A common AMP template is much appreciated by many stakeholders. Therefore, this proposal seems to be well-taken by all persons offering comments.
response	*Noted*

A. Explanatory Note - IV. Content of the draft Opinion/Decision - b) Changes proposed for Phase I - Proposal 5 p. 17-21

comment	*6* comment by: *Ian HEY* The proposal that the ARC may be issued by the Maintenance organisation (Part 145 or M.A. Subpart F) is welcomed. Para 55 states that the person carrying out the airworthiness review is either independent from the continuing airworthiness management process of the aircraft being reviewed, or has overall authority in such process for the complete aircraft. In the case that the owner writes the maintenance programme then the owner has overall authority for continuing airworthiness management, and if suitably qualified and authorised by a Subpart F organisation, may therefore sign both annual inspection release and ARC. Please confirm.
response	*Not accepted* The owner cannot be authorised by the subpart F maintenance organisation

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

unless he/she is employed by this organisation. In addition, he/she must meet all the requirements for airworthiness review staff and certifying staff. Finally, he/she would be signing the annual inspection and the ARC on behalf of the Subpart F organisation.

comment *22* comment by: *BPvL e. V.*

The BPvL supports this proposal because professional mechanics and engineers are involved. This system works fine for many years in Germany before EASA. This will lead in safety with acceptable costs.

response *Noted*

comment *41* comment by: *anthony wellings*

Sir
I would like to make a comment regarding NPA 2012-17 Proposal 5. Proposal 5 is a welcome improvement to the present regulation but is no benefit to my situation.
I operate an ELA 1 non-commercial aircraft, the maintenance of which is performed by an independent certifying staff and I as the owner manage the continuing airworthiness. Because of the extremely high charges imposed by the competent authority I have no alternative but to contract a CAMO in order to perform an airworthiness review and issue an ARC.
My situation is indeed summed up by your document (NAP 2012-17) paragraphs 45 through 48 page 17. Hence it was a surprise that proposal 5 does not include the possibility for the airworthiness review and issue of the corresponding ARC to be performed by an independent certifying staff given all other conditions met.
Furthermore paragraph 54 page 18 does allow a CAMO staff member to perform the airworthiness review, issue the ARC, and perform the annual inspection but only if the person is qualified and acts as an independent certifying staff.
A quote from paragraph 55 Page 19 is as follows:-
"Regarding the alleged lack of independence due to the fact that the person performing the airworthiness review is also releasing maintenance, the Agency believes that in the case of ELA1 not involved in commercial operations the possibility for a conflict of interest is much lower due to the fact that the maintenance performed by this person is the annual inspection, which is a maintenance event covering the full aircraft. As a consequence, it can be regarded as if the person releasing the annual inspection (and performing the airworthiness review) had overall authority on the proper performance of maintenance on such aircraft."
I see no reason, given the above agency view, why the privileges extended to maintenance organizations regarding airworthiness reviews and ARC issue cannot also be granted to independent certifying staff.
The current legislation allows independent certifying staff, that do not belong to an organization, to carry out maintenance on these aircraft. This is as it should be, after all the person is qualified, licensed and approved. If proposal 5 is not modified this same person is unable to perform an airworthiness review and issue the ARC. These amendments, I understand, were supposed to be driven on 'risk basis'. Undoubtedly continuing airworthiness and reviews are a vital and important part of an aircraft's overall maintenance, but, given the aircraft inspection part of the review is carried out during an annual, the rest is an

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

assessment and largely a paperwork task. It is my view that there is a far greater risk in the actual aircraft maintenance than there is in the assessment and paperwork task, yet the paperwork function requires the person to be part of an organization.
If the problem is that an independent certifying staff does not belong to an organization that is audited by the competent authority, could it not be that if he/she wished to perform an airworthiness review and issue a subsequent ARC on an ELA1 non-commercial aircraft on which he/she has carried out a satisfactory annual inspection, could be allowed to seek clearance on an aircraft by aircraft basis from the competent authority or in some other way be audited.
Can I therefore propose that proposal 5 is amended to include independent certifying staff and that MA901 paragraph (g) is amended accordingly?
Regards A. P. Wellings

response

Noted

The possibility for independent certifying staff to issue the ARC will be analysed in Phase II of the task. It was not done in Phase I because how the qualification of this person (in relation to the airworthiness review) would be controlled since he/she does not work for a maintenance organisation has to be carefully discussed.

Please note that the independent certifying staff are allowed to release maintenance because they are licensed (or equivalent). However, there is no licence (or equivalent) to perform airworthiness reviews and somebody has to control the qualification.

In the case of a person working for a CAMO/maintenance organisation, this qualification is controlled by the organisation. In this case, this person can be also independent certifying staff or work for a Subpart F maintenance organisation.

comment

50 comment by: *Graham HALLETT*

There can be no objection to any such alleviation permitting a subpart F organisation to issue an ARC; but, insofar as this relates to balloon operations, particulalry as seen from the UK viewpoint, this proposal is of limited use and does not correct what is considered to be the issue it was trying to address.

Most organisations dealing with balloon airworthiness are both subpart F and G organisations, so there is no apparent benefit here. The proposal is only for aircraft using a self declared minimum inspection programme, so owners will be forced down this route (with the consequent extra burden on the subpart F in checking this programme) to make use of this alleviation.

The real issue, which I understood the Part M taskforce was trying to address, is that of allowing the same person to carry out the review and issue the ARC at the same time as performing the annual inspection and issuing the aircraft CRS, without being constrained by unnecessary, impractical and illogical requirements for independence. These constraints can be circumvented by judicious allocation of authority responsibility, but this should not be neccessary.

The arguments which EASA gives for permitting the perceived lack of independence in this case for ELA1 non commercial aircraft, would apply equally well to all balloons in all tyes of operations. Para 55, 3rd bullet point, refers to the fact that the maintenance performed is the annual inspection and

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

consequently asserts that the person performing that inspection and the airworthiness review had overall authority (and hence removes the conflict of interest). This would apply equally to an individual who is able to operate as a subpart F CRS signatory and a subpart G ARC signatory for a joint F/G organisation. In which case a clarification in the AMC M.A.707(a) specifying that personnel carrying out an annual inspection of the complete aircraft at the same time as performing an airworthiness review meet the requirements for overall authority on the aircraft should be made.

response *Partially accepted*

The rule has been amended to allow the airworthiness review by a Subpart F organisation regardless of whether the maintenance programme is based or not on the MIP and regardless of whether the maintenance programme is self-declared or approved by the NAA.

The reason why the provision has been limited to ELA1 aircraft not used in commercial operations during Phase I is to avoid the need for a significant regulatory impact assessment which would delay the implementation of these urgent provisions. For this category of aircraft and operation, the associated risks and liabilities are lower.

During Phase II of the task it will be analysed other options.

For ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, the paragraph M.A.901(l) can be used by the CAMO. In particular, paragraph M.A.901(l)1(c) requires independence from the continuing airworthiness management process or having overall authority. If the person does not manage the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft, this person is already independent. As a consequence, he/she can perform the airworthiness review if he/she is also certifying staff (whether he/she is independent certifying staff or certifying staff of a Subpart F organisation).

comment *71* comment by: *BCAA - G. Pierlot*

PAGE / POINT / PARAGRAPH / SECTION OUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:

Point 51 – second bullet :
Obligation to perform the airworthiness review at the same time as the annual inspection contained in the 'Minimum Inspection Programme' and by the same person releasing the annual inspection;

PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:
M.A.901(l): For ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, the Part-145 or M.A. Subpart F maintenance organisation performing the annual inspection contained in the Appendix IX 'Minimum Inspection Programme' **or in the approved maintenance programme** may, if appropriately approved, perform the airworthiness review and issue the corresponding airworthiness review certificate, subject to the following conditions: (…)

RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION FOR THE COMMENT:

The explanations in the NPA indicate that the issuance of the ARC Form 15C has to be combined with the overall authority on the continuing airworthiness management process of the aircraft being reviewed.
For which reason should the issuance of the ARC Form 15C should be limited to a MIP based AMP? An AMP based on DAH maintenance data has also

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	"annual/100h" maintenance schedules, and could therefore meet the criterion of the overall authority over the proper performance of annual maintenance.
response	*Accepted* AMC M.A.901(l) has been amended.

comment	*72* comment by: *BCAA - G. Pierlot* **PAGE / POINT / PARAGRAPH / SECTION OUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:** **Point 55:** Regarding this new privilege granted to maintenance organizations, there were some comments during the Task Force meetings on the supposed lack of independence between maintenance and airworthiness review activities. **Point 56:** In addition, there were also some discussions related to high utilization aircraft due to the possible implications for the date of performing the airworthiness reviews. **PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:** Clarify the "overall authority" criterion in the AMC 901(l). Include a provision to AMC for the competent authority / approved organizations to require a bridging check to come back to the ARC Form 15A/B system. **RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION FOR THE COMMENT:** Our concerns are related to the alleged lack of independence between the maintenance and airworthiness review. Is the "overall authority on the proper performance of maintenance" defined in the third bullet of point 56 satisfied when 2 different maintenance organisations are performing 2 different "100h" inspections a year and one of them perform the airworthiness review? If yes, what are the responsibilities of each organisations regarding the possible discrepancies during the airworthiness review? The AMC should at least cover a definition of the overall authority in such conditions. This lack of clarity will not help the understanding and the application of the rules. With all the alleviations (MIP, maintenance organisation performing the airworthiness review, etc.), the owner chooses a specific "degraded" system. In this case, is a sort of "bridging check" to transfer an aircraft between the ARC Form 15C system and the ARC Form 15 A/B systems foreseen? Is an aircraft flying more than 100h acceptable to this system? The maintenance / airworthiness conditions could be really different and the general condition of the aircraft can be "degraded" by choosing the ARC Form 15C system. The AMC should allow the NAA / approved organisations to organise a bridging check between two different systems.
response	*Partially accepted* The Agency believes that the term 'overall authority' is sufficiently clear in AMC M.A.901(l). Due to the limitation to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations and the fact that the airworthiness review staff is performing the airworthiness review and the full annual/100 hour inspection, we believe that it is enough with ensuring the independence from the continuing airworthiness management process (or the overall authority). Yes, it is acceptable that an aircraft flies more than 100 h per year in this

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

system (see field 13 on the template in AMC M.A.302(e)).

The Agency does not agree that having the airworthiness review performed by a maintenance organisation (EASA Form 15c) is 'degrading' the system. It has been limited to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations and the organisation must have procedures and qualified personnel.

comment *114* comment by: *CAA-NL*

Proposal 5
We do not see any arguments given to limit this proposal to aircraft whit a AMP based on the Minimum Inspection Program. The link to the issue of a declaration by the owner is given as a consequence and not a limiting argument. We would like to suggest to remove this limitation and make this option available to all ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operation, under the condition the AR is performed in combination with the 100hrs/annual inspection or similar depending on the maintenance data from the design approval holder. During the AR there shall be a check whether the maintenance program has been reviewed in accordance with M.A.710(h) and M.A.302(h)5, so we do not see any objection to limit this proposal to the Minimum inspection program.

response *Accepted*

The text has been changed to allow the airworthiness review by a maintenance organisation as long as it is combined with the annual inspection contained in the maintenance programme, regardless of whether it is based or not on the MIP and regardless of whether it is approved by the NAA or declared by the owner.

comment *116* comment by: *CAA-NL*

Proposal 5
We disagree with the proposal to not to require the AR-staff to perform an AR under supervision. The added value of the AR on top of just maintenance is within the control of the maintenance of the aircraft and this is just not the first expertise of a maintenance organisation but of the CAMO. If someone could skip the supervised review it would be the person within the CAMO.

response *Accepted*

An airworthiness review under supervision has been introduced.

comment *146* comment by: *UK CAA*

Page No: 18
Paragraph No: 50
Comment:
This paragraph proposes that an ELA1 aircraft that is not maintained using the MIP (i.e. following the TC holders recommendations), cannot have an ARC issued by a Part M Subpart F or Part 145 organisation performing the maintenance. It has not been adequately explained why this alleviation does not include aircraft where the owner has contracted the maintenance organisation to process approval of the AMP as specified in M.A.201(e).
Justification:

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

As the Subpart F or Part 145 organisation is processing approval of the AMP and carrying out the annual inspection, it would appear to be entirely logical that they could carry out the Airworthiness Review and issue the ARC. As the organisation would have greater experience of the programme than a MIP generated by an aircraft owner.
Proposed Text:
Amend paragraph M.A.901(l) to read:
"(l) For ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, the Part-145 or M.A. Subpart F maintenance organisation performing the annual inspection contained in **either**, the Appendix IX 'Minimum Inspection Programme' , **or a Maintenance Programme that the organisation has developed or approved**, may, if appropriately approved, perform the airworthiness review and issue the corresponding airworthiness review certificate, subject to the following conditions:"

response *Accepted*

The text has been changed to allow the airworthiness review by a maintenance organisation as long as it is combined with the annual inspection contained in the maintenance programme, regardless of whether it is based or not on the MIP and regardless of whether it is approved by the NAA or declared by the owner.

comment *147* comment by: *UK CAA*

Page No: 18
Paragraph No: 51
Comment:
For consistency the Subpart F or Part 145 organisation issuing the ARC should also include carrying out an initial Airworthiness Review under supervision as part of gaining the approval. It is a requirement for a Subpart G organisation or Licensed Engineer (on ELA1 aircraft).
Justification:
Consistency in regulation. CAMOs or LAE's carrying out ARCs on ELA1 aircraft may feel at a disadvantage.
Proposed Text:
Add new paragraph to M.A.901(l)1:
"(f) The formal acceptance of the nominated airworthiness review staff by the competent authority should only be granted after the satisfactory performance of an airworthiness review under the supervision of the competent authority."

response *Accepted*

An airworthiness review under supervision has been introduced.

comment *168* comment by: *KLM Engineering & Maintenance*

KLM Engineering & Maintenance does not agree with the proposal to add a field on Form 15a , 15b and 15c to record airframe flight hours. The validity of the ARC is based a.o. on this kind of utilisation data which is already provided to the authority in the accompanying airworthiness review report . It makes no sense to provide information twice.

response *Not accepted*

The rule only requires to send a copy of the airworthiness review to the State of

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Registry, not the full report. The full report is sent only when there is a recommendation. As a consequence, the authority does not receive this information on a regular basis.

comment *197* comment by: *SVFB/SAMA*

18/129 para 52 but if the part M/F or 145 is delegated to manage the CAW ? We think it should be possible by this same organisation. If he can fix it, he can also control it.
Para 54 : by all good intentions: we cannot see here a resulting simple legislation as it is required by EU . The part M gets more and more complex. Its not segmented. For major MRO'S much of the material already in part M is just a disturbance, because they are not affected. It's scatter or noise in the daily work. In turn, for the small ones, the whole M rulebook gets heavy, especially as 98% will have to work along Part M and Part 145.

response *Partially accepted*

The procedures and qualifications for maintenance are different from those required for continuing airworthiness management.

Phase II of this task will include the introduction of a simplified format for Part-M for light aircraft.

comment *208* comment by: *KLM Engineering & Maintenance*

Comment from KLM Engineering & Maintenance: Although we understand that the proposed addition of Airworthiness Review Requirements in Part 145 are all conditional on the basis of requested and obtained privileges and only concern non-commercial operation we are nonetheless of the opinion that these additional requirements present an unnecessary "clutter" in the text of the regulation and a continuous burden on all entities regulated by Part 145 which is not in the interest of safety.

response *Noted*

Although this provision is only applicable to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations and it will mostly affect Subpart-F maintenance organisations, there are also Part-145 organisations interested in providing these services.

comment *217* comment by: *DGAC France*

Proposal 5 – Possibility for a maintenance organisation to perform airworthiness review

Scope of the privileges and consistency with M.A.901 (g) privileges
- M.A.901 (g) authorised staff and maintenance organisation should not be authorised to perform airworthiness review for aircraft imported from third countries due to the complexity of such reviews. Therefore M.A.904(a)(2) shall be revised to specify the corresponding subparagraph of M.A.901
- M.A.901 (g) privileges currently limited to non CAT aircraft should be further limited to non commercial aircraft, like for maintenance organisation AR privileges.

Requirement to perform the AR during a MIP annual inspection

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	- The reason why it is mandatory to perform the AR at the same time an annual inspection is performed is not clear. - The reason why the privilege of performing AR is limited to the case where the MP is based on the MIP is not clear. Qualification requirements for the ARS (M.A.901 (l) and M.A.707 (f)) - Experience: Requiring 3 years of experience as certifying staff exclusively on ***ELA1 aircraft*** is too restrictive. The competency on ELA1 aircraft is ensured through the requirement to be a certifying staff on the corresponding aircraft, therefore it should be accepted that the additional 3 years experience could possibly have been acquired on other relevant categories. - Independence/overall authority: requiring independence or overall authority from the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft concerned may be too demanding for small organisations: o The mechanics will only have overall authority if he is the owner of the aircraft (for aircraft not managed by CAMOs) o The cases where the maintenance organisation performs airworthiness management tasks for the owner are frequent and independence is difficult to achieve within small organisations (example one man organisation) - An airworthiness review under supervision shall be requested. It is the only practical means to ensure the ARS has adequate understanding of Part M Airworthiness Management requirements and airworthiness review procedures. This supervised exam shall be performed by the Authority or delegated to the maintenance organisation as it is possible for CAMO. Note: If comments above are accepted, the only remaining alleviation of M.A.707(f) compared to M.A.707(a)(2) is that the experience in continuing airworthiness required by M.A.707(a)(2)(a) may be limited to CS experience with no airworthiness management experience provided the staff have acquired knowledge of the parts of Part M relevant to continuing airworthiness management. This could simply be described in an AMC to M.A.707 (a) (2). Requirements related to the airworthiness review New § M.A.901 (l) should refer more directly to M.A.710 requirements instead of partial copy/reference.
response	*Partially accepted* **Scope of privileges and consistency with M.A.901(g) privileges** These issues will be discussed during Phase II. **Requirement to perform the AR during the MIP annual inspection** This has been changed. It can be performed during the annual inspection of any maintenance programme and regardless of whether it is approved by the NAA or declared by the owner. **Qualification requirements for the ARS** The proposal has been amended to require 3 years of experience as certifying staff (but not on ELA1 aircraft). Please note that when a maintenance organisation is performing continuing airworthiness management tasks for an owner, this can only happen under the full responsibility of the owner (the maintenance organisation does not have privileges for continuing airworthiness management). As a consequence, they are independent of the continuing airworthiness management process. An airworthiness review under supervision has been included. **Requirements related to the airworthiness review**

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

The Agency decided not to make reference to M.A.710 because certain paragraphs were too stringent for this category of aircraft. As a consequence, the Agency preferred to directly list in M.A.901(l) the applicable requirements.

comment *328* comment by: *Andre Jansen*

Grundsätzlich sinnvoll.

Es ist bei kleinen Flugzeugen sowieso häufig gängige Praxis das ein und dieselbe physikalische Organisation diese Tätigkeiten parallel (oder "seriell") durchführt.
Häufig ja sogar ein und dieselbe Person.

Die Trennung in einen Teil-MF- und einen "anderen" Teil-MG-Betrieb sieht da häufig recht "bürokratisch bemüht" aus.
Um das zu verstehen muß man sich nur ansehen wieviel lizenziertes Personal kleine Luftfahrttechnische Betriebe so im Durchschnitt beschäftigen.
Es würde mich nicht wundern, wenn dort eine 1 vor dem Komma steht.....

response *Noted*

During Phase II, the possibility to have a combined Subpart G and Subpart F approval will be analysed.

comment *341* comment by: *European Sailplane Manufacturers*

The simplified possibility to issue the ARC seems to be a good solution - especially for the rather simple aircraft like sailplanes and balloons.
The coupling to the physical inspection as been applauded by many commenters.

response *Noted*

A. Explanatory Note - IV. Content of the draft Opinion/Decision - b) Changes proposed for Phase I - Proposal 6 p. 21

comment *23* comment by: *BPvL e. V.*

The BPvL supports this proposal as it shows the real life.

response *Noted*

comment *73* comment by: *BCAA - G. Pierlot*

Please, note that the first proposal is acceptable for the Belgian CAA.

response *Noted*

comment *107* comment by: *British Gliding Association*

British Gliding Association
Proposal 6
The BGA fully support this proposal

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

response | *Noted*

comment | *218* comment by: *DGAC France*

Proposal 6 – Facility requirements – Need of a hangar

The terms "alternative suitable facilities" are not so clear. In particular, does it include outdoor activities?
The reference to "remote location" is also not clear and in any case does not seem related to the concept of alternate facilities.
For maintenance operations that can be performed outside a hangar, the possibility to perform these operations at a location not listed on the Part M/F certificate, including on a regular basis, should be introduced, subject to an appropriate procedure in the exposition. M.A.615(c) would therefore need to be revised.
This would allow Part M/F organisations to be in a position to offer a reactive answer to their customers like their independent certifying staff competitors.
The maintenance Organisational Manual should detail the criteria to select such places that the organisation shall consider suitable, and the limits when it is not suitable based on the work to be performed.

response | *Accepted*

See new GM M.A.615(a) and amended AMC M.A.605(a).

comment | *226* comment by: *FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation*

In the AMC M.A.605(a) 1. refers to "alternative suitable facilities". It is unclear whether the alternative suitable facilities include outdoor activities. To that extend, the GIPAG France requests:
- That the suitability of such a facility shall be defined by the organisation on its own.
- For maintenance operations that can be performed outside a hangar, the possibility to perform these operations at a location not listed on the Part M/F certificate, including on a regular basis, should be introduced, subject to an appropriate procedure in the exposition. M.A.615(c) would therefore need to be revised.
This would allow Part M/F organisations to be in a position to offer a reactive answer to their customers like their independent certifying staff competitors.

response | *Accepted*

See new GM M.A.615(a) and amended AMC M.A.605(a).

comment | *329* comment by: *Andre Jansen*

Das sollte eigentlich von vornherein selbstverständlich sein.

Um z.B. das Sitzpolster zusammenzunähen benötigt man (vielleicht) eine Nähmaschine, aber keine Halle.
(OK, das ist jetzt polemisch.)

response | *Noted*

comment | *342* comment by: *European Sailplane Manufacturers*

	Many maintenance tasks are possible to be done outside on the airfiled (good weather permitting) and accordingly many positive comments where received for this proposal. Even more so as the privilege to release even complex maintenance tasks by regarding Part-66 personnel outside a maintenance organisation is also not coupled to a defined hangar space. This added flexibilty for maintenance organisations is appreciated.
response	*Noted*

A. Explanatory Note - IV. Content of the draft Opinion/Decision - b) Changes proposed for Phase I - Proposal 7 p. 21-22

comment	*74* comment by: *BCAA - G. Pierlot* Please, note that the first proposal is acceptable for the Belgian CAA.
response	*Noted*

comment	*108* comment by: *British Gliding Association* British Gliding Association Proposal 7 The BGA fully support this proposal.
response	*Noted*

comment	*117* comment by: *CAA-NL* Proposal 7 We would suggest with the current proposals to include this or similar guidance also for the maintenance organisations, there exists also the possibility to include new type ratings within their scope of work under an indirect approval procedure.
response	*Partially accepted* See AMC M.B.603

comment	*219* comment by: *DGAC France* **Proposal 7 – Indirect approval of CAMO to introduce new ratings** DGAC France suggests extending this possibility to the Part M/F organisation scope of approval for ELA2 aircraft (scope on the certificate limited to the scope covered by the licence(s) of the Certifying Staff).
response	*Partially accepted* See AMC M.B.603

comment	*231* comment by: *FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation*

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	The GIPAG France agrees with the guidance related to the use of the indirect approval procedure by a CAMO. This would allow a maximum flexibility to the competent authority and to the organization to expand their privileges to their actual scope of work. However, the GIPAG France suggests to extend this possibility to the Part M/F organisation scope of approval for ELA2 aircraft (scope on the certificate limited to the scope covered by the licence(s) of the Certifying Staff).
response	*Partially accepted* See AMC M.B.603

comment	*343* comment by: *European Sailplane Manufacturers* Of course any alleviation to keep the effort small in case of additional ratings is appreciated by CAMOs. It should be discussed in the Task Force, if other changes to ratings of the organisations described in Part-M and Part-145 could be also simplified.
response	*Partially accepted* See AMC M.B.603

A. Explanatory Note - IV. Content of the draft Opinion/Decision - c) Action Plan for Phase II p. 22-23

comment	*13* comment by: *John Milner* Item 63 As an owner pilot I support these proposals. The main impact of the present regulations is to take away the discretion of the owner and his engineer to assess work which ought to be done. The regulations also create demands for paperwork that adds no value to safety but does add costs. As an owner pilot I would clearly not take any safety risks, but would not (for example) replace serviceable parts at considerable expense purely on a calendar basis, I would take the advice of my engineer. In the UK we have operated LAMP with engineer discretion successfully for many years and the UK has an exemplary safety record. ARC and annual inspection going together under the supervision of a suitably licenced engineer works very satisfactorily at modest cost. A light aircraft maintenance schedule should reflect the manufacturer's recommendations and experience in the field, but this must be qualified for an individual aircraft by the judgement of a skilled engineer so that work affecting safety is the priority and other work discretionary. As far as I am concerned the UK requirements for maintenance intervals and tolerances are well understood, soundly based and wholly acceptable.
response	*Noted* It will be analysed during Phase II.

comment	*39* comment by: *John DAVIES* Proposals for ELA2 Aircraft not involved in commercial operations will not affect balloons as there are only a few people who will operate a large balloon for fun. The fact that all the proposals (apart from general actions) are specific to ELA2

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	Aircraft not involved in commercial operations reinforces the opinion that, without a representative on the GA task force, the problems the ballooning industry is facing are being ignored.
response	*Noted* Please note that the definition of ELA2 aircraft includes all the ELA1 aircraft. As a consequence, the proposals apply to all balloons.

comment	*201* comment by: *SVFB/SAMA* 22/129 we appreciate that certain of the proposal we made above will hopefully find their way in phase II.
response	*Noted*

comment	*265* comment by: *Howard Torode* EUROPEAN GLIDING UNION CONDUCT OF GA TASK FORCE - PHASE II - GENERAL COMMENT. The forward programme of work for the GATF group (for 2013) appears to be totally focused on the ELA2 category. Meanwhile, through Europe Air Sports, a variety of urgent measures seeking alleviation for GA against the current requirements of Part 21 (Initial Certification) have been tabled (Response to European General Aviation Safety Strategy). Is there no way in which these can, at least, start to be addressed in 2013? Issues in this field, include, but are not limited to: • modification and repair design, • owner authorised and produced spare parts, • licensed engineer approval of airworthiness of used parts. • pilot responsibility for defects. These are serious constraints to GA and need alleviation in the shortest possible timescale.
response	*Partially accepted* Please note that the definition of ELA2 aircraft includes all the ELA1 aircraft. Provisions for 'Standard Changes and Repairs' and for 'Parts without EASA Form 1' have already been introduced in Part-21. The CS for 'Standard Changes and Repairs' is currently being developed.

comment	*331* comment by: *Andre Jansen* Ich hoffe es wird weitere Schritte zu einfacheren und weniger bürokratischen Verfahren geben. Auch diese weiteren Vorschläge hören sich sinnvoll an, aber auch sie sind nicht ausreichend für eine im Umfang und der Komplexität angepaßte Regulierung der allgemeinen Luftfahrt.
response	*Noted* Phase II will analyse further alleviations.

A. Explanatory Note - V. Regulatory Impact Assessment - Proposal 1 p. 23-24

comment *14* comment by: *John Milner*

Item 65, The impact on the owner is the only important issue and as long as he has someone competent to help produce a maintenance schedule for his aircraft and access to engineering skills to carry it out, no more is needed.
As to CAMO and maintenance organisations, the present regulations have cost some maintenance organisations a great deal of money to establish new capabilities and processes, all of which were arguably unnecessary else this consultation would not be taking place.
However, that is history and the light aircraft engineering market is a working competitive market in need of no intervention.

response *Noted*

comment *202* comment by: *SVFB/SAMA*

23/129 as to the economic impact: the eventual loss for pure M/G organisations should in fact be compensated by the body whom introduced the rule.

response *Noted*

The contract with a CAMO in order to develop a maintenance programme has always been an option and not a requirement for this category of aircraft.

comment *264* comment by: *HB-Flugtechnik GmbH*

In order to avoid abuse it shall not be possible to extent or change TBO times , maintenance limits or the content of the periodic maintenance actions foreseen by the TC-H / STC-H .
Furthermore there shall be no exceptions to the fulfilment of EASA AD´s, the national competent authorities or instructions issued by a Part-21 organisations.
Part-145 or Part M Subpart F organisation may proof overall knowledge of drafting, developing and approval of maintenance programmes.

response *Partially accepted*

Only Mandatory Continuing Airworthiness Information (MCAI) is mandatory, which includes items such as AD, ALI, and CMR. The rest has to be taken into account but deviations are possible under certain conditions.

A. Explanatory Note - V. Regulatory Impact Assessment - Proposal 2 p. 24-25

comment *24* comment by: *BPvL e. V.*

66.a) "Your safety is our mission"; this is the slogan on EASA's website.
The BPvL is wondering that EASA, knowing that this proposal will let a lower level of safety continue to support this pilot's assosiations idea. With this position EASA is working against it's own voluntary engagement.
One major part for owners is the "pilot owner maintenance". We worry about that this is understood as a carte blanche for uncontrolled maintenance by pilot

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

owners.
Low manpower at competent authorities can never be an excuse for accepting a lower level of safety. On the other hand with proposal #1 we will have more capacity for development and approval of maintenance programmes.

response *Noted*

The objective of the Agency is to adapt the rules to the risk involved. For lower risk (or liability) activities, more simplified requirements are a reasonable approach.

comment *266* comment by: *HB-Flugtechnik GmbH*

Is it a good idea to let the owner/operator decide how the content of the maintenance , more precise of the maintenance checklist , shall / has to be ?
Does an owner/operator have enough competency and technical knowledge to "customize" a maintenance checklist , using the Minimum Inspection Programm" as a "guidance" ?
From our experience there is a simple answer : NO !!
"Based on all the arguments above, the Agency has decided not to require a copy of the declared maintenance programme to be sent to the competent authority."
36. As a consequence, the declared (by the owner) maintenance programme will not be subject to further checking by the competent authority and will be the basis for the adequate planning of the maintenance as well as the basis for the airworthiness reviews and ACAM inspections.
Above is partially agreed:
Still Maintenance Programmes shall be forwarded to the competent authorities for there reference , but finally the owner/operator still needs to be fully responsible for its requested and / or approved content.(this is especially true for TBO extension whereas the competent authority shall be able to accept TBO extension up to 15-20 % of the recommended TBO times but shall not be responsible and triable in case of an accident or incidient)

response *Partially accepted*

The current rule already allows the owner to completely manage the continuing airworthiness of his/her aircraft under his/her own responsibility. In addition, the option of self-declaration has been limited to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations and compensating measures have been introduced, as the review of the effectiveness of the maintenance programme at the time of the airworthiness review. Please refer to GM M.A.302(h) on how the effectiveness of the maintenance programme is evaluated and the problems are communicated to the NAA.

Furthermore, GM M.A.201(e) clearly reminds the owner to carefully self-assess his/her competence.

A. Explanatory Note - V. Regulatory Impact Assessment - Proposal 3 p. 25-26

comment *68* comment by: *BCAA - G. Pierlot*

PAGE / POINT / PARAGRAPH / SECTION OUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:
Point 67. Anticipated impacts c) Social: This measure is expected to achieve a

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

much higher level of standardisation and fair competition across Europe in relation to the maintenance programme.

PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:

A much higher level of standardization and fair competition across Europe concerning the content of the AMP is not certain.

RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION FOR THE COMMENT:
The MIP provides a mean to standardize and to simplify the AMP for a specific class of aircraft. However, it is only one "new" *option* among the others, making the system (much) more complex than previously. The easiest way to standardize the content of the AMP is to propose an unique option (based on DAH schedule **OR** on MIP schedule). The anticipated impact is therefore overestimated.

response *Noted*

The text has been amended to state that the maintenance programme cannot be less restrictive than the MIP. In addition, the requirements for the MIP have been included in M.A.302(i) and the tables with the specific MIPs have been transferred to AMC M.A.302(i).

The opinion of the Agency is that this, together with the template contained in AMC M.A.302(e), will promote standardisation.

comment *267* comment by: *HB-Flugtechnik GmbH*

Comment:
Approved Data / Maintenance Data / Maintenance Checklists issued and approved by the TC-H, STC-H or any Part-21 organisation of a specific type or configuration shall still be considered sufficient and shall be the only acceptable source.
Above organisations or persons shall be seen to be those to know best about the continuing airworthiness requirements on THEIR products (what´s about 21.A.3 ???)

response *Partially accepted*

The Agency agrees that the use of DAH data is sufficient in most cases (except where these data is very poor for old aircraft). Nevertheless, in order to cover those cases and to promote standardisation, the option of the MIP has been introduced.

A. Explanatory Note - V. Regulatory Impact Assessment - Proposal 4 p. 26

comment *268* comment by: *HB-Flugtechnik GmbH*

Same is true as for Proposal 3:
Approved Data / Maintenance Data / Maintenance Checklists issued and approved by the TC-H, STC-H or any Part-21 organisation of a specific type or configuration shall still be considered sufficient and shall be the only acceptable source.
Above organisations or persons shall be seen to be those to know best about the continuing airworthiness requirements on THEIR products (what´s about

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	21.A.3 ???)
response	*Noted* The Agency agrees that the use of DAH data is sufficient in most cases (except where these data is very poor for old aircraft). Nevertheless, in order to cover those cases and to promote standardisation, the option of the MIP has been introduced.

A. Explanatory Note - V. Regulatory Impact Assessment - Proposal 5 p. 26-27

comment	*269* comment by: *HB-Flugtechnik GmbH* When Part-M and the requirement to establish a CAMO organisation acc. Part M Subpart G to be able to issue ARC has introduced we spent a lot of money because of working hours and for certification……..why might it be the case to loose a part of privileges (not only but mainly the management of the Cont. Airworthiness stay left) and maybe loosing quite an amount to Part-145 or Part M/F organisations ? Why does EASA plan plan to cut our CAMO amount / incomes or cut short our Return-On-Invest ? Furthermore the safety benefit of a 4-eyes-check (acc. M.A. 402) and the independence of Certifying Staff will be jeopardized !! Furthermore : is it wise to maybe have a brandnew e.g. B3 staff issuing an ARC (when working for a P-145 or Part-M organisation) ? Isn´t there a lack of experience and a lack of knowledge ?
response	*Noted* Please note that the Agency has not reduced the privileges of CAMOs. On the other hand, the privileges given to maintenance organisations are very limited. They only cover airworthiness reviews and development of maintenance programmes, and for a limited category of aircraft. Besides that, they don't cover continuing airworthiness management activities. In addition, having the aircraft in a controlled environment (managed by a CAMO) still gives the advantage to the CAMO of being able to extend the ARC for 2 consecutive years. Regarding your comments on the B3 staff, if he/she is going to perform airworthiness reviews, he/she must be appropriately qualified and pass an airworthiness review under supervision.

A. Explanatory Note - V. Regulatory Impact Assessment - Proposal 6 p. 27-28

comment	*270* comment by: *HB-Flugtechnik GmbH* Let´s start with a question: why to treat certified M/F organisation having established a quality management system worse than a Part-66 staff working outside the overview of an approved organisation ? Whilst the Part-66 which is working outside the overview of an approved organisation can do the maintenance at indeed any place (provided there is adequate "accommodation" for the work forseen) he /she wishes to , a certified organisation is either limited to the place(s) mentioned within the MOM/MOE or limited to non-periodic maintenance actions outside the mentioned place(s)

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	within the MOM/MOE. Or according AMC M.A.605 (a) Facilities 1. Where a hangar is not owned by the M.A. Subpart F organisation, it may be necessary to establish proof of tenancy. This is not correct and shall be terminated ! Provided there is adequate protection from inclement weather [prevents the ingress of rain, hail, ice, snow, wind and dust etc. ; see AMC M.A.402 (e) Performance of maintenance] and that "working place" is appropriate for all planned maintenance (light , humidity , space etc) certified M/F organisations shall be permitted to do periodic maintenance at any place. Tooling requirements to stay unchanged and shall be fully applied !
response	*Accepted* See new GM M.A.615(a) and amended AMC M.A.605(a).

A. Explanatory Note - V. Regulatory Impact Assessment - Proposal 7 p. 28

comment	*203* comment by: *SVFB/SAMA* 28/129 Impact: overall, even if the intent was to make it easier for GA, and there are indeed many alleviations which we fully appreciate, we are of the opinion, that the rulebook , already complex and not user-friendly as it is now, will probably become even more complex and user unfriendly in it's application in the daily life of Part M/F staff and Part 145 staff when finally reprinted, following this NPA. We think that to really make life easier and regulation more understandable,resulting in a safer daily work, a split up into non complex organisations, working with non complex regulation could be a means to this end. However, this would probably need a basically different set up as to how the problem is solved. The many interconnected RMT's NPA's in many different ways make the present task enourmously difficult. The hard and in many ways very progressive work and effort of the WG is highly appreciated in any case.
response	*Noted* Phase II of this task will include the introduction of a simplified format for Part-M for light aircraft.

comment	*262* comment by: *Howard Torode* EUROPEAN GLIDING UNION #8 Proposal 7 – MB 703. Indirect approval The EGU strongly supports this measure. Ever since the promulgation of Part M CAMOs and Sporting Bodies have spent large resources of time and effort in unnecessary updating of lengthy lists of type approval for essentially similar airframes, sub marks and developments wholly within their scope and competence to administer. Many competent authorities have been reticent to confer these privileges which would significantly improve the efficiency of a

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	CAMO to accommodate a developing situation.
response	*Noted*

comment	*272* comment by: *HB-Flugtechnik GmbH* CAMO´s but also maintenance organisations acc. Part-M/F or Part-1415 shall be granted aircraft groups such as, for example, "all sailplanes and powered sailplanes" or "Cessna single piston engined aircraft" or "Group 3 aircraft (as defined in 66.A.5)" or "aircraft below 2730 kg MTOM" but not be required to "limit" their scope by creating a Capability Liste where each single type or type variant needs to be listed. To avoid abuse a system needs to be introduced which forces the organisation to proof their access to the national competent authority for all Approved Data needed for the type amended via an indirect approval procedure. It shall not be necessary to work out / create Baseline/Generic Maintenance Programmes for any type as for small organisation that just wastes time and therefore money. CAMO`s needed to proof their generic understanding in how to cope with OMP´s anyhow whilst initial certification ……..
response	*Partially accepted* AMC M.B.603 has been amended but only to cover the case of ELA1 aircraft (while CAMOs were limited to ELA2 aircraft). The reason for this limitation is that the approval of maintenance organisations is more focussed on facilities and tooling, while the approval of CAMOs is more focussed on processes. These processes are more common to a wider category of aircraft.

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - I. Draft Opinion - Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 (Cover Regulation) p. 29-30

comment	*77* comment by: *Luftsport Verband Bayern / Germany*
response	*Noted*

comment	*200* comment by: *SVFB/SAMA* The comments forwarded in the general introduction until page 28/129 are not repeated further down into the detail regulation, as they are not dealing with the detail phraseology, but with principal issues. We think many of the recommendations in the roadmap for GA of the EASA MB should be further expanded and then find their way into the final proposal here from page 29 to the end of this NPA.
response	*Noted*

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - II. Draft Opinion - Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 - Annex I (Part-M) p. 31

comment	*32* comment by: *CAMO - Klaus Lehmköster, DE.MG.1016*

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	Page 31: Certifying staff The task/reponsibility of a "certifying staff" has to be defined.
response	*Not accepted* The responsibilities of certifying staff are already defined in Part-145 (point 145.A.30(h)) and Part-M Subpart F (point M.A.606(g)).

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - II. Draft Opinion - Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 - Annex I (Part-M) - M.A.201 p. 31-32

comment	*25* comment by: *BPvL e. V.* (e) (ii) second point shouldn't it read " in the case of ELA**1** aircraft not involved in..."?
response	*Not accepted* This option has been created for ELA2 aircraft. Please note that the definition of ELA2 aircraft includes all the ELA1 aircraft.

comment	*79* comment by: *Luftsport Verband Bayern / Germany* In General we would recommend, to place all definitions to one place in the regulation EC 2042/2003. This allows the users to look at this place to get the definition and not to search arround, where a specific definitionmay be located. Furthermore this will eliminate to have various definitions of a specific term throughout the regulation. **Article 2(k) (ii):** "of 1200kg MTOW or less" could be deleted. According to CS-22 sailplanes and powered sailplanes are limited to MTOW of less than 850kg, **Article 2(l) (ii):** "of 1200kg MTOW or less" could be deleted. According to CS-22 sailplanes and powered sailplanes are limited to MTOW of less than 850kg, **Article 2 (m):** Instead of listing the characteristics here wouldn't it be better to refer to CS-LSA.
response	*Not accepted* Please note that in the future the weight may exceed 850 kg. This definition was adopted recently after long discussions with the General Aviation community within task MDM.032. It is not the scope of this task to change this definition.

comment	*88* comment by: *Luftfahrt-Bundesamt* **M.A.201 (e) (ii)** It is appreciated that, in case of ELA2 aircraft not involved in commercial operations (including ELA1, LSA and VLA), maintenance organisations, too, (Subpart M-F and Part-145) can develop maintenance programmes and process their approval. However, it is not quite clear why this is only restricted to maintenance organisations under the oversight of the State of Registry of the aircraft. In case of a maintenance organisation that is not under the oversight of the State of Registry, the indirect procedure can then not be applied. (see M.1 number

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	4.) A further proposal would be to develop a pattern (included in Annex Ia) for the limited contract similar to Annex I to Part-M of the full contract.
response	*Partially accepted* The text has been revised. Maintenance organisations can develop the maintenance programme no matter where they are located, but they cannot use indirect approval procedures, which is a possibility retained only for CAMOs.

comment	*172* comment by: *FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation* In case of limited contract for development of an MP combined with declaration by the owner, the respective responsibilities of the owner/contracted organisation are not clear in AMC M.A.201(e). The maintenance organization preempted by the GIPAG France do not agree with taking legal responsibilities in applying an owner MP which would not be approved by the competent authority. A safe level of security has to be kept with the activities of the operator of ELA2 aircraft.
response	*Noted* The responsibilities have been clarified. See GM M.A.302(h) and AMC M.A.201(e).

comment	*274* comment by: *Irish Aviation Authority* M.A.201(e) (ii) does not permit an owner to contract an M.A. Subpart F maintenance organisation from a state other than the State of Registry, even if the owner wishes to have a self-declared or an NAA approved maintenance programme. The same paragraph allows the owner to contract a CAMO in any state for the same purpose. Will this differentiation create borders for Subpart F organisations and give a commercial advantage to the CAMOs?
response	*Accepted* This limitation has been removed.

comment	*321* comment by: *ENAC - Ente Nazionale per l'Aviazione Civile* **Appendix IX: Minimum Inspection Programmes** In the text of that appendix it is reported that a tolerance of 10% may be applied for the 100h inspection interval and not for calendar interval. It should be clarified that the annual cap is in any case to be respected. Additionally it may be also useful to allow a 10% tolerance on the calendar interval which may be useful when annual utilization is close to 100 FH.
response	*Accepted* 10% tolerance is allowed for 100 hour and annual inspection.

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - II. Draft Opinion - Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 - Annex I (Part-M) - M.A.302 p. 32-34

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

comment	*2* comment by: *Jari LYYTINEN* For what reason should it be possible to contract continuing airworthiness management tasks to maintenance organisation? Maintenance organisation is by definition competent to perform maintenance, not to develope and approve maintenance programmes. There are alredy separate organisations approved for these tasks.
response	*Noted* Please note that the only continuing airworthiness management activity allowed to maintenance organisations is the development of the maintenance programme, and only if they are qualified and have authorised personnel.

comment	*26* comment by: *BPvL e. V.* Remove para (h) due to reducing the level of safety. As explained before BPvL does not believe that most of the owners are able to fulfill all these requirements due to missing valid documentation, knowledge and skills.
response	*Not accepted* The current rule already allows the owner to completely manage the continuing airworthiness of his/her aircraft under his/her own responsibility. In addition, the option of self-declaration has been limited to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations and compensating measures have been introduced, as the review of the effectiveness of the maintenance programme at the time of the airworthiness review. Furthermore, GM M.A.201(e) clearly reminds the owner to carefully self-assess his/her competence.

comment	*33* comment by: *CAMO - Klaus Lehmköster, DE.MG.1016* Page 33: (a) **Aircraft maintenance manuel = Aircraft maintenance programm** (b) The maintenance programm is allready approved by aircraft manufacturer and the competent authority when the aircraft was certifyed against C22/23/25 or FAA. (c)(d) cancell (e) Please look at any aircraft maintenance manual. Here you can find all details for life limited parts, frequency of maintenance etc. Cancell this item (f) - (g) see (e), cancell
response	*Not accepted* An aircraft maintenance programme is not just the maintenance manual. It must include other aspects related to the configuration and operation of the particular aircraft (see template in AMC M.A.302(e)).

comment	*58* comment by: *Klemens* (h) must be removed! Safety is observed.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

response

Not accepted

The current rule already allows the owner to completely manage the continuing airworthiness of his/her aircraft under his/her own responsibility. In addition, the option of self-declaration has been limited to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations and compensating measures have been introduced, as the review of the effectiveness of the maintenance programme at the time of the airworthiness review.

Furthermore, GM M.A.201(e) clearly reminds the owner to carefully self-assess his/her competence.

comment

78 comment by: *Luftsport Verband Bayern / Germany*

M.A.302 (b): This paragraph should either be adapted to allow CAMO or MO approval of maintenance programs or
M.A.302 (c) should start with "By derogation from point (b) or (h)…."
M.A.302 (d) (iii): The last sentence may have to be adapted depending on the change done in M.A.302 (b).

response

Not accepted

Please note that an 'indirect approval procedure' is by definition an approval by the competent authority. As a consequence, direct approval by CAMOs or maintenance organisations are not possible.

comment

90 comment by: *Luftfahrt-Bundesamt*

Attachments #3 #4 #5

M.A.302 Aircraft maintenance programme
The completely new paragraph (h) offers the possibility that the owner/operator (limited to ELA 1 aircraft) can issue a declaration for his/her own maintenance programme.
Consequently, does it still make sense to require a maintenance programme? If the owner/operator can issue his/her own declaration, 'may' can be replaced by a general requirement that the aircraft shall be maintained according to the requirements specified in M.A. 302 (d). In addition to that, a further requirement must be taken into consideration in case of a pilot-owner maintenance and release, which is M.A. 803 and the relevant AMC.
This is absolutely sufficient.
Should there be no change in the draft to permit a self-declaration by the operator, this would be, of course, a considerable alleviation. On the one hand, the owner/operator can, immediately after having bought the aircraft, establish the maintenance programme and, in the future, can have recourse to already existing or approved maintenance programmes; he/she has just to establish a new signed statement.
Ad M.A.302 (h):
Ad 2:
The aircraft maintenance programme either:
complies with the 'Minimum Inspection Programme' described in Appendix IX corresponding to the particular aircraft, or
complies with pararaphs (d) and (e) above.
That is redundant because it is obvious that a maintenance programme can be established in accodance with M.A.303 (d) and (e).
New proposal for M.A.302 (h) 2.:

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

The aircraft maintenance programme may comply with the 'Minimum Inspection Programme' described in Appendix IX corresponding to the particular aircraft.'
This proposal is only valid subject to the conditions that 'MIPs' will become mandatory in Appendix IV to Part-M.
(see further comments)
Ad 5:
On the occasion of the annual review of the maintenance programme, problems are identified by the entity that performs the airworthiness review. Here the oversight carried out by the authority is transferred to the CAMO and, in the future, also to the maintenance organisations.
This could lead to disputes between the inspecting entity and the owner/operator.
The inspecting entity can refer to the new wording specified in M.A.710 (i) in Part-M. It would be of advantage, if in M.A.302 (h) reference could be made to M.A. 710 (i).
It will be seen to which extent the economic pressure of the CAMOs has any influence so that the reports will be really addressed to the authority. The past, however, showed that this did not happen. See ARC inspections without approved maintenance programmes!
Enclosed please find our proposal for maintenance programmes (3 files, in German language only).

response *Partially accepted*

The objective of having a maintenance programme is to make sure that the maintenance requirements have been evaluated (and recorded) taking into account not only the documentation of the manufacturer but also the specific configuration and operation of the aircraft.

This evaluation and recording is essential for the proper planning of the maintenance required.

This is independent of whether the maintenance programme is approved by the NAA or declared by the owner.

Your proposal to make reference to M.A.710(i) has been accepted (although the reference has actually be made to M.A.710(h)).

Please note that the objective of referring in M.A.302(h) to paragraphs (d) and (e) is to make sure that M.A.302(h) contains all the options. That way, if the owner decides to use (d) and (e), he does not need to comply with (b), (c), and (g).

comment *148* comment by: *UK CAA*

Page No: 33
Paragraph No: M.A.302(h)
Comment:
The new paragraph M.A.302(h) describes in subparagraph 3 what the content of a maintenance programme should include. Some of the items described have caused much debate regarding their meaning within the UK GA community. The opportunity for the Agency to provide a definition and clarify the situation exists and thus reduces confusion. The CAA suggests that additional AMC material be added to the proposed point AMC M.A.302(h).
Justification:
To improve clarity and reduce confusion.
Proposed Text:
Add the following new text to AMC M.A.302(h) at subparagraph 3:

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

"Life Limited Components and flight safety critical components:
Life limited parts are those parts that have a specific life limit specified by the design approval holder, for example, the Type Certificate Data Sheets (TCDS), the Approved Airworthiness Limitations Section of the aircraft maintenance manual and Airworthiness Directives. Life limited parts must not remain in service beyond their specified life limit. The life limit may be specified by total time in service, total cycles in service or on a calendar time basis.
Mandatory Requirements (Airworthiness Directives (ADs), Airworthiness Limitations (ALs)):
For a task to be mandatory the State of Design, the State of Registry or the Agency will have issued an Airworthiness Directive (AD). Only those ADs that contain repetitive requirements need to be included in the Maintenance Programme. Any item referred to in the Airworthiness Limitations (AL's) section of the Type Certificate Data Sheet, typically Chapter 4 or 5 of the Service/Maintenance Manual must be included in the maintenance programme.
Service Bulletins (SBs), Service Letters (SLs)
Accomplishment of Service Bulletins and other service data are not mandatory; however all such data produced by a design approval holder is intended to maintain the reliability and serviceability of their products. These instructions should be formally assessed, evaluated and applied when considered appropriate. The assessment should include determining which tasks are of a continuing airworthiness nature over those which simply offer a product improvement. Where the information is not applicable, or when the task has been satisfied by another means, an entry should be made in the aircraft records. When it has been decided not to comply with the instructions, an entry in the aircraft records should be made stating the rationale for this decision. In the event that the instructions are to be satisfied by a means other than those defined by their originator, the alternative means of compliance must be appropriately approved."

response

Partially accepted

These issues are currently under debate in other rulemaking tasks (MDM.056 and MDM.076) and do not only affect the General Aviation community.

In particular, life-limited parts are being discussed within task MDM.076.

Regarding the mandatory requirements, field 8 of the template in AMC M.A.302(e) makes it clear. This template has to record the deviations.

comment *149* comment by: *UK CAA*

Page No: 34
Paragraph No: M.A.302(h)3
Comment:
When an owner has decided to use the Minimum Inspection Programme, the wording of the requirement should be such that the review of maintenance data from the design Approval Holder is required and is not optional.
Justification:
Experience in the UK has shown that this is an area of considerable debate and confusion. A clear, concise set of instructions should be given to ensure the maintenance programme is correctly developed.
Proposed Text:
Amend paragraph M.A.302(h)3 to read:
"3. The aircraft maintenance programme **shall** ~~identifies~~ **identify** any additional maintenance tasks to be performed because of the specific aircraft type, aircraft configuration and type and specificity of operation. ~~Consideration~~

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	~~shall be taken, as~~ **As** a minimum, ~~for~~ the following **shall be reviewed and included where applicable.”**
response	*Accepted*

comment	*173* comment by: *FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation* Each airplane has different specific features and variances. Due to this fact, the GIPAG France do not agree that a given aircraft MP can solely comply with a generic “Minimum Inspection Programme” (as described in appendix IX to Part-M in the NPA). Any MP, even simplified has to comply with the one and only relevant MP which is the “Manufacturer MP”. The MP should have as reference the only and unique reference of M.A.302 (d) and (e) as following: *“(d) The aircraft maintenance programme must establish compliance with:* *(i) instructions issued by the competent authority;* *(ii) instructions for continuing airworthiness:* *• issued by the holders of the type certificate, restricted type-certificate, supplemental type-certificate, major repair design approval, ETSO authorisation or any other relevant approval issued under Regulation (EC) No 1702/2003 and its Annex (Part-21), and* *• included in the certification specifications referred to in point 21A.90B or 21A.431B of the Annex (Part-21) to Regulation (EC) No 1702/2003, if applicable;* *(iii) additional or alternative instructions proposed by the owner or the continuing airworthiness management organisation once approved in accordance with point M.A.302, except for intervals of safety related tasks referred in paragraph (e), which may be escalated, subject to sufficient reviews carried out in accordance with paragraph (g) and only when subject to direct approval in accordance with point M.A.302(b).* *(e) The aircraft maintenance programme shall contain details, including frequency, of all maintenance to be carried out, including any specific tasks linked to the type and the specificity of operations*
response	*Not accepted* One of the objectives of the task was to define which is the minimum level for the maintenance programme, and that is why the MIP was introduced. Nevertheless, the recommendations from the Design Approval Holder still need to be considered (although they owner may deviate from them under his/her own responsibility).

comment	*174* comment by: *FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation* Associations and corporate bodies shall have nominated Accountable Manager and relevant procedures to identify the decision process for submitting owner’s MP. In addition to this comment, the GIPAG France do not agree with the fact that the owner can issue a declaration for his/her own aircraft’s maintenance programme which would not need to be approved by th competent authority. The GIPAG France suggests either: -to replace M.A.302 (h) 4. By: “Any amendment on the maintenance programme made by the owner of the aircraft can be issue if it has been submitted and accepted by the relevant and competent legal authority” Or: - to modify M.A.302 (h) 4. as following: “The aircraft maintenance programme

contains a signed statement where the owner declares that this is the aircraft maintenance programme for the particular aircraft registration."

response *Not accepted*

The current rule already allows the owner to completely manage the continuing airworthiness of his/her aircraft under his/her own responsibility. In addition, the option of self-declaration has been limited to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations and compensating measures have been introduced, as the review of the effectiveness of the maintenance programme at the time of the airworthiness review.

Furthermore, GM M.A.201(e) clearly reminds the owner to carefully self-assess his/her competence.

comment *233* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency*

NPA Page 34, NPA M.A.302(h)
M.A.302(h)(3) mentions that "*Consideration shall be taken, as a minimum, for the following:"*. It covers the "additional maintenance tasks" (9 bullets). But it is only possible to list the considered deviations when it comes to maintenance recommendation in AMP "template" (AMC M.A.302(e)) Field 10.
Field 10: *"Enter in Table 2 any deviations to the maintenance recommendations mentioned above, together with the alternative inspections/tasks to be performed. This may include a change to the recommended intervals or the decision not to perform a particular recommended maintenance task."*
How and where should the other affected "additional maintenance tasks" with considered deviations in M.A.302(h)(3) be listed?
STA propose that <u>all</u> considered deviations should be listed in the declaration-AMP (MIP/DAHD).
Reason:

- It will show what tasks the owner has considered to be performed or not.
- It clarifies what the owner takes responsible for.
- This will also help the ARS during the annual review of the AMP.

response *Accepted*

The template in AMC M.A.302(e) has been amended to list the deviations coming from fields 5, 10, and 13.

comment *234* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency*

NPA Page 34, M.A.302(h)(3) bullet 5
The M.A.302(h)3 bullet 5 will be contradictory to M.A.302(h)2 bullet 2.
M.A.302(h)3 mentions about *"Consideration shall be taken, as a minimum, for the following:"*
In M.A.302(h)3 bullet 5
"Maintenance recommendations, such as TBO intervals, recommended through service bulletins, service letters and other non-mandatory service information."
In M.A.302(h)2 bullet 2
"complies with paragraphs (d) and (e) above."
The current (and not affected by this NPA) AMC M.A.302 (d)1, already mention that all maintenance data shall be followed.
("…or any other maintenance data containing information on scheduling.")
That includes service bulletins, service letters and other non-mandatory service

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

information.
Since M.A.302(h)2 bullet 2 points to M.A.302(d), all service bulletins, service letters and other non-mandatory service information are embraced.

response *Noted*

The interpretation of the Agency is that compliance with M.A.302(d) and (e) does not mean the obligation to include in the maintenance programme all maintenance data (including SB's, SL's, etc.). This information has to be evaluated but deviations are possible, sometimes with a justification and other times (like the declaration by the owner) without it.

comment *255* comment by: *Howard Torode*

EUROPEAN GLIDING UNION #0

OVERVIEW STATEMENT

The EGU sees the fundamental approach of Proposals 2 through 5 as representing a very significant recognition by EASA of the essential difference between CAT and Sport Aviation. We strongly support this option particularly as it now represents an acceptable approach for EASA. The approach is much closer to the sort of relationships we are used to operating in many major gliding nations, all be it that the former may not have had the clarity of responsibility that EASA would now require.
Rationale

At first sight this approach may appear to other stakeholders to be something of a 'leap of faith'. The EGU believes this to be a workable approach that is necessary, which also fulfils regulators requirement for a clear and unique responsibility chain. While one could take the view that the owner may not be competent to understand the needs of airworthiness/maintenance, the provisions virtually impel him to seek appropriate advice from organisations that are approved as competent. We applaud this step forward in sensible regulation. It represents a valid and useful development to the extant procedures in the 'uncontrolled environment', which is normally adopted in sport aviation. This might be difficult to accept by some nations where they chose, or are constrained, either by choice or, often by NAAs, to operate the 'controlled environment' approach. Those nations who have to date used the uncontrolled environment will certainly find these measures an economic and useful option.

response *Noted*

comment *256* comment by: *Howard Torode*

EUROPEAN GLIDING UNION 2

Page 34, - M.A.302(h) 2 – Aircraft Maintenance Programme

EGU do not understand the use of 'either-or'?

Rationale

The measures referred to in M.A.302 (d) & (e) (above) are clearly specified

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	measures in the development of a maintenance programme. Why should they be specifically precluded for the consideration when customising from the Minimum Maintenance Programme template. This requirement appears to deliberately and unnecessarily diverge the two approaches.
response	*Noted* The wording 'either-or' gives the option to the owner to choose between MIP or DAH data. In any case, there are some additional requirements: — If the MIP is followed, other recommendations from the DAH have to be at least considered. — In any case, the final maintenance programme cannot be less restrictive than the MIP.

comment	*257* comment by: *Howard Torode* EUROPEAN GLIDING UNION #3 Page 34, - M.A.302 – Aircraft Maintenance Programme and Appendix IX The adoption and specification of the Minimum Maintenance Programme (plus the necessary 'customisation') is strongly supported. We believe this to be a significant step forward in the measures available to GA outside CAT.
response	*Noted*

comment	*258* comment by: *Howard Torode* EUROPEAN GLIDING UNION #4 Page 34, - M.A.302 – Aircraft Maintenance Programme In support of Proposal 4 EGU fully supports the introduction of the template to assist customisation of the MIP. This type of customisation would be greatly assisted if the manufacturers could be persuaded to provide a coherent and consistent approach to the description of the maintenance functions and documentation. Rationale Current maintenance manuals (for simple aircraft, like sailplanes) contain a wide range of information ranging from system descriptions, operating instructions, liability disclaimers and (thinly spread among these) detailed maintenance requirements, generally only for specific items and equipment, often at unhelpfully frequent intervals. Such hard data is often given with questionable justification and authority and inappropriate emphasis. Given that Airworthiness Directives (AD's) are managed in a different context and timescale the only reason that maintenance programme customisation is as complex as it is currently found, is the plethora of different mechanisms and authority levels at which 'manufacturer's recommendations' are disseminated.
response	*Noted*

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

comment	*275* comment by: *Irish Aviation Authority* M.A.302 (h) (2) and AMC M.A.302 (e) may be interpreted as meaning that an owner using the Minimum Inspection Programme(MIP) does not have to comply with M.A.302 paras (d) and (e). Would this allow the owner to use the MIP and exclude any instructions issued by the competent authority, the Design Approval Holder, or additional tasks proposed by the owner/CAMO?
response	*Noted* The owner still has to take into account other recommendations from the DAH (see fields 5, 10, and 13 of the template in AMC M.A.302(e)). Nevertheless, the owner may deviate from such recommendations when declaring the maintenance programme, identifying the deviations in the template.

comment	*277* comment by: *Irish Aviation Authority* M.A.302 (h) (3) and AMC M.A.302 (e) require the owner/organisation to review all maintenance recommendations issued via Service Bulletins, Service Information Letters etc. for the aircraft, engine(s), propeller(s) and all fitted equipment. This may prove onerous to many organisations/owners developing maintenance programmes, especially for older aircraft. It mandates the review of such recommendations while the NPA, in para 44, shows that such recommendations are not mandatory.
response	*Noted* This proposal is retained in order to ensure that the owner is, at least, aware of the recommendations.

comment	*297* comment by: *AESA* On M.A.302(c): - Indirect approval of the Maintenance Programme The NPA appears not to be coherent in this aspect: M.B.301 is amended to include the indirect approval of maintenance programme through a procedure for Part-145 organisations and MFs. Also AMC M.A.201 is being amended accordingly. However M.A 302 does not include this option: the Maintenance programme shall be approved by the competent authority (MA 302 b); Only when the continuing airworthiness of an aircraft is managed by a CAMO, this CAMO can approve the Maintenance Programme through an indirect approval procedure.
response	*Noted* Even if the maintenance programme is approved via indirect approval procedure, it is still considered as being approved by the competent authority. There is no need to amend M.A.302(b). Nevertheless, the text has been revised in order not to allow the use of indirect approval procedures by maintenance organisations (only the development of the maintenance programme is allowed).

comment	*299* comment by: *AESA* To M.A.302 (h) 4 and (5):

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

The responsibility of the NAA related to the content of the maintenance programme is not clear. Although the intention of the NPA is to release NAAs from responsibility related to the content of the maintenance programme (by declaring it in M.A.302 (h) 4 and the declaration itself) the fact is that it is not the case. Two examples:
1.- M.A.710 (i) indicates that the authority has to be notified in case of deficiencies in the content of the maintenance programme during the review of the maintenance program. This implies that the NAA has to take appropriate action so that NAAs became responsible for the content.
Also, there may be even situations in which the NAA perfoms the Airworthiness Review iaw 901 (i).In this case the NAA has to perform the review of the maintenance programme i.a.w. M.A.302 (h) 5.
2.- ACAM inspections, it is not specified the treatment of the maintenance programme establish by the owner during an ACAM inspection: does the authority has to verify compliance with this maintenance programme? Or is it necessary to evaluate the adequacy of the maintenance programme?

response

Noted

The NAA does not need to evaluate the adequacy of the maintenance programme unless there are findings on the aircraft which may be linked to an inadequate maintenance programme.

More clarifications have been introduced in GM M.A.302(h) and AMC M.A.302(e).

comment *303* comment by: *AESA*

<u>On M.A.302 (h):</u>
To establish the aircraft maintenance programme and to comply with all the conditions specified in M.A.302 h) it is necessary to review the applicable documentation. The rule requires to CAMOs (M.A 709) to hold and use maintenance documentation but there is no requirement to the owner to review (hence at least have access to) that documentation.

response

Noted

The regulation establishes requirements for the approval of CAMOs (personnel, qualification, data, facilities, etc.).

However, the owner does not need to hold an approval. That's why those requirements are not imposed on them.

This does not mean that they don't have to have access to the documentation. If the owner decides to manage the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft himself/herself, then he/she is responsible for the airworthiness of the aircraft. They can achieve that by any means they consider necessary as long as they comply with the rules. The competent authority can inspect at any time whether he/she is properly managing the aircraft.

comment *304* comment by: *AESA*

<u>On M.A.302 (h) 5:</u>
Can the owner establish a maintenance programme by a declaration and have the aircraft managed by a CAMO?
This option is feasible because it is not restricted in the NPA. In fact this is real option in the current regulation (AMC M.A.709 says that *the customer may*

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	already have an approved aircraft maintenance programme, which in that case should be used by the continuing airworthiness management organisation to manage the continuing airworthiness of such aircraft). So that, in this case the aircraft can be managed by a CAMO and if it is in controlled environment, the ARC can be extended twice, and the AR is not performed every year.
response	*Noted* Yes. The owner can declare the maintenance programme even if the aircraft is being managed by a CAMO. In that case, the owner takes full responsibility for any deviations introduced to the maintenance programme proposed by the CAMO. See GM M.A.302(h).

comment	*307* comment by: *AESA* On M.A.302 (h) 4: For consistency, Point M.A 301 -3 should be also amended to indicate that now the maintenance programme can be established by a declaration (and not approved). The proposal is underlined: "the accomplishment of all maintenance, in accordance with the M.A.302 ~~approved~~ aircraft maintenance programme either established by the owner or approved by the competent authority
response	*Accepted*

comment	*315* comment by: *ENAC - Ente Nazionale per l'Aviazione Civile* It should be clarified that not only if the airworthiness review shows discrepancies linked to deficiencies in the content of the maintenance programme, the owner shall amend the maintenance programme accordingly, but also if those discrepancies results from annual review. Actually as explained in AMC M.A.302(h) point 3, results of airworthiness review should be taken into account when performing annual review of maintenance programme Proposed change in **M.A.302(h) point 5** (5) The aircraft maintenance programme is reviewed at least annually in conjunction with the airworthiness review. This review shall be accomplished by the person who performed the airworthiness review. If the annual review of the aircraft maintenance programme as well as airworthiness review shows discrepancies linked to deficiencies in the content of the maintenance programme, the owner shall amend the maintenance programme accordingly.
response	*Partially accepted* The text in point 5 of M.A.302(h) has been changed.

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - II. Draft Opinion – Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 - Annex I (Part-M) - M.A.604 p. 34-35

comment	*119* comment by: *CAA-NL* M.A.604(a)5. Maintenance organisation manual We suggest for clarity of who may act on behalf of the approved organisation to include those persons who can approve AMP's under the indirect approval

privilege on behalf of the approved organisation in the list mentioned here:
5. a list of certifying staff and, if applicable, airworthiness review staff with their scope of approval, and staff that may approve AMP's on behalf of the organisation and;

response *Partially accepted*

M.A.605(a)5 has been reworded. However, the possibility for maintenance organisations to use indirect approval procedures has been removed. They can only develop the maintenance programme.

comment *293* comment by: *AESA*

On M.A.604:
In the current regulation, the contract between the owner and the CAMO is not required to be approved. However the CAMO has to list the aircraft managed in CAME 0.2 General Information c).
In the same way the contract for the development of a Maintenance Programme by a part 145 of MF organisation is not required to be approved either, but in this case MOE and MOM do not contain the list of aircraft.

response *Not accepted*

The Agency does not consider this necessary. The maintenance organisation does not manage the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft, it just develops the maintenance programme.

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - II. Draft Opinion - Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 - Annex I (Part-M) - M.A.606 p. 35-36

comment *34* comment by: *CAMO - Klaus Lehmköster, DE.MG.1016*

Page 35: M.A.606 (g)
See comment page 5
In Germany we have the situation that we have insufficient personnel as certifying staff (about 3000 less). These were the former workshop superviser (Werkstattleiter) certifyed by the German Aero Club. For this staff now it is not allowed to certify a maintenance by a CRS like before the EASA rules. The present licenced Part 66 certifying staff cannot do this job. It is too much. In my experience a lot of aircrafts are flying without a valid CRS.
The B3 aircraft maintenance licence for the former German workshop superviser will relieve the situation. France has allready done it!

response *Partially accepted*

The issue of the personnel certified by the German Aero Club is an issue which has to be addressed through the applicable German Law. The current provisions of the EU regulations allow converting national certifying staff to Part-66 licences while maintaining the privileges (see also GM 66.A.70, paragraph 1, for further clarifications).

Please note that a maintenance programme is not only the instructions from the manufacturer. Several other aspects specific to the particular aircraft have to be considered (operational environment, repairs and modification, life-limited parts, pilot-owner maintenance, etc.). Please refer to the template contained in

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

AMC M.A.302(e).

comment 290 comment by: *AESA*

On M.A.606:
- Competence of personnel: 145.A.30 e) and M.A.606 should be modified to include reference to the maintenance programme development:
" *The organisation shall establish and control the competence of personnel involved in any maintenance, development of maintenance programmes if applicable, management and/or quality audits…*

response *Accepted*

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - II. Draft Opinion - Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 - Annex I (Part-M) - M.A.607 p. 36

comment 120 comment by: *CAA-NL*

M.A.607(c) Certifying staff and AR staff
We suggest for clarity of who may act on behalf of the approved organisation to include those persons who can approve AMP's under the indirect approval privilege on behalf of the approved organisation in the list mentioned here:
(c) The approved maintenance organisation shall record all details concerning certifying staff, ~~and~~ airworthiness review staff and staff that may approve AMP's on behalf of the organisation and maintain a current list of all certifying staff, ~~and~~ airworthiness review staff and staff that may approve AMP's on behalf of the organisation together with their scope of approval as part of the organisation's manual pursuant to point M.A.604(a)5.

response *Not accepted*

The possibility for maintenance organisations to use indirect approval procedures has been removed.

comment 121 comment by: *CAA-NL*

M.A.607. Certifying staff and AR staff
We suggest to include the supervised review for AR staff within an AMO. We disagree with the proposal to not to require the AR-staff to perform an AR under supervision. The added value of the AR on top of just maintenance is within the control of the maintenance of the aircraft and this is just not the first expertise of a maintenance organisation but of the CAMO. If someone could skip the supervised review it would be the person within the CAMO.
(d) Airworthiness review staff nominated by the approved maintenance organisation can only be issued an authorisation by the approved maintenance organisation when formally accepted by the competent authority after satisfactory completion of an airworthiness review under supervision.

response *Accepted*

See M.A.901(l)1(f).

comment 316 comment by: *ENAC - Ente Nazionale per l'Aviazione Civile*

M.A.607 Certifying staff and airworthiness review staff:
The content of the paragraph should be aligned with 145.A.36 . Therefore the last two paragraphs of 145.A.36, should be added as point (d) and (e) in **M.A.607**
Proposed change in **M.A.607**
…….
(d) The organisation shall retain the record for at least three years after the staff referred to in this paragraph have ceased employment (or engagement as a contractor or volunteer) with the organisation or as soon as the authorisation has been withdrawn. In addition, upon request, the maintenance organisation shall furnish the staff referred to in this paragraph with a copy of their personal record on leaving the organisation.
(e) The staff referred to in this paragraph shall be given access on request to their personal records as detailed above.

response *Not accepted*

The requirements in Subpart F are more simple than those in Part-145. In Subpart F, this is not required even for certifying staff.

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - II. Draft Opinion - Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 - Annex I (Part-M) - M.A.614 p. 36-37

comment *80* comment by: *Luftsport Verband Bayern / Germany*

M.A.614 (c): It is impossible for the maintenance organisation to find out, when an aircraft has been permanently withdrawn from service. The aircraft may have been sold several times before it is permanently taken out of service. A fixed time after the last maintenance has been carried out should be introduced.
M.A.614 (c) 3: It may be impossible for the maintenance organisation to transfer all records to the owner. The aircraft may have been sold several times before this event. The NAA should propose how to handle the documents.

response *Accepted*

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - II. Draft Opinion - Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 - Annex I (Part-M) - M.A.615 p. 37

comment *81* comment by: *Luftsport Verband Bayern / Germany*

M.A.615 (f): depending weather M.A.302 (b) has been changed or not this paragraph should start "develop the maintenance programme and by derogation to M.A.302 (b) process …."

response *Noted*

M.A.302(b) does not need to be changed. An indirect approval procedure is always an approval by the competent authority.

In addition, the possibility for maintenance organisations to use indirect approval procedures has been removed.

comment *122* comment by: *CAA-NL*

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

M.A.615(f) Privileges of the organisation
We suggest to add e few words to this point to make sure this is an option as with point (e)
(f) develop the maintenance programme and process its approval in accordance with point M.A.302 for ELA2 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, under the conditions specified in point M.A.201(e)(ii), if specifically approved to do so.

response *Not accepted*

The possibility for maintenance organisations to use indirect approval procedures has been removed. The Agency does not consider necessary to specify whether the organisation is approved to develop maintenance programmes. Having the corresponding procedures and qualified personnel are sufficient.

comment *295* comment by: *AESA*

On M.A.615 (f):
The articles referring to the privileges of the organizations Part 145s and Part M Subpart F (145.A.75 and M.A 615) should be modified in order to link this new privilege to the scope approved to perform maintenance. As it is written, any Part 145/Part M subpart F could develop a maintenance programme, including for example maintenance organisations approved only with rating C (components other than engines) or D (specialized services). The proposal is underlined:
M.A.615 Privileges of the organisation
(f) develop the maintenance programme and process its approval in accordance with point M.A.302 for ELA2 aircraft not involved in commercial operations and listed in the approval certificate, under the conditions specified in point M.A.201(e)(ii).

response *Accepted*

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - II. Draft Opinion - Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 - Annex I (Part-M) - M.A.707 p. 38-39

comment *51* comment by: *Graham HALLETT*

Para 2 allows the the same person to carry out the annual inspection and the airworthiness review at the same time - but only if the inspection is as per the minimum inspection programme. But not, therefore, if the inspection is in accordance with an approved maintenance programme. I.E, it is OK for an inspection under a programme which has not been shown to be adequate, but it is not OK under a programme which has been assessed and approved. This is illogical. Para 2 should be amended to cater for approved programmes as well.
Suggested text:
The airworthiness review is performed at the same time as the annual inspection contained in the maintenance programme as sepcified in M.A.302 and by the same person who releases such annual inspection.
Para 54 of the introduction states that the CAMO staff member must act as independent certifying staff or as certifying staff of another maintenance organisation. However the proposed regulation does not appear to specify that - and nor should it. It must be acceptable for the certifying staff to act as a

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

member of a joint subpart F & G organisation.

Having permitted the above for non commercial ELA1 aircraft, there is no reason (certainly for balloons) why this could not be extended to ELA2 balloons, or indeed commercial balloons.

response *Partially accepted*

M.A.901(l) and M.A.707(f)2 have been revised to allow the airworthiness review together with the annual inspection of the maintenance programme (even if it is not based on the MIP).
M.A.707(f)2 states that the airworthiness review is performed by the same person as the annual inspection. It is possible that this person belongs to a joint F & G organisation as long as the conditions in M.A.707(f)1(c) are met.
Extending this option of airworthiness review by maintenance organisations to ELA2 aircraft will be analysed during Phase II.

comment *91* comment by: *Luftfahrt-Bundesamt*

M.A.707 (f) 3.
The procedure still must be required according to which the CAMO is obliged to report problems regarding maintenance programmes on a self-declaration basis.
In any case, the AMC should include a classification of problems.

response *Partially accepted*

M.A.707(f) has been amended. However, a classification of problems is not included because the problems which may arise cannot be anticipated. AMC M.A.710(h) already provides some guidance.

comment *123* comment by: *CAA-NL*

M.A.707(f) AR staff
These requirements are related to a CAMO approval. A CAMO is not approved to perform maintenance ant thus this option as it is formulated here is not possible in our opinion.
M.A.707(f)1.(a): Staff holding a certifying staff authorisation is not possible within a CAMO, staff could be in possession of a Part 66 licence but not of an organisation authorisation as the organisation does not have the privilege to perform maintenance.
M.A.707(f)2. The AR 'to be performed at the same time as the annual inspection and by the same person who releases such inspection' is in our opinion not possible within a CAMO. The CAMO can not perform maintenance and if that person performs the annual inspection it can only be released on his personal licence or when he is also working with an AMO, but then the AR could be performed by the AMO and not the CAMO.

response *Not accepted*

The option is possible because the person could be acting as independent certifying staff or be employed by an organisation holding both approvals (CAMO and Subpart F).

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

comment	*150* comment by: *UK CAA* **Page No:** 39 **Paragraph No:** M.A.707(f) **Comment:** M.A.707(f) is not the correct point to provide a privilege for the Subpart G organisation to issue the airworthiness review certificate. For consistency this should be contained within point M.A.901 (M.A.901(e) provides for this). **Justification:** To provide consistency and ensure the correct level of expertise. **Proposed Text:** Amend paragraph M.A.707(f) to read: "(f) By derogation from paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e), for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, the M.A. Subpart G organisation may, if appropriately approved, perform the airworthiness review ~~and issue the corresponding airworthiness review certificate~~, subject to the following conditions:"
response	*Accepted*

comment	*175* comment by: *FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation* The GIPAG France agrees to combine the annual visit with the ARC but only within an approved framework in order to keep the privileges higher to the approved maintenance organization compared to those given to the independent mechanics. It is mandatory today to focus on the European Air Transport level-playing field and to achieve a rise of the level of safety. What is more, it should be an option for an operator to be able to change of approved framework from one to another without losing any privilege in order to warranty the exercise of the level-playing field. Nevertheless, the possibility to renew the ARC twice by the operator should be extended in the case of approved maintenance organisation. The GIPAG France is asking for the possibility for the approved maintenance organisation to have an unlimited ARC combined with the CofA with the ARC. This should be taken into consideration in order to have an unlimited validity for the airworthiness' documents of any aircraft maintained in an approved framework, as compared with limited validity for aircraft.
response	*Not accepted* The privileges of approved organisations versus independent certifying staff have been maintained. The possibility for annual inspection plus airworthiness review is only possible within approved organisations Your proposal allowing the maintenance organisation to extend the ARC is not acceptable. The extension of the ARC, without airworthiness review, only makes sense when it is done by the organisation which manages the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft. This can only be done by CAMOs since maintenance organisations are not qualified/approved to perform continuing airworthiness management tasks. Your proposal of unlimited ARC is not accepted by the Agency because there is already an unlimited CofA. The Agency believes that there is a need for a periodic inspection of the airworthiness status of the aircraft, independent of the continuing airworthiness management process.

comment	*235* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency*

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

NPA Page 39, M.A.707(f)1(e)
There is no requirement for airworthiness reviews under supervision for this "new" type of ARS.
The requirement should be equivalent to M.A.707(b), with the following exemptions:

- The supervision may be performed by any other approved ARS from CAMO/MF/145.
- An assessment should be enough, if the ARS previously is or has been approved in another organization.

There seems to be a lack of "Appropriate aeronautical maintenance training" for this "new" type of ARS. The "demonstrated knowledge of relevant parts of initial airworthiness regulations" is not considered in the NPA. During the airworthiness review the ARS shall perform the review of modification and repairs (M.A.710(a)(6)). Should not the requirements be equivalent to AMC M.A.707(a)(2)(2)?

response *Partially accepted*

An airworthiness review under supervision has been introduced.

Please note that the qualification requirements for airworthiness review staff in maintenance organisations are more simple due to the category of aircraft affected (ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations). The same conditions have been provided for CAMOs (M.A.707(f)) in the case of this category of aircraft.

comment *236* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency*

NPA Page 39, M.A.707(f)2
The airworthiness review privilege should not only be limited to declaration-AMP (MIP). It should also include the declaration-AMP (DAHD).

response *Accepted*

comment *259* comment by: *Howard Torode*

EUROPEAN GLIDING UNION #5

Page 39, Proposal 6 and M.A.710 – Airworthiness Reviews

There seems no clear reason why the simultaneous performance of the annual maintenance and the airworthiness review should be a requirement for this procedure.

Rationale

It can only be presumed that the Subpart F organisation is seen here as operating outside of its normal brief, and so not considered competent to establish a management system to address the Airworthiness Review as an separate task. This may also be a regulatory contrivance to ensure that the maintenance programme review remains up to date by a minimum of one year. If this is seen as important, then so be it, but it was regulators who imposed separated maintenance and AR on simple GA aircraft in the first place. This represents only an minor inflexibility to the sport aviation community, as pre-Part M we always did these functions simultaneously.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

response	*Not accepted* If the Subpart F organisation wishes to have full privileges to perform airworthiness reviews, they should get a CAMO approval. The possibility for maintenance organisations to perform airworthiness reviews only for ELA1 aircraft has been introduced in order to allow the previous practice where the national CofA was renewed after the organisation performed an annual inspection and reviewed the airworthiness status of the aircraft.

comment	*311* comment by: *AESA* On M.A.707 (b): The approval of Airworthiness Review Staff of Part 145 and Part M –Subpart F should be subject to a formal acceptance by the competent authority after satisfactory completion of an airworthiness review.
response	*Accepted*

comment	*312* comment by: *AESA* On M.A.707 (f) 1.(d): In addition to the comment on M.A.707 (b), it should be necessary to include a requirement related; M.A 707 f) 1 d) should say: "The staff have acquired knowledge of the relevant parts of initial and continuing airworthiness regulations" instead of " … of the parts of Part-M relevant to continuing airworthiness management"
response	*Not accepted* This is not necessary, since Part-M already cross-refers to any applicable Part-21 requirement.

comment	*317* comment by: *ENAC - Ente Nazionale per l'Aviazione Civile* **M.A.707 Airworthiness review staff:** Appropriate alignment similarly to M.A.607 contents above should be ensures also into the M.A.707 adding appropriate provisions after point (f). Provision of point (e) are derogated by the wording of point (f). Additionally the two year limit for record retention in point (e) should be aligned with M.A.607(d) [three years] Proposed change in **M.A.707** ……. (e) The organisation shall maintain a record of all airworthiness review staff, which shall include details of any appropriate qualification held together with a summary of relevant continuing airworthiness management experience and training and a copy of the authorisation. This record shall be retained until ~~two~~ three years after the airworthiness review staff have left the organisation. ……. (g) The organisation shall retain the record for at least three years after the staff referred to in this paragraph have ceased employment (or engagement as a contractor or volunteer) with the organisation or as soon as the authorisation has been withdrawn. In addition, upon request, the maintenance organisation shall furnish the staff referred to in this paragraph with a copy of their personal record on leaving the organisation.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

(h) The staff referred to in this paragraph shall be given access on request to their personal records as detailed above.

response *Not accepted*

The change that you proposed to M.A.607 in your comment number 316 was not accepted.
There is no reason for changing from 2 to 3 years in M.A.707(e).

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - II. Draft Opinion - Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 - Annex I (Part-M) - M.A.710 p. 39

comment *27* comment by: *BPvL e. V.*

Remove (h).
The weakest goes to the wall.
First EASA removed all the responsibility for the maintenance programme away from the competent authority and now the certifying staff is responsible for the correct maintenance programme because he has to review it. And now he has the problem to discuss it with his customer. It's not the right way to share our responsibilities with aircraft owners in case of MP.
As a result the CS will do nothing in order not to loosing a customer and at the end he is the man who will be taken to court if something happened after that. The certifying staff is being left out in the rain by EASA.
This is not the level of safety in our understanding.
In the irreproducible case that EASA will follow this proposal the BPvL recommendes that the first review of the declared maintenance programme should be performed by the competent authority.

response *Not accepted*

GM M.A.710 has been amended to make clear the responsibilities of the airworthiness review staff. They are not responsible for the content of the maintenance programme. When performing the airworthiness review, they have to follow the requirements of M.A.710(h) and should follow the AMC M.A.710(h)

comment *92* comment by: *Luftfahrt-Bundesamt*

M.A.710 (h) new and (i)
See comments to M.A.302 (h) 5.

response *Noted*

See reply to your comment on M.A.302(h)5.

comment *109* comment by: *British Gliding Association*

British Gliding Association
M.A.710 (i)
Only significant deficiencies in the maintenance programme that could affect flight safety need to be reported to the competent authority.
Rationale;
If followed exactly as written, the Competent Authority could be receiving a

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

multitude of insignificant discrepancies that have no safety implication and just require a minor amendment or correction to the maintenance programme

response

Not accepted

If the airworthiness review has shown discrepancies on the aircraft because the maintenance programme did not include certain inspections recommended by the manufacturer or because the intervals were not the ones recommended by the manufacturer, this needs to be communicated to the NAA in order to plan their ACAM programme.

comment

261 comment by: *Howard Torode*

EUROPEAN GLIDING UNION #7

Page 39 – M.A.710(i) – Airworthiness Review
(Page 42 - M.A.901 (7) Aircraft Airworthiness Review staff also refers)

EGU believes that only contentious or safety critical issues relating maintenance programme formulation need to be drawn to the attention of the competent authority. More detailed issues of conformity and standardisation could and should be left to the CAMO to resolve.

Rationale

This seems remarkable heavy handed and short notice (72 hours) requirement for an issue that is almost certainly procedural. Furthermore this could easily be rectified via the usual procedures of a competent organisation that is both Subpart F and CAMO approved (In this case the CAMO would be reporting itself to the CA, which seems an unlikely situation). That said, in the general situation there are maybe separate Subpart F and CAMOs, so there may a role for the CA in conflict resolution.

response

Not accepted

If the airworthiness review has shown discrepancies on the aircraft because the maintenance programme did not include certain inspections recommended by the manufacturer or because the intervals were not the ones recommended by the manufacturer, this needs to be communicated to the NAA in order to plan their ACAM programme.

comment

281 comment by: *Irish Aviation Authority*

M.A.710 (h) – "*The review shall be accomplished by the person who performed the airworthiness review."* The term 'performed' may be interpreted to mean that the maintenance programme review is conducted after the airworthiness review process is complete. Is the intention that the maintenance programme review shall be accomplished as part of the airworthiness review?

response

Noted

The intention is that the review of the maintenance programme is performed annually after the airworthiness review. However, as indicated in AMC M.A.710(h), it is not only the results of the airworthiness review what has to be taken into account.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

comment	*300* comment by: *AESA* On M.A.710 (i) (same comment as on M.A.302.h 4 and 5): The responsibility of the NAA related to the content of the maintenance programme is not clear. Although the intention of the NPA is to release NAAs from responsibility related to the content of the maintenance programme (by declaring it in M.A.302 (h) 4 and the declaration itself) the fact is that it is not the case. Two examples: 1.- M.A.710 (i) indicates that the authority has to be notified in case of deficiencies in the content of the maintenance programme during the review of the maintenance program. This implies that the NAA has to take appropriate action so that NAAs became responsible for the content. Also, there may be even situations in which the NAA perfoms the Airworthiness Review iaw 901 (i).In this case the NAA has to perform the review of the maintenance programme i.a.w. M.A.302 (h) 5. 2.- ACAM inspections, it is not specified the treatment of the maintenance programme establish by the owner during an ACAM inspection: does the authority has to verify compliance with this maintenance programme? Or is it necessary to evaluate the adequacy of the maintenance programme?
response	*Noted* See new GM M.A.302(h).

comment	*305* comment by: *AESA* On M.A.710 (i): Action expected by the competent authority after a notification that there are discrepancies on the aircraft linked to the deficiencies of the content of the maintenance programme is not defined; in particular: - Can an ARC be issued with findings related to the content of the MP? - Can a valid ARC be suspended upon notification of discrepancies related to the content of the MP?
response	*Noted* If there are open findings on the aircraft, the ARC cannot be issued. See M.A.710(i), GM M.A.302(h), and GM M.A.710(i).

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - II. Draft Opinion - Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 - Annex I (Part-M) - M.A.901 p. 39-42

comment	*82* comment by: *Luftsport Verband Bayern / Germany* **M.A.901 (a):** Appendix 15c) is missing in the sentence.
response	*Accepted*

comment	*93* comment by: *Luftfahrt-Bundesamt* **M.A.901 (l) 8.** See comments to M.A.707 (f) 3.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

response | *Partially accepted*

M.A.901(l)8 has been amended.

A classification of problems cannot be anticipated. Some guidance is provided in AMC M.A.710(i).

comment | *110* comment by: *British Gliding Association*

British Gliding Association
M.A.901 Aircraft airworthiness review
(L) 5. Include "or CAMO" after maintenance organisation…. as a CAMO should be able to issue an EASA Form 15C if the minimum inspection programme is used.
Rationale;
As a CAMO can also issue an ARC for aircraft not used for commercial operations where the owner has declared the maintenance programme using anything other than an EASA Form 15C would be inconsistent.

response | *Not accepted*

The CAMO can perform the airworthiness review and issue the ARC at any time (together with the annual inspection or not). In any case, the CAMO cannot use EASA Form 15c because this form does not contain fields for the extension of the ARC. The CAMO uses EASA Form 15a or 15b.

comment | *112* comment by: *British Gliding Association*

British Gliding Association
M.A.901 Aircraft airworthiness review
(L) 7. add "significant" before discrepancies.
Rationale;
Only significant discrepancies that effect flight safety need reported to the competent authorities. Minor omissions and errors should be reported to the CAMO or maintenance organisation responsible for the airworthiness review and recorded on the airworthiness review checklist. If all minor discrepancies were reported to the competent authority it would create a huge workload for no safety benefit.

response | *Not accepted*

If the airworthiness review has shown discrepancies on the aircraft because the maintenance programme did not include certain inspections recommended by the manufacturer or because the intervals were not the ones recommended by the manufacturer, this needs to be communicated to the NAA in order to plan their ACAM programme.

comment | *151* comment by: *UK CAA*

Page No: 41
Paragraph No: M.A.901(l)1(c)
Comment:
This paragraph requires staff from the Part M subpart F or Part 145 organisation to be independent from the continuing airworthiness management process. As maintenance organisations by definition do not have the legal right to

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

undertake contracted continuing airworthiness management this subparagraph can be deleted, as the organisation cannot be made responsible for performing this process.
Justification: Correctness.
Proposed Text: Delete M.A.901(l)1 subparagraph (c).

response *Not accepted*

This is not always true. The person may have been directly involved in the continuing airworthiness management of the aircraft if he/she works also for a CAMO (quite normal in the case of organisations holding CAMO and Subpart F approval).

comment *152* comment by: *UK CAA*

Page No: 41
Paragraph No: M.A.901(l)2
Comment:
It has not been adequately explained why the proposed regulation prevents maintenance organisations who have developed a maintenance programme, based on manufacturers recommendations for an ELA1 aircraft owner, in accordance with M.A.201(e) (ii), from issuing an ARC.
Justification:
As the Subpart F or Part 145 organisation is processing approval of the AMP and carrying out the annual inspection, it would seem entirely logical that they can carry out the Airworthiness Review and issue the ARC as they have greater experience of the programme than a MIP that has been generated by the owner.
Proposed Text:
Amend paragraph M.A.901(l)2 to read:
"2. The airworthiness review is performed at the same time as the annual inspection contained in the ~~Appendix IX 'Minimum Inspection~~ '**Maintenance** Programme' and by the same person who releases such annual inspection, being possible to use the 90 days anticipation provision contained in M.A.710(d)."

response *Accepted*

comment *153* comment by: *UK CAA*

Page No: 42
Paragraph No: M.A.901(l)5
Comment:
Paragraph M.A.901(l)5 states that an Airworthiness Review Certificate (ARC) is issued after an airworthiness review has been carried out and that the individual is satisfied that the stated conditions have been met. Whatever the outcome of this paragraph, M.A.901(k) does not allow an ARC to be issued if there is evidence that the aircraft is not airworthy. Therefore should discrepancies be found that are linked to the maintenance programme, the ARC should not be issued until they have been rectified.
Justification:
The maintenance programme is reviewed in accordance with point M.A.710(h) in conjunction with the Airworthiness Review, further clarity should be added to point M.A.710(i) with regard to the status of the airworthiness review and ARC.
Proposed Text:

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Keep paragraph M.A.710(h) as written and amend paragraph M.A.710(i) as shown below:
"(h) For ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations for which the owner has issued a declaration for the maintenance programme in accordance with M.A.302(h), the aircraft maintenance programme shall be reviewed in conjunction with the airworthiness review. This review shall be accomplished by the person who performed the airworthiness review."
"(i) Should the outcome of the airworthiness review be inconclusive or should the review under point M.A.710(h) show discrepancies on the aircraft linked to deficiencies in the content of the maintenance programme, the competent authority shall be informed as soon as practicable but in any case within 72 hours of the organisation identifying the condition to which the review relates. **The ARC cannot be issued until all findings have been resolved.**"

response *Accepted*

comment *176* comment by: *FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation*

The GIPAG France agrees to combine the annual visit with the ARC but only within an approved framework in order to keep the privileges higher to the approved maintenance organization compared to those given to the independent mechanics. It is mandatory today to focus on the European Air Transport level-playing field and to achieve a rise of the level of safety.
What is more, it should be an option for an operator to be able to change of approved framework from one to another without losing any privilege in order to warranty the exercise of the level-playing field. Nevertheless, the possibility to renew the ARC twice by the operator should be extended in the case of approved maintenance organisation. The GIPAG France is asking for the possibility for the approved maintenance organisation to have an unlimited ARC combined with the CofA with the ARC. This should be taken into consideration in order to have an unlimited validity for the airworthiness' documents of any aircraft maintained in an approved framework, as compared with limited validity for aircraft.

It has been pointed out also that requiring independence or overall authority from the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft concerned may be too demanding for small organisations:
- The mechanics will only have overall authority if he is the owner of the aircraft (for aircraft not managed by CAMOs);
- The cases where the maintenance organisation performs airworthiness management tasks for the owner are frequent and independence is difficult to achieve within small organisations (example one man organisation).

response *Not accepted*

The privileges of approved organisations versus independent certifying staff have been maintained. The possibility for annual inspection plus airworthiness review is only possible within approved organisations

Your proposal allowing the maintenance organisation to extend the ARC is not acceptable. The extension of the ARC, without airworthiness review, only makes sense when it is done by the organisation which is managing the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft. This can only be done by CAMOs since maintenance organisations are not qualified/approved to perform continuing airworthiness management tasks.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Your proposal of unlimited ARC is not accepted by the Agency because there is already an unlimited CofA. The Agency believes that there is a need for a periodic inspection of the airworthiness status of the aircraft, independent of the continuing airworthiness management process.

Please note that in those cases where the owner has requested to the maintenance organisation to perform certain continuing airworthiness management tasks, this is done under the full responsibility of the owner, since the maintenance organisation does not have the corresponding privileges. As a consequence, the maintenance organisation is independent of the continuing airworthiness management process.

comment *237* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency*

NPA Page 41, M.A.901(l)1(e)
There is no requirement for airworthiness reviews under supervision for this "new" type of ARS.
The requirement should be equivalent to M.A.707(b), with the following exemptions:

- The supervision may be performed by any other approved ARS from CAMO/MF/145.
- An assessment should be enough, if the ARS previously is or has been approved in another organization.

There seems to be a lack of "Appropriate aeronautical maintenance training" for this "new" type of ARS. The "demonstrated knowledge of relevant parts of initial airworthiness regulations" is not considered in the NPA. During the airworthiness review the ARS shall perform the review of modification and repairs (M.A.710(a)(6)). Should not the requirements be equivalent to AMC M.A.707(a)(2)(2)?

response *Partially accepted*

An airworthiness review under supervision has been introduced.

Please note that the qualification requirements for airworthiness review staff in maintenance organisations are simpler due to the category of aircraft affected (ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations). The same conditions have been provided for CAMOs (M.A.707(f)) in the case of this category of aircraft.

comment *238* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency*

NPA Page 41, M.A.901(l)2
The airworthiness review privilege should not only be limited to declaration-AMP (MIP). It should also include the declaration-AMP (DAHD).

response *Accepted*

comment *260* comment by: *Howard Torode*

EUROPEAN GLIDING UNION #6

Page 42, M.A.901 -(l) 5

Introduce a common Form 15 which during completion clearly delineates the approach being taken to the assembly and customisation of the maintenance

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

programme. While a different responsibility chain is involved, there is no method of changing this, unless an option (to be deleted as required) is introduced in the original Form 15b.

Rationale

A new version (15c) of the Form 15 introduced here to cover the new arrangements, and responsibilities. It seems unfortunate that a separate form is required. Form 15B is already poorly adapted to the uncontrolled environment case as it covers two extensions that are not permitted under that regime. The draft of Form 15c does not appear to contain any such declaration by the owner, and I can't find it anywhere else! There is bound to be confusion leading to the use of the wrong form at least in the early days.

response *Not accepted*

EASA Form 15c clearly indicates that it is applicable only to maintenance organisations. It can be used regardless of whether the maintenance programme is based on the MIP or not and whether it is approved by the NAA or declared by the owner.

Regarding the 2 extensions contained in EASA Forms 15a and 15b, they are just options for the case of controlled environment. It is not mandatory to use them.

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - II. Draft Opinion - Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 - Annex I (Part-M) - M.B.301 p. 42

comment *239* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency*

NPA Page 42, M.B.301
The only reference that MF/145 may have indirect approval of AMP is found in M.B.301. This should also be described in section A in the regulation. We suggest M.A.302 or M.A.615(f)/145.A.75(g).
Note: For CAMO this is found in M.A.302(c).

response *Noted*

The possibility for maintenance organisations to use indirect approval procedures has been eliminated.

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - II. Draft Opinion - Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 - Annex I (Part-M) - Appendix I p. 43-46

comment *9* comment by: *John DAVIES*

The airworthiness review certificate refers to airframe hours. This will require clarification for hot air balloon / hot air airships.
The "airframe hours" normally refers to the envelope for hot air balloons and the gondola for hot air airships. In some Member States, the hot air airship is alternatively defined as the envelope so a decision needs to be made and stated either in the rule or the AMC.
Note: Logic dictates that the gondola should be used for defining airframe hours for a hot air airship as the envelope can be replaced many times during the life

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	of the gondola and the gondola contains the engine and propeller. This is the situation in the UK and in the USA for all airships.
response	*Accepted* The ARC has been modified to exclude balloons and airships from the need to indicate the airframe hours. This is based on the difficulty to assign those airframe hours (gondola or envelope) and on the fact that the Minimum Inspection Programme (MIP) for balloons does not have a FH interval (only annual interval). For airships there is no MIP.

comment	*113* comment by: *British Gliding Association* Appendix III. Airworthiness Review Certificate form 15c An additional box is required to cater for Part M subpart G CAMO to issue the ARC when the minimum inspection programme is used. Rationale; CAMO's issue Form 15B currently even if the aircraft is not in a controlled environment where the owner is responsible for the airworthiness management, the 2 extension boxes are not used and add to confusion is it appears the aircraft may be in the controlled environment when it is not.
response	*Not accepted* EASA Form 15c clearly indicates that it is applicable only to maintenance organisations. It can be used regardless of whether the maintenance programme is based on the MIP or not and whether it is approved by the NAA or declared by the owner. Regarding the 2 extensions contained in EASA Forms 15a and 15b, they are just options for the case of controlled environment. It is not mandatory to use them.

comment	*140* comment by: *CAA-NL* Attachment #6 CAA-NL has developed some GM to clarify how to include the proper information on the ARC when issued by a CAMO. Please find attached this GM, and we would be happy if this will be used by EASA to write some AMC or GM or even to include this in the rule as with the text accompanying EASA Form 1.
response	*Noted* The Agency welcomes this document. Since it affects not only General Aviation but all types of aircraft and operations, the Agency prefers to discuss it during the ongoing rulemaking task (RMT.0521) dealing with the 'Review of the Airworthiness Review Process'.

comment	*154* comment by: *UK CAA* **Page No:** 45 **Paragraph No:** EASA Form 15c **Comment:** The proposed new EASA Form 15c contains the statement:

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

"Hereby certifies that it has performed an airworthiness review in accordance with point M.A.901(l) of Annex I to Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 on the following aircraft:"
The airworthiness review is detailed in M.A.710, the reference M.A.901(l) provides all the requirements for issuing an ARC for ELA1 aircraft which includes an airworthiness review.
Justification:
Corrects the detail of the referenced text.
Proposed Text:
Amend text to read:
"Hereby certifies that it has performed ~~an airworthiness review~~ **the requirements as stated in accordance** with point M.A.901(l) of Annex I to Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 on the following aircraft:".

response *Not accepted*

It wouldn't be true to certify that the requirements of M.A.901(l) have been performed. For example, at the time of the signature of the ARC the organisation has not sent a copy of the ARC to the State of Registry. It can only be certified that it has performed the airworthiness review.

comment *155* comment by: *UK CAA*

Page No: 45
Paragraph No: EASA Form 15c
Comment:
The ARC refers to 'Section A' in relation to Subpart F but not in relation to Part 145 which should also be included.
Justification:
For consistency with EASA Form 15b which refers to 'Section A' in relation to Subpart G.
Proposed Text:
Amend reference to read:
"Section A, Annex II (Part 145) to Commission Regulation (EC) 2042/2003"

response *Accepted*

comment *252* comment by: *Finnish Transport Safety Agency*

Appendix III: Airworthiness review certificate – EASA Form 15
Separate form for necessary information with ARC. Flying hours is not enough. There is also need to know who looks after airworthiness (CAMO, owner, member of club), maintenance program, it's revision and who has approved it, engine and propeller type and serial n:o, installed STCs and etc. For example in case of emergency AD for engine, it is impossible to know now, which aircrafts are effected.

response *Not accepted*

The purpose of adding the Flight Hours was to help the NAAs to know data of fleet utilisation. Adding all the information that you propose would excessively complicate EASA Form 15. All this information is retained by the CAMO.

comment *282* comment by: *Irish Aviation Authority*

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	EASA Forms 15a, 15b, and 15c – Organisations with the privileges of M.A.711 (a) (4) may, in accordance with point M.A.901(f) extend twice the validity of an ARC. The proposed Airworthiness Review Certificate now includes a space to record the "Airframe Flight Hours at date of issue [of the ARC or ARC extension]". Is the intention to include a requirement in M.A.901(f) for the person extending the ARC to review the flight hours?
response	*Noted* The purpose of adding the Flight Hours was to help the NAAs to know data of fleet utilisation. During the extension of the ARC, there is no need for auditing or checking how those Flight Hours were recorded. However, this is part of the airworthiness review when an ARC is re-issued.

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - II. Draft Opinion - Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 - Annex I (Part-M) - Appendix IV p. 47-50

comment	*83* comment by: *Luftsport Verband Bayern / Germany* **Appendix IV Table, 2nd row:** must read 5 700 kg (line break error)
response	*Accepted*

comment	*124* comment by: *CAA-NL* Part M Appendix IV, 13 table In the columns base and line there is an * without a explanation at the bottom of the table. Within A2 and A4 we suggest to also include the indirect approval privilege for AMP's in the column Limitations.
response	*Partially accepted* A footnote has been added explaining the meaning of the symbol '*'. The possibility for maintenance organisations to use indirect approval procedures has been removed.

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - II. Draft Opinion - Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 - Annex I (Part-M) - Appendix V p. 51-54

comment	*125* comment by: *CAA-NL* Part M Appendix V Approval form Within the text on page 1 just before the conditions, we suggest to also include the indirect approval privilege for AMP's, as well as in page 2 under the limitation section for aircraft.
response	*Not accepted* The possibility for maintenance organisations to use indirect approval procedures has been removed.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

comment	*240* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency* **NPA Page 51-52, Form 3-MF** The EASA Form 3-MF should have Issue 3.
response	*Accepted*

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - II. Draft Opinion - Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 - Annex I (Part-M) - new Appendix IX p. 54-68

comment	*3* comment by: *Jari LYYTINEN* In my experience the main difficulty with the current requirement of approved maintenance programme is the strict format requirement for a maintenance programme laid down in Appendix 1 to AMC M.A.302, which distracts the focus of stakeholders to secondary format issues from the main issue -collecting all maintenance needs of an aircraft to one single document, including the tasks required less frequently than every year, and ensuring that the person responsible for airworthiness management has made himself aware of all maintenance instructions of his aircraft. Introducing more options for the basis of maintenance programme would not simplify the system and allowing the maintenance programme to be not based on TC holder instructions would be problematic in view of TC holder responsibilities. A better solution could be issuing an AMC for general aviation aircraft maintenance programme that would concentrate on the issue and leave the format of the document to be chosen freely.
response	*Partially accepted* The Agency does not agree that introducing more simple options complicates the system. In addition, even if the MIP is used, the instructions of the Design Approval Holder still need to be considered. In Phase II, it will be analysed how to produce a simplified format of Part-M for use by the General Aviation community.

comment	*10* comment by: *John DAVIES* Minimum Inspection Programme "To be performed every annual interval, whichever comes first." does not make sense presumably should read. "To be performed every 100 hours or annual interval, whichever comes first".
response	*Accepted*

comment	*11* comment by: *John DAVIES* Minimum inspection programme-ELA-1 Balloons General Markings: Balloons do not have wings Registration is usually marked on the envelope. Weighing: Part-NCO does not require weighing of balloons

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

response | *Partially accepted*

The wording related to 'markings' has been removed.

Regarding the weighing, NCO.POL.105 requires to establish the mass of balloons before they enter into service and when the effect of modifications on the mass is not accurately known.

comment | *12* comment by: *John DAVIES*

Minimum Inspection Programme
At the present time all manufacturers have well developed Maintenance Schedules for their product. In contrast to some aviation products, they are relatively brief documents (the current CB Maintenance schedule is seven pages including space for recording serial numbers, grab test results etc.) that contain the minimum information to maintain airworthiness.
It is difficult to see how the Minimum Inspection Programme can maintain the same level of safety in its present format.
For example (this is not a complete list):

"*Inspect for tears, holes and burn damages"*: Are holes tears and burn damage acceptable? If so how many size, location etc.
"Perform grab-test on minimum two (2ea) gores/panels (as required by age/condition)": At what age?/when does condition dictate a grab test is needed? What about different colours? What is the grab test value?
No electrical continuity check for gas balloons that could hold Hydrogen?
In the above cases the obvious answer is to use the manufacturer's data but if you need to refer to the manufacturer's documents you may as well use them in their entirety.
If EASA are convinced a Minimum Inspection Programme will be required for ELA1 then it should be developed with the aid of the manufacturers, inspectors and maintenance organisations to ensure the level of safety is not reduced. It will be a difficult task to produce a programme which is significantly shorter than the existing manufacturers documents without compromising the content.
It is also difficult to understand why the intended use should affect the physical inspection standard. EASA is proposing a single category of inspector (not a non-commercial/commercial rating) so one would assume that if the inspector declares a balloon or assembly is airworthy, it is safe for use in commercial or non-commercial operations.
Balloons are different to light aircraft

response | *Noted*

The purpose of the Minimum Inspection Programme is to set the minimum required:

— If the maintenance instructions from the DAH are poor, even if the owner decides to use such data the requirement states that the maintenance programme cannot go below the Minimum Inspection Programme.

— It the maintenance instructions from the DAH are adequate, there are 2 options:
  - If the owner chooses to follow those instructions, this is adequate.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

- If the owner chooses to follow the Minimum Inspection Programme, the proposal states that the recommendations from the DAH still need to be considered (see fields 5, 10, and 13 of the template in AMC M.A.302(e)).

comment | *28* comment by: *BPvL e. V.*

It must be clear that this 100 hrs / annual inspection cannot be performed under pilot's owner maintenance approval due to requirements of special tools, training and experience in maintaining aircraft.

response | *Accepted*

Appendix VIII 'Limited Pilot-Owner Maintenance' has been amended

comment | *35* comment by: *CAMO - Klaus Lehmköster, DE.MG.1016*

Page 55 and following:
Uuups, are the aircraft maintenance checklists not longer valid?
With these checklists it is not possible to do the minimum maintenance for a C172. What will Cessna tell you?
For a M20J this minimum inspection programm is too much. Why I have to do more than the OEM wants?

response | *Noted*

The purpose of the Minimum Inspection Programme is to set the minimum.

If the manufacturer's programme is too simple, the minimum is the Minimum Inspection Programme.

If the manufacturer's programme is more strict and the owner decides to use the Minimum Inspection Programme, the owner has to take into account the other recommendations from the Design Approval Holder. He/she may decide, under its own responsibility, to deviate from them, but he/she will not be able to go below the Minimum Inspection Programme.

comment | *55* comment by: *AOPA-Sweden*

Information on where to find (i.e. TCDS) information on the certified limits to static rpm etc should be included, perhaps in the AMC.

response | *Not accepted*

The Agency does not believe that Part-M is the proper place to indicate the certified limits.

comment | *84* comment by: *Luftsport Verband Bayern / Germany*

Appendix IX:
Aeroplanes, general: "weight" instead of "weigh"
Aeroplanes, general: National requirements should be referred too (e.g. registration mark and papers, airworthiness certificate, insurance etc.)

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Aeroplanes: There are a lot of differences between the aeroplane section and the sailplanes section, e.g. "pitot and static system", "bonding", "harnesses", "seats", "rudder pedals", "rudder cables" etc. missing in the aeroplane section. The content of both sections should be rechecked.
Electronic engine control: "check for chafing" missing
Sailplanes, general: "weight" instead of "weigh":
Avionics and electrics: The recommended capacity check of batteries should be deleted. The pilots do have a very high interest to keep their electronic equipment operative for a complete long flight so they will change batteries anyway if they loose capacity. Additionally batteries may not be directly assigned to an aircraft (e.g. in clubs).
Miscellaneous: The check of the chute should be deleted as the chute is normally not directly assigned to the aircraft.
Powerplant: The recommended capacity check of batteries should be deleted.

response

Partially accepted

The proper word is 'weigh' (verb). The word 'weight' is a noun.

Registration papers, airworthiness certificate, insurance papers, etc. are not part of the annual inspection because the annual inspection is only related to continuing airworthiness.

In the particular case of the airworthiness certificate, its existence will be checked during the airworthiness review but not during the annual inspection.

Your proposals for deleting the capacity check of batteries and the check of the chute have not been accepted. If they are installed on the aircraft, they have to be checked. If they are frequently changed between different aircraft, their condition should be checked before installation.

Nevertheless, taking into account that these programmes have been moved from Appendix IX to AMC M.A.302(i), the Agency will use the time taken by the Comitology process to perform a full review in order to ensure consistency between the 3 different programmes.

comment *115* comment by: *British Gliding Association*

British Gliding Association
Appendix IX Minimum Inspection Programme (1)
To make it clear to owners a statement at the beginning of each task list to include check items of less than 100 hours must be included if specified in the ICA.
Rationale;
It could be deduced by owners preparing their own maintenance programme to include the minimum inspection programme that these more frequent checks were not needed and can be omitted. 25 and 50 hour checks are very important especially for engine lubrication and servicing.
Appendix IX Minimum Inspection Programme (2)
Amend the 10% tolerance statement to state the extension need not be deducted from the next check cycle. See previous comment on this subject.

response

Not accepted

This is already specified in the template contained in AMC M.A.302(e) (see field 5, where it refers to tasks with an interval different to 100 h and/or annual)

comment *118* comment by: *Gerhard HOOGESLAG*

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Remark 1:

Check that ~~side and under-wing~~ registration markings are correct.

Just because most balloons 'fly' without 'wings'.

Remark 2:

Just as in the (powered) sailplanes section I would like to recommended adding:

Lubrication/servicing : Lubricate in accordance with manufacturer's requirements.

response *Accepted*

comment *128* comment by: *Gerhard HOOGESLAG*

If a 'minimum' of two gores/panels is added to the inspection programme it makes sense to add 'on each color' and 'on each type of fabric' (long-life fabric and standard fabric).

Mentioning a grabtest on the internal parts of the side- or turningvents and parachute should be considered.

An alternative could be: A grabtest in accordance with manufacturer's requirements.

response *Accepted*

comment *156* comment by: *UK CAA*

Page No: 54
Paragraph No: Appendix IX: Minimum Inspection Programmes
Comment:
The Appendix text does not make any reference that further additional tasks may need to be added for the specific aircraft type, configuration, and operation as detailed in point M.A.302(h)3.
Justification:
To ensure consistency and a complete maintenance programme.
Proposed Text:
Amend to include the text in bold below:
"Appendix IX: Minimum Inspection Programmes
This Appendix contains the 'Minimum Inspection Programme' referred to in point M.A.302(h). It is applicable to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations and is divided into the following categories:
• ELA1 Aeroplanes;
• ELA1 Sailplanes and ELA1 powered sailplanes;
• ELA1 Balloons.
Any additional maintenance tasks to be performed because of the specific aircraft type, aircraft configuration and type and specificity of operation as described in point M.A.302(h)3 should be added.
In the absence of a 'Minimum Inspection Programme' for ELA1 airships, the Design Approval Holder maintenance data shall be used as the basis for their maintenance programme."

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

response	*Accepted*

comment	*157* comment by: *UK CAA* **Page No:** 55 - 65 **Paragraph No:** Appendix IX **Comment:** Minimum Inspection Programmes for ELA1 aircraft and ELA1 sailplanes and powered sailplanes are described. There are significant differences between the two programmes, with that for the sailplanes containing more tasks (2 more pages). The aeroplane MIP does not address a number of maintenance items which are covered in the Sailplane and Balloon versions but are equally, if not more, applicable to aeroplanes. Examples include: Undercarriage lubrication, batteries electrolyte and when necessary, capacity checks, spark plug replacement, magneto inspection, Avionics operational checks/ function checks (e.g. Transponders), pitot/static instrument calibration checks. For each system/component/area heading the task should, generally, have similar content, e.g. "General – all tasks" for aeroplanes: "clean aircraft and open access points". For sailplanes: "aircraft must be clean, inspect for…". The content of the Minimum Inspection Programme for aircraft should be reviewed against that for the sailplanes with the objective to have a consistent approach to both and for the content for aircraft to be more reflective of the build and general equipment/systems fit, particularly for Avionics and electrical items,. Consideration should also be given to including tasks relevant to aircraft constructed using composite materials. **Justification:** These are basic tasks and could be related to safety, it is appropriate to include them. As these are examples only it would be appropriate to review the entire task list.
response	*Noted* Taking into account the urgency to issue the Opinion for the changes to the regulation, and since the content of Appendix IX has been moved to AMC M.A.302(i), the Agency will use the time taken by the Comitology process to perform a full review in order to ensure consistency between the 3 different programmes.

comment	*206* comment by: *FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation* A note has been included in the MIP to clarify that the manufacturers maintenance manuals must be used when accomplishing the "specific" maintenance instructions. The GIPAG France would like to know the reference of the term "specific". What is more, the GIPAG France is asking why is there no tolerance defined for the calendar interval?
response	*Noted* The wording has been replaced by the following: 'Use the manufacturer's maintenance manual to accomplish each task/inspection.'

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

comment	*283* comment by: *Irish Aviation Authority* Appendix IX, Minimum Inspection Programmes, "*Minimum Inspection Programme for ELA1 aeroplanes not involved in commercial operations*" does not require Instruments or Electronic Equipment to be checked per the manufacturer's instructions while the "*Minimum Inspection Programme for ELA1 Sailplane and ELA1 Powered Sailplane not involved in commercial operations*" does. Is it the intention that the Sailplane and Powered Sailplane MIP would be more restrictive than the MIP for aeroplanes?
response	*Noted* Every MIP has at the top a note indicating .Use the manufacturer's maintenance manual to accomplish each task/inspection.'

comment	*332* comment by: *Cessna Aircraft Company* **Comment:** Minimum Inspection Programme guidelines has multiple lines items which check for "Improper Installation". It is possible to have proper installation with a latent failure of a secondary/back-up system. **Suggested Change:** Add an additional note to each aircraft class: *"Note: Proper function of back-up or secondary systems and components should be included for every instance where a check is made for Improper Operation."*
response	*Accepted*

comment	*335* comment by: *Gerhard Meixner* Annual transponder and pitot-static test should be added to the Minimum Inspection Programme. Justification: The broadcast message of the transponder Mode C & S includes the aircrafts altitude. This information needs to be correct in any case, since anti-collision systems like TCAS are using this information for its calculations.
response	*Accepted*

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - III. Draft Opinion - Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 - Annex II (Part-145) - 145.A.30 p. 69-71

comment	*127* comment by: *CAA-NL* 145.A.30. Personnel requirements We suggest to include the supervised review for AR staff within an AMO. We disagree with the proposal to not to require the AR-staff to perform an AR under supervision. The added value of the AR on top of just maintenance is within the control of the maintenance of the aircraft and this is just not the first expertise of a maintenance organisation but of the CAMO. If someone could skip the supervised review it would be the person within the CAMO. (l) Airworthiness review staff nominated by the approved maintenance organisation can only be issued an authorisation by the approved maintenance

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	organisation when formally accepted by the competent authority after satisfactory completion of an airworthiness review under supervision.
response	*Accepted*

comment	*291* comment by: *AESA* On 145.A.30 e): - Competence of personnel: 145.A.30 e) and M.A.606 should be modified to include reference to the maintenance programme development: " *The organisation shall establish and control the competence of personnel involved in any maintenance, development of maintenance programmes if applicable, management and/or quality audits…*
response	*Accepted*

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - III. Draft Opinion - Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 - Annex II (Part-145) - new 145.A.36 p. 71-72

comment	*130* comment by: *CAA-NL* 145.A.36 Records of AR staff We suggest for clarity of who may act on behalf of the approved organisation to include those persons who can approve AMP's under the indirect approval privilege on behalf of the approved organisation in the list mentioned here: (The approved maintenance organisation shall record all details concerning airworthiness review staff and staff that may approve AMP's on behalf of the organisation and maintain a current list of all airworthiness review staff and staff that may approve AMP's on behalf of the organisation together with their scope of approval as part of the organisation's manual exposition to point 145.A.70(a)6.
response	*Not accepted* The possibility for maintenance organisations to use indirect approval procedures has been removed.

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - III. Draft Opinion - Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 - Annex II (Part-145) - 145.A.70 p. 72-73

comment	*132* comment by: *CAA-NL* Part 145.A.70(a)5. Maintenance organisation exposition We suggest for clarity of who may act on behalf of the approved organisation to include those persons who can approve AMP's under the indirect approval privilege on behalf of the approved organisation in the list mentioned here: 6. a list of certifying staff and, if applicable, airworthiness review staff with their scope of approval, and staff that may approve AMP's on behalf of the organisation;
response	*Not accepted* The possibility for maintenance organisations to use indirect approval

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

procedures has been removed.

comment *292* comment by: *AESA*

On 145.A.70:
In the current regulation, the contract between the owner and the CAMO is not required to be approved. However the CAMO has to list the aircraft managed in CAME 0.2 General Information c).
In the same way the contract for the development of a Maintenance Programme by a part 145 of MF organisation is not required to be approved either, but in this case MOE and MOM do not contain the list of aircraft.

response *Not accepted*

The Agency does not consider this necessary. The maintenance organisation does not manage the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft, it just develops the maintenance programme.

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - III. Draft Opinion - Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 - Annex II (Part-145) - 145.A.75 p. 73-74

comment *133* comment by: *CAA-NL*

145.A.75(g) Privileges of the organisation
We suggest to add e few words to this point to make sure this is an option as with point (f)
(g) develop the maintenance programme and process its approval in accordance with point M.A.302 for ELA2 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, under the conditions specified in point M.A.201(e)(ii), if specifically approved to do so.

response *Not accepted*

The possibility for maintenance organisations to use indirect approval procedures has been removed. The Agency does not consider necessary to specify whether the organisation is approved to develop maintenance programmes. Having the corresponding procedures and qualified personnel are sufficient.

comment *296* comment by: *AESA*

On 145.A.75 (g):
The articles referring to the privileges of the organizations Part 145s and Part M Subpart F (145.A.75 and M.A 615) should be modified in order to link this new privilege to the scope approved to perform maintenance. As it is written, any Part 145/Part M subpart F could develop a maintenance programme, including for example maintenance organisations approved only with rating C (components other than engines) or D (specialized services). The proposal is underlined:
145.A.75 Privileges of the organisation
(g) Develop the maintenance programme and process its approval in accordance with point M.A.302 for ELA2 aircraft not involved in commercial operations and listed in the approval certificate, under the conditions specified

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	in point M.A.201(e)(ii).
response	*Accepted*

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - III. Draft Opinion - Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 - Annex II (Part-145) - Appendix III p. 75-76

comment	*135* comment by: *CAA-NL* Part 145 Appendix III Approval form Within the text on page 1 just before the conditions, we suggest to also include the indirect approval privilege for AMP's, as well as in page 2 in note (****) to the limitation section for aircraft.
response	*Not accepted* The possibility for maintenance organisations to use indirect approval procedures has been removed.

comment	*241* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency* **NPA Page 75-76,** Appendix III The EASA Form 3-145 should have Issue 3.
response	*Accepted*

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - IV. Draft Decision - Annex I (AMC to Part-M) p. 77

comment	*177* comment by: *FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation* In case of limited contract for development of an MP combined with declaration by the owner, the respective responsibilities of the owner/contracted organisation are not clear in AMC M.A.201(e). Associations and corporate bodies shall have nominated Accountable Manager and relevant procedures to identify the decision process for submitting owner's MP. In addition to this comment, the GIPAG France do not agree with the fact that the owner can issue a declaration for his/her own aircraft's maintenance programme which would not need to be approved by th competent authority. The GIPAG France suggests either: -to replace M.A.302 (h) 4. By: "Any amendment on the maintenance programme made by the owner of the aircraft can be issue if it has been submitted and accepted by the relevant and competent legal authority" Or: - to modify M.A.302 (h) 4. as following: "The aircraft maintenance programme contains a signed statement where the owner declares that this is the aircraft maintenance programme for the particular aircraft registration."
response	*Partially accepted* AMC M.A.201(e) has been revised in order to make clear the responsibilities.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

The current rule already allows the owner to completely manage the continuing airworthiness of his/her aircraft under his/her own responsibility. In addition, the option of self-declaration has been limited to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations and compensating measures have been introduced, as the review of the effectiveness of the maintenance programme at the time of the airworthiness review.

Furthermore, GM M.A.201(e) clearly reminds the owner to carefully self-asess his/her competence.

As a consequence, the Agency retains the proposal for declaration of the maintenance programme by the owner.

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - IV. Draft Decision - Annex I (AMC to Part-M) - AMC M.A.201(e) p. 77

comment *89* comment by: *Luftfahrt-Bundesamt*

AMC M.A.201 (e) Responsibilities
The changes of the AMC wording are not clear. It is already the first sentence with the supplement 'when applicable' that is not comprehensible.
The new second paragraph is redundant. It describes the possibility that the owner/operator can make a limited contract with a CAMO or a maintenance organisation (Part-145, M-F organisation) according to M.A.201 (e) and that the organisation does not bear any responsibility. This possibility, however, exists at any time and falls under private law so that it is not necessary to mention it in a regulation. Especially the reference to M.A.302 (e) leads to misunderstandings. The question is why should an owner who issues a declaration for his/her own maintenance programme still make la limited contract? This AMC introduces a further limited contract "for the development" that is unnecessary.

response *Accepted*

AMC M.A.201(e) has been completely reworded. GM M.A.302(h) has been added.

comment *158* comment by: *UK CAA*

Page No: 77
Paragraph No: AMC M.A.201(e)
Comment:
This paragraph has deleted the requirement for a contracted Subpart G organisation but refers to the use of the 'Indirect approval procedure' in M.A.302(c). However M.A. 302(c) refers only to Subpart G organisations.
Justification:
It is unclear where the link is between the use of the 'Indirect approval procedure' and Part M Subpart F/ Part 145 organisations.

response *Noted*

The possibility for maintenance organisations to use the indirect approval procedure has been removed.

comment *159* comment by: *UK CAA*

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Page No: 77
Paragraph No: AMC M.A.201(e)
Comment:
The new paragraph makes reference to '....the owner is fully responsibility....'
Justification: This is incorrect English.
Proposed Text: '....the owner is fully **responsible**....'

response *Accepted*

The text has been completely reworded.

comment *308* comment by: *AESA*

On AMC M.A.201(e) Responsibilities:
Second paragraph "…in accordance with M.A.301(h),.." should say " in accordance with M.A.302 (h)"
"… in accordance with M.A.201(e)," should say "… in accordance with M.A.201(e) ii"

response *Accepted*

The paragraph has been completely reworded.

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - IV. Draft Decision - Annex I (AMC to Part-M) - new AMC M.A.302(e) p. 78-85

comment *29* comment by: *BPvL e. V.*

The example is good as a basis for a maintenance programme, but again, most of the owners will be overstrained to answer all these questions.
Especially with older aircraft we as professionals are sometimes working for days on end to get all the information needed for a maintenance programme due to poor historical documents and the need to survey the aircraft to find out the status of it.

response *Noted*

That is precisely the reason for requiring a maintenance programme. To make sure that the status of the aircraft in known.

The introduction of Minimum Inspections Programmes will help in those cases where there are very poor maintenance instructions.

comment *37* comment by: *CAMO - Klaus Lehmköster, DE.MG.1016*

Pilot-Owner Maintenance:
The tasks for a pilot-owner maintenance, see Part-M, AMC to Appendix VIII "Limited Pilot Owner Maintenance", have to be reviewed completly.
For a pilot-owner of an ELA1 aircraft it must be allowed to do the complete maintenance published in the aircraft maintenance manual, inclusive CRS.
Remark:
The checklists in Part-M, AMC to Appendix VIII "Limited Pilot Owner Maintenance", for CS22 aircrafts have a general failure.
According to CS22 it is not allowed to use the ATA-system for the manuals. There is an other own system for CS22 aircrafts.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	Compare it with CS23. Here it is strongly recommended to use ATA.
response	*Not accepted* Only those tasks which meet the requirements of Appendix VIII to Part-M can be performed by the pilot-owner. In order to extend them, it would be necessary that the pilot-owner is appropriately qualified (not just self-assessment).

comment	*56* comment by: *AOPA-Sweden* Information on where to find Mandatory Continuing Airworthiness Instructions (i.e. TCDS) should be included, here or perhaps in AMC.
response	*Not accepted* The Agency does not believe that Part-M is the proper place to indicate where to find MCAI. This includes very different type of information such as ADs, ALIs, CMRs, etc.

comment	*70* comment by: *BCAA - G. Pierlot* **PAGE / POINT / PARAGRAPH / SECTION OUR COMMENT IS RELATED TO:** **AMC M.A.302(e) : AMP template – frame 5** **PROPOSED TEXT / COMMENT:** (...) provide such details by reference to particular documents/manuals/checklists (including revision level status, ~~**which should be updated at the time of the Periodic Reviews referred to in Table 3**~~ **which can be referred at their latest available revision**) **RATIONALE / REASON / JUSTIFICATION FOR THE COMMENT:** One major issue with the AMP is the burden of time needed to update the maintenance data revision status during the Periodic Reviews. This need to update the maintenance data reference in a DAH based AMP will push the owner to choose a more "static" MIP based AMP. As the current maintenance data has to be referred to on the work card /work sheet systems (AMC M.A.401(c)4), it would be easier to only refer to the maintenance data via their "latest available revision" in the AMP. As far as the maintenance revision status can be checked via a work card / work sheet system, the added value of the accurate reference in the AMP is really limited. The proposition only aims to define the manual reference at its latest available revision : if the maintenance data system is completely changed (e.g. changing the whole maintenance manual reference), the periodic review will require the change of the manual reference.
response	*Not accepted* Even if the owner decides to use the MIP, he/she still needs to review the other recommendations from the DAH and record them in the template. Having the revision level of the maintenance instructions is essential to make sure that the owner has reviewed those instructions.

comment	*85* comment by: *Luftsport Verband Bayern / Germany*

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	AMC M.A.302 (e): The pilot owner signature should be placed at the end of the document and the list of pilot/owners should be located after the signature so that the list can be exchanged without having the program affected.
response	*Noted* This is an AMC. As a consequence, the location of the different fields may be changed as long as all the information is retained. However, please note that changing the list of pilot-owners implies a change to the MP, which means that there will be a new Revision number of the MP and this revision will have to be recorded in Table 4. In addition, every time the MP changes, there is a need for a new approval by the NAA or a new declaration (with the new date).

comment	*126* comment by: *British Gliding Association* British Gliding Association AMC M.A.302(e) maintenance programme example Pilot-Owner Maintenance. As the list of tasks is already included in Part M, AMC to Appendix VIII parts A, B, C & D allow a reference to this AMC or other document detailing pilot-owner maintenance rather than producing the list again. Rationale: Duplicate list of tasks is unnecessary and leads to errors when updated.
response	*Not accepted* The list of Pilot-owner tasks in the template is not just a copy of the Appendix VIII. The Pilot-owner has to evaluate (self-assessment) for which tasks he is competent.

comment	*129* comment by: *British Gliding Association* British Gliding Association Maintenance programme Table 4 The review and conclusion of the effectiveness of the maintenance programme should be removed and included in the airworthiness review checklist. Rationale; This is an airworthiness review task.
response	*Not accepted* If we remove table 4, it would be impossible to keep track of the changes to the maintenance programme. Please note that the airworthiness review may not be done by the same organisation every year.

comment	*136* comment by: *CAA-NL* AMC M.A.302(e) example format. To enhance the awareness of the owner using the self declaration that the aircraft then cannot be used for commercial operations anymore we suggewst to include the following words in the declaration: 'I hereby declare that this is the maintenance programme applicable to the aircraft referred to in fields 3 and 4 and I am fully responsible for its content and, in particular, for any deviations introduced as regards the Design Approval

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	Holder recommendations. I am fully aware that this aircraft cannot be operated for commercial operations' Further we would like to suggest to EASA to develop additional AMC what an owner has to do when he wants his aircraft to be eligible again for commercial operations.
response	*Accepted*

comment	*160* comment by: *UK CAA* **Page No:** 78 **Paragraph No:** AMC M.A.302(e) **Comment:** The new example of an Aircraft Maintenance Programme (for aircraft other than 'complex motor-powered aircraft') includes an entry for pilot-owner maintenance. For Pilot-owner maintenance a CRS can only be issued by the Pilot on aircraft below 2730kg. Pilot owner maintenance can only be applied on privately operated non-complex motor-powered aircraft of 2730 kg MTOM and below, sailplane, powered sailplane or balloon. **Justification:** The entry for Pilot-owner maintenance should clearly state that it is applicable to aircraft below 2730 kg to provide clarity and avoid misuse. **Proposed Text:** Amend 'Pilot-Owner Maintenance' box to read: **"(Pilot owner maintenance can only be applied on privately operated non-complex motor-powered aircraft of 2730 kg MTOM and below, sailplane, powered sailplane or balloon)** Are there any maintenance actions performed by the Pilot-owner (ref. Part-M, M.A.803)? Enter in Table 1: • The list of tasks • The name of the pilot-owner(s) or the alternative procedure described in AMC M.A.803 point 3."
response	*Accepted*

comment	*161* comment by: *UK CAA* **Page No:** 78 **Paragraph No:** AMC M.A.302(e) **Comment:** The example of an Aircraft Maintenance Programme is for use for aircraft other than 'complex motor-powered aircraft'. M.A.302(e) is not applicable to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations as M.A.302(h) derogates from this point. Therefore it is incorrect to reference in the example maintenance programme the details for this new relaxed requirement for this classification of aircraft. **Justification:** Current reference does not include all aircraft that are detailed in the example programme. **Proposed Text:** Amend referenced point as highlighted below: AMC M.A.302(e) **and M.A.302(h)** Aircraft Maintenance programme.
response	*Not accepted*

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Please note that AMC M.A.302(h), paragraph 2 already states that the maintenance programme may take the format of the example provided in AMC M.A.302(e). This makes the template applicable to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations.

comment

162 comment by: *UK CAA*

Page No: 80
Paragraph No: AMC M.A.302(e) Aircraft maintenance programme: "Basic information for the maintenance programme"
Comment:
When an owner has decided to use the Minimum Inspection Programme the wording of the requirement should be such that the review of maintenance data from the design Approval Holder is required and is not optional.
Justification:
Experience in the UK has shown that this is an area of considerable debate and confusion. A clear, concise set of instructions should be given to ensure the maintenance programme is correctly developed.
Proposed Text:
Amend the 4th paragraph as highlighted below:
"In the case of ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, if the option selected is to follow the 'Minimum Inspection Programme', the owner ~~should~~ **shall** review the maintenance data from the Design Approval Holder to identify if there are specific inspections to be performed at intervals different to 100 hours and/or annual interval."

response

Not accepted

It is not possible to use mandatory wording in AMC material.

comment

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

The GIPAG France agrees with and supports this proposal.
The current format of the aircraft MP has inflated in too high proportions. The GIPAG France asks the format for the aircraft MP to be revised and deflated. A lighter format seems to be more appropriate and is welcome.
To that extract, the GIPAG France suggests:
- To suppress sections 1 to 6. This would avoid documentary burden and allow to concentrate on safety task.
- To add a field to identify Authority requirements;
- The possibility to extend applicability of the template to complex motor powered aircraft. This option should be studied (in particular, when the aircraft is managed by a CAMO, the organisation has procedures and systems to manage the detailed customisation of MP and scheduling of tasks);
- A customisation of MP to aircraft definition.

response

Partially accepted

The Agency does not agree with suppressing the fields 1 to 6 of the template. This is essential information to identify the owner and the aircraft.

There is already a field (field 11) for 'national operational and airspace directives/requirements which have not been superseded by European rules'. No other national requirements can be introduced.

Extending the use of the template to complex motor-powered aircraft is outside

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	the Terms of Reference of this task. Regarding the level of customisation of the MP, it will be decided by the owner/operator.
comment	*242* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency* **NPA Page 78, AMC M.A.302(e) "Template"** Is it correct that it is possible to use the AMP "template" (AMC M.A.302(e)) in CAT (non-CMPA)?
response	*Accepted* Yes.
comment	*243* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency* **NPA Page 79, AMC M.A.302(e) "Template"** It should be noted in the AMP what maintenance data (from the Design Approval Holder) it is developed from, including the revision number. This will help the ARS during the annual review of the AMP.
response	*Noted* This is already required in field 5 of the template.
comment	*244* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency* **NPA Page 80, AMC M.A.302(e) "Template"** In the field 5 in AMP "template" (AMC M.A.302(e)): *"In the case of ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, if the option selected is to follow the maintenance data from the Design Approval Holder, at least the manuals referred to in the latest version of the TCDS (type Certificate Data Sheet) should be followed."* What shall the owner do when he/she select a declaration-AMP (DAHD) and there is no reference to maintenance data such as Maintenance Manual in the TCDS? For example: Piper PA 28 (TCDS 2A13, Revision 50).
response	*Noted* Since the manuals referred in the TCDS are considered mandatory information (M.A.302(h)3, 4th bullet point), the text has been amended in field 5 to refer to maintenance manuals and maintenance schedules.
comment	*263* comment by: *Howard Torode* Page 81, - AMC302(e) – Pilot Owner Maintenance This list is a repeat from Part M, AMC to Appendix VIII which should be referenced here rather than repeated.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Rationale

As a point of principle we feel that PO maintenance (as a measure to meet unscheduled arisings) should not be mixed with the sort of scheduled maintenance carried out by licensed organisations/individuals as considered herein. Even if this premise is not accepted there seems no case for this duplication.

response *Not accepted*

This is not just a repeat of the tasks contained in Appendix VIII to AMC. The Pilot-owner has to decide for which tasks he/she is competent (after self-assessment).

comment *278* comment by: *Irish Aviation Authority*

M.A.302 (h) (3) and AMC M.A.302 (e) require the owner/organisation to review all maintenance recommendations issued via Service Bulletins, Service Information Letters etc. for the aircraft, engine(s), propeller(s) and all fitted equipment. This may prove onerous to many organisations/owners developing maintenance programmes, especially for older aircraft. It mandates the review of such recommendations while the NPA, in para 44, shows that such recommendations are not mandatory.

response *Noted*

This proposal is retained in order to ensure that the owner is, at least, aware of the recommendations.

comment *309* comment by: *AESA*

On AMC M.A 302 (e) Aircraft Maintenance Programme template:
Section **Basic information for the maintenance programme** indicates "List of maintenance tasks for the aircraft/engine/propeller **or** reference to particular documents/manuals/checklists"
It is acceptable then to have a reference to other documents. This option is welcome; however consideration should be taken regarding the status of the revisions of the documentation referenced. Without indicating revision status it is not clear which documentation really is contained in the maintenance programme. Adding the sentence "as latest revision" is not a solution because it is not clear if the latest revision published is the latest evaluated and incorporated into the Maintenance Programme.
The proposal is to add "…or reference to particular documents/manuals/checklists, <u>including revision status</u>" also in the line which appears isolated at the end of that section.

response *Accepted*

comment *310* comment by: *AESA*

<u>On AMC M.A 302 (e) Aircraft Maintenance Programme template, section on approval / declaration:</u>
The statement signed by the owner of CAMO (point 1.1.4 of Appendix I to AMC M.A 302 and AMC M.B.301 (b) Content of the Maintenance Programme) should be included in the template

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

response | *Accepted*

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - IV. Draft Decision - Annex I (AMC to Part-M) - new AMC M.A.302(h) p. 86

comment | *276* comment by: *Irish Aviation Authority*

M.A.302 (h) (2) and AMC M.A.302 (e) may be interpreted as meaning that an owner using the Minimum Inspection Programme(MIP) does not have to comply with M.A.302 paras (d) and (e). Would this allow the owner to use the MIP and exclude any instructions issued by the competent authority, the Design Approval Holder, or additional tasks proposed by the owner/CAMO?

response | *Noted*

Even if the owner decides to use the MIP for the basic information of the maintenance programme, he/she still has to customise it in accordance with M.A.302(h)3. The template contained in AMC M.A.302(e) includes additional instructions from the DAH (see fields 5, 10 and 13).

comment | *279* comment by: *Irish Aviation Authority*

AMC M.A.302 (h) (1) What provision is made for aircraft moving from one self-declared (e.g. not approved) maintenance programme to another self-declared programme or an approved programme?

response | *Noted*

There is no special provision for the case where the aircraft moves from one declared MP to another declared MP (because of change of owner). The existing provisions of the rule apply.

Please note that the intention of AMC M.A.302(h)1 is to cover cases where there is a change in the type of operation.

comment | *306* comment by: *AESA*

On AMC M.A.302 (h) point 1:
Transfer check or inspection:
Further detail is necessary: the transfer check should cover the bridge programme elements

response | *Not accepted*

The Agency does not feel that there is a need for more details.

comment | *318* comment by: *ENAC - Ente Nazionale per l'Aviazione Civile*

AMC M.A.302(h):
It should be clarified that contents of aircraft maintenance programme declared by the owner can be questioned during annual review and/or airworthiness review, or during ACAM activities only if detected discrepancies show deficiencies in the content of the maintenance program. Request for amendment of the maintenance programme to the owner can be filed only

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	when supported by discrepancies detected as results of annual review and/or airworthiness review and not only based on a different point of view matured by ARS or NAA from different background, feeling or experience
response	*Accepted* See new GM M.A.302(h).

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - IV. Draft Decision - Annex I (AMC to Part-M) - AMC M.A.605(a) p. 86-87

comment	*4* comment by: *Andreas Keiser* It should be defined which scope of work requires what kind of facility standards.
response	*Accepted* A special paragraph has been created for ELA2 aircraft.

comment	*179* comment by: *FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation* In the AMC M.A.605(a) 1. refers to "alternative suitable facilities". It is unclear whether the alternative suitable facilities include outdoor activities. To that extend, the GIPAG France requests: - That the suitability of such a facility shall be defined by the organisation on its own. - For maintenance operations that can be performed outside a hangar, the possibility to perform these operations at a location not listed on the Part M/F certificate, including on a regular basis, should be introduced, subject to an appropriate procedure in the exposition. M.A.615(c) would therefore need to be revised. This would allow Part M/F organisations to be in a position to offer a reactive answer to their customers like their independent certifying staff competitors. The terms "remote location" should also be defined.
response	*Accepted* A special paragraph has been created for ELA2 aircraft.

comment	*319* comment by: *ENAC - Ente Nazionale per l'Aviazione Civile* **AMC M.A.605(a) Facilities:** The alleviation provided under added statement in point 1) of the AMC should be explicitly extended also to other type of aircraft . This will be helpful when MF AMO is maintenance support (routine maintenance, certain defect rectification, minor maintenance, etc) to operators involved in commercial operations other than commercial air transport (aerial school and flying school) .
response	*Accepted*

comment	*320* comment by: *ENAC - Ente Nazionale per l'Aviazione Civile*

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	AMC M.A.605(a) Facilities: The alleviation provided under added statement in point 1) of the AMC should be explicitly extended also to other type of aircraft . This will be helpful when MF AMO is maintenance support (routine maintenance, certain defect rectification, minor maintenance, etc) to operators involved in commercial operations other than commercial air transport (aerial school and flying school) . Proposed change to **AMC M.A.605 point 1** ……. Depending on the scope of work of the maintenance organisation, it may not be necessary to have a hangar available. For example, an organisation maintaining ELA2 aircraft ~~sailplanes~~ (when not performing major repairs) may perform the work in alternative suitable facilities (and possibly at remote locations) as agreed by the competent authority; ……..
response	*Accepted*

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - IV. Draft Decision - Annex I (AMC to Part-M) - AMC M.A.614(a) p. 88

comment	*139* comment by: *CAA-NL* As we are unable to include comments to points that are not included in the EASA proposals we include this comment in the nearest available point that is included. Please be advised this is a comment to AMC M.A.613(a) We suggest to add a few words to AMC to M.A.613(a) 2.6.1.(d) to enhance the awareness of maintenance personal and organisations that deviations from the design approval holders recommendations made possible with this proposal may have consequences when removing components from aircrafts. (d). The aircraft record should be researched for any unusual events that could affect the serviceability of the aircraft component such as involvement in accidents, incidents, heavy landings, ~~or~~ lightning strikes or the maintenance deviating from the design approval holders recomendartions. Under no circumstances may an EASA Form 1 be issued in accordance with this paragraph 2.6 if it is suspected that the aircraft component has been subjected to extremes of stress, temperatures or immersion which could effect its operation.
response	*Not accepted* The intention of this point is to list unusual events which could affect the serviceability of the component. As stated in GM M.A.302(h), the content of the maintenance programme cannot be challenged up-front. Only if aircraft defects are found linked to an inadequate maintenance programme, actions have to be taken. As a consequence, the Agency does not support this text to be included.

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - IV. Draft Decision - Annex I (AMC to Part-M) - new AMC M.A.707(f) p. 88-89

comment	*163* comment by: *UK CAA*

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Page No: 89
Paragraph No: AMC M.A.707(f), bullet point 1
Comment:
This paragraph refers to 'Maintenance Post holder' of the CAMO, however there is no such position in the regulation. This should refer to 'Continuing Airworthiness Post Holder'.
Justification: Correctness.
Proposed Text:
Amend to read:
"The Accountable Manager or the ~~**Maintenance Postholder**~~ **Continuing Airworthiness** post holder of the CAMO."

response *Partially accepted*

The text has been amended to refer to the 'nominated Postholder' (as designated in M.A.706(d)).

comment *245* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency*

NPA Page 88, AMC M.A.707(f)
There is no AMC that describes how to keep the validity of the ARS authorization. Should not the requirements be equivalent to current AMC M.A.707 (c)?

response *Accepted*

A new paragraph M.A.707(f)1(g) has been added.

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - IV. Draft Decision - Annex I (AMC to Part-M) - new AMC M.A.710(i) p. 89

comment *301* comment by: *AESA*

<u>On AMC M.A.710(i) (same as on M.A.710.i and M.A.302.h.4 and 5):</u>
The responsibility of the NAA related to the content of the maintenance programme is not clear. Although the intention of the NPA is to release NAAs from responsibility related to the content of the maintenance programme (by declaring it in M.A.302 (h) 4 and the declaration itself) the fact is that it is not the case. Two examples:
1.- M.A.710 (i) indicates that the authority has to be notified in case of deficiencies in the content of the maintenance programme during the review of the maintenance program. This implies that the NAA has to take appropriate action so that NAAs became responsible for the content.
Also, there may be even situations in which the NAA perfoms the Airworthiness Review iaw 901 (i).In this case the NAA has to perform the review of the maintenance programme i.a.w. M.A.302 (h) 5.
2.- ACAM inspections, it is not specified the treatment of the maintenance programme establish by the owner during an ACAM inspection: does the authority has to verify compliance with this maintenance programme? Or is it necessary to evaluate the adequacy of the maintenance programme?

response *Noted*

See new GM M.A.302(h).

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - IV. Draft Decision - Annex I (AMC to Part-M) - new AMC M.A.901(l)1 p. 89-90

comment	*221* comment by: *FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation* dr The authorised staff and maintenance organisation should be authorised to perform airworthiness review for aircraft imported from third countries due to the complexity of such reviews. Therefore M.A.904(a)(2) shall be revised to specify the corresponding subparagraph of M.A.901 M.A.901(g) privileges currently limited to non CAT aircraft should not be further limited to non commercial aircraft, like for maintenance organisation Airworthiness Review privileges.
response	*Partially accepted* M.A.904(b) has been amended to allow the airworthiness review by the maintenance organisation for imported aircraft. Privileges of independent certifying staff will be discussed during Phase II.

comment	*246* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency* **NPA Page 89-90, AMC M.A.901(l)** There is no AMC that describes how to keep the validity of the ARS authorization. Should not the requirements be equivalent to current AMC M.A.707 (c)?
response	*Accepted* A new paragraph M.A.901(l)1(g) has been added.

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - IV. Draft Decision - Annex I (AMC to Part-M) - new AMC M.A.901(l)7 p. 90

comment	*302* comment by: *AESA* <u>On AMC M.A.901(l)7 (same as on AMC 710.i, M.A.710.i and M.A.302.h.4 and 5):</u> The responsibility of the NAA related to the content of the maintenance programme is not clear. Although the intention of the NPA is to release NAAs from responsibility related to the content of the maintenance programme (by declaring it in M.A.302 (h) 4 and the declaration itself) the fact is that it is not the case. Two examples: 1.- M.A.710 (i) indicates that the authority has to be notified in case of deficiencies in the content of the maintenance programme during the review of the maintenance program. This implies that the NAA has to take appropriate action so that NAAs became responsible for the content. Also, there may be even situations in which the NAA perfoms the Airworthiness Review iaw 901 (i).In this case the NAA has to perform the review of the maintenance programme i.a.w. M.A.302 (h) 5. 2.- ACAM inspections, it is not specified the treatment of the maintenance programme establish by the owner during an ACAM inspection: does the authority has to verify compliance with this maintenance programme? Or is it

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	necessary to evaluate the adequacy of the maintenance programme?
response	*Noted* See new GM M.A.302(h).

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - IV. Draft Decision - Annex I (AMC to Part-M) - AMC M.B.301(c) p. 90-91

comment	*36* comment by: *CAMO - Klaus Lehmköster, DE.MG.1016* Delete!! Aircraft maintenance manuel = Aircraft maintenance programm
response	*Not accepted* An aircraft maintenance programme is not just the maintenance manual. It must include other aspects related to the configuration and operation of the particular aircraft (see template in AMC M.A.302(e)).

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - IV. Draft Decision - Annex I (AMC to Part-M) - AMC M.B.703 p. 91

comment	*131* comment by: *British Gliding Association* British Gliding Association AMC M.B.703 Issue of Approval The third bullet point allowing Form 14 to be endorsed "all sailplanes and powered sailplanes" or "Aircraft below 2730 kg MTOM" is very helpful and fully supported by the BGA. It would be very helpful to have the same alleviation for subpart F Maintenance Organisation activities for ELA1 aircraft not used for commercial operations. Rationale; The scope of work is ultimately controlled by the company exposition and is audited and approved by the competent authority. The majority of aircraft in these groups are very similar in construction and technology and generally do not require any great degree of specialist equipment or tooling. Additionally the proposed Part 66 "L" licence is group rated so it would align with that. Unwieldy type lists are difficult to manage outside the exposition capability lists and require significant work for the competent authority and cost to industry just for a minor certificate change where it is not necessary. In any case the competent authority is aware through the capability list.
response	*Accepted* See AMC M.B.603.

comment	*180* comment by: *FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation* The GIPAG France agrees with the guidance related to the use of the indirect approval procedure by a CAMO. This would allow a maximum flexibility to the competent authority and to the organization to expand their privileges to their actual scope of work.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	However, the GIPAG France suggests to extend this possibility to the Part M/F organisation scope of approval for ELA2 aircraft (scope on the certificate limited to the scope covered by the licence(s) of the Certifying Staff).
response	*Partially accepted* See AMC M.B.603

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - IV. Draft Decision - Annex I (AMC to Part-M) - Appendix IV to AMC M.A.604 p. 93-97

comment	*137* comment by: *CAA-NL* Appendix IV to AMC M.A.604 MOM Include staff designated to approve AMP's under the following heading: **— Certifying staff and airworthiness review staff** · Minimum qualification and experience · List of authorised certifying staff ~~and~~ airworthiness review staff and staff that may approve AMP's on behalf of the organisation, their scope of qualification and the personal authorisation reference
response	*Not accepted* The possibility for maintenance organisations to use indirect approval procedures has been removed.

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - IV. Draft Decision - Annex I (AMC to Part-M) - Appendix VI to AMC M.B.602(f) p. 98-104

comment	*313* comment by: *AESA* On EASA Form 6F Part 2: The EASA Form 13 Part 2 includes paragraph M.A 710 to check compliance with the performance of the Airworthiness review by a CAMO; in the same way, the EASA Form6 and EASA Form6F should be modified to include this point when maintenance organizations are approved to perform airworthiness reviews.
response	*Not accepted* These aspects are already covered by the following points of EASA Form 6F: — Part 2, M.A.607 'Certifying staff and airworthiness review staff'; — Part 2, M.A.615 'Privileges of the organisation'; and — Part 3, item 4.9.

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - IV. Draft Decision - Annex I (AMC to Part-M) - Appendix VIII to AMC M.A.616 p. 105-107

comment	*134* comment by: *British Gliding Association* British Gliding Association Appendix VIII to AMC M.A.616 Organisational Review 5 Certification of maintenance 4th bullet point.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	Not all maintenance programmes will have been approved; those using the Minimum Inspection Programme will have been declared by the aircraft owner.
response	*Partially accepted* The text has been amended in order to refer to ELA2 aircraft. However, the organisational review only needs to check how the organisation has developed the maintenance programme, because the possibility for indirect approval by the organisation has been removed.

comment	*164* comment by: *UK CAA* **Page No:** 106 **Paragraph No:** Paragraph 5, bullet point 4 **Comment:** This refers to ELA1 aircraft, however it should refer to ELA2 as detailed in M.A.201(e). **Justification:** Correctness. **Proposed Text:** Amend to read: "Have maintenance programmes for ~~ELA1~~ **ELA2** aircraft not involved in commercial operations been properly developed and approved?"
response	*Partially accepted* The text has been amended in order to refer to ELA2 aircraft. However, the organisational review only needs to check how the organisation has developed the maintenance programme, because the possibility for indirect approval by the organisation has been removed.

comment	*182* comment by: *FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation* It has to be clear that the maintenance programmes for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations have been properly developed and approved by the competent Authority. The GIPAG France proposed to refreeze point 5 of the Appendix VIII to AMC M.A.616 as following: **"5 – Certification of maintenance, airworthiness review and development and approval processing (including indirect approval) of maintenance programmes** • Has maintenance on products and components been properly certified? • Have implementation of modifications/repairs been carried out with appropriate approval of such modifications/repairs (sample check). • Have airworthiness reviews been properly performed and the airworthiness review certificate properly issued? • Have maintenance programmes for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations been properly developed and approved" **by the legal Authority."**
response	*Not accepted* The option of declaration of the maintenance programme by the owner has been retained. The text has been amended in Appendix VIII in order to refer to ELA2 aircraft. However, the organisational review only needs to check how the organisation has developed the maintenance programme, because the possibility for indirect approval by the organisation has been removed.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

comment	*247* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency* **NPA Page 106, Appendix VIII to AMC M.A.616** In item 5 bullet 4 ELA1 is noted, where it should be ELA2.
response	*Partially accepted* The text has been amended in order to refer to ELA2 aircraft. However, the organisational review only needs to check how the organisation has developed the maintenance programme, because the possibility for indirect approval by the organisation has been removed.

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - IV. Draft Decision - Annex I (AMC to Part-M) - Appendix IX to AMC M.A.602 and AMC M.A.702 p. 108-110

comment	*97* comment by: *Luftfahrt-Bundesamt* Attachments #7 #8 #9 #10 **Appendix IX** Appendix IX is new and describes the MIP for ELA 1 aircraft of the different categories. Without referring to the proposed contents in detail, the MIPs are totally insufficient and relatively unstructured. The opinion is, however, that MIPs should not be in the Appendix, but in the AMCs. Explanation: By this, they become part of the regulation. Changes will not be possible at short notice, but have to pass the European rulemaking procedure. Thus, it is not possible to react to new developments in a flexible way. The MIPs must be translated into the official languages. The experience gathered in the past showed that the translations often did not comply with the terminology daily used in the relevant official language. These MIPs rather should be included in the AMCs which could be adapted more quickly by EASA. Additionally, the national authorities could include specific national requirements. The maintenance programme specified in the AMC M.A.302 (e), however, should be laid down in a necessary Appendix IX. In the event of the standardization audits, EASA stated that the maintenance programmes approved by the national authorities have allegedly not always complied with M.A.302 so that in this case there can be no question of harmonisation. Laying down maintenance programmes into App. IX could mean to approach the objective of the basic regulation, '...namely the establishment and uniform application of common rules in the field of aviation safety ....' (see Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 (29)), considerably. The LBA could accept the proposed maintenance programme included in the AMC M.A.302 (e), if the following is changed. 1. Clarification of the term 'owner' (see general comment) 2. Maintenance programmes should not include any yes/no inquiries. Things should be named, if available, or deleted. 3. If the operator makes use of the MIP, the maintenance programme is principally ready, except for the page of the declaration.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	Enclosed please find our proposal for MIPs (4 files, in German language only).
response	*Partially accepted* The requirements for the MIP have been introduced in M.A.302(i) and the tables with the acceptable MIPs to each category of aircraft have been transferred to the AMC. However, please note that the specific national requirements can only be added as indicated in field 11 of the template in AMC M.A.302(e). This includes only those national operational/airspace directives/requirements which have not been superseded by European rules. Finally, and taking into account that these programmes have been moved from Appendix IX to AMC M.A.302(i), the Agency will use the time taken by the Comitology process to perform a full review in order to ensure consistency between the 3 different programmes. Your 4 files are welcome for this purpose.

comment	*138* comment by: *CAA-NL* Part M Appendix IX to AMC M.A.602 and AMC M.A.702, EASA form 2 Within A2 and A4 we suggest to also include the indirect approval privilege for AMP's in the column Limitations.
response	*Not accepted* The possibility for maintenance organisations to use indirect approval procedures has been removed.

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - V. Draft Decision Annex II (AMC to Part-145) - new AMC 145.A.36 p. 111

comment	*165* comment by: *UK CAA* **Page No:** 111 **Paragraph No:** AMC 145.A.36 **Comment:** This refers to 'Airworthiness Review person'. However Part M refers to 'Airworthiness Review Staff'. **Justification:** Consistency of language in the regulations. **Proposed Text:** Amend to read: "The following minimum information as applicable should be kept on record in respect of each Airworthiness Review ~~person~~ **Staff"**
response	*Accepted*

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - V. Draft Decision Annex II (AMC to Part-145) - Appendix II to AMC 145.B.20(5) p. 116-123

comment	*314* comment by: *AESA* On Part 2 of EASA Form 6: The EASA Form 13 Part 2 includes paragraph M.A 710 to check compliance with

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	the performance of the Airworthiness review by a CAMO; in the same way, the EASA Form6 and EASA Form6F should be modified to include this point when maintenance organizations are approved to perform airworthiness reviews.
response	*Not accepted* These aspects are already covered by the following points of EASA Form 6: — Part 2, 145.A.36 'Records of airworthiness review staff'; — Part 2, 145.A.75 'Privileges of the organisation'; and — Part 3, item 2.29.

B. Draft Opinion(s) and Decision(s) - VII. Draft Decision - Annex VI (GM to Part-M) p. 128-129

comment	*204* comment by: *FNAM-French Aviation Industry Federation* In the table which summarize the provisions contained in M.A.302 and AMC M.A.901 (page129), in the row "Approval/declaration of the maintenance programme", for ELA1 and ELA2 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, the GIPAG France do not agree with the fact that the MP is not approved directly by the competent authority. This responsibility for the Part-145 or M.A. Subpart F maintenance organization or owner is not appropriate. The GIPAG France suggests to modify this field accordingly to the comment made in the point 4 of Part M.A. 302 (h).
response	*Partially accepted* The current rule already allows the owner to completely manage the continuing airworthiness of his/her aircraft under his/her own responsibility. In addition, the option of self-declaration has been limited to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations and compensating measures have been introduced, as the review of the effectiveness of the maintenance programme at the time of the airworthiness review. Furthermore, GM M.A.201(e) clearly reminds the owner to carefully self-assess his/her competence. Please note that the possibility for maintenance organisations to use the indirect approval procedure has been removed.

comment	*248* comment by: *Swedish Transport Agency* **NPA Page 129,** OPTION 2 (for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations) According to this table, the NAA shall issue the ARC when the NAA has performed the airworthiness review on an aircraft with declaration-AMP (MIP). Who shall perform the annual inspection contained in MIP and the annual review of the maintenance program in this case? The requirement should include that NAA shall not issue the ARC for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations with declaration-AMP (MIP/DAHD) because of the question above.
response	*Noted* The annual inspection will be performed by a maintenance organisation.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

The airworthiness review by the NAA can be performed at any time. It does not need to be performed together with the annual inspection, because this is only a requirement contained in M.A.901(l), which is only applicable to the case where the airworthiness review is performed by the maintenance organisation.

M.A.710(h) and M.A.302(h)5 require that the review of the maintenance programme is performed at the same time as the airworthiness review and by the same person (this covers the case of a maintenance organisation, a CAMO and the NAA). See AMC M.A.710(h).

comment *284* comment by: *Irish Aviation Authority*

'GM M.A.201(e), M.A.302(h) and M.A.901(l)' refers to 'private aircraft' for which there is no EASA definition available.

response *Accepted*

The following has been added:

* 'Private aircraft means and aircraft for which M.A.201(f), (g), (h) and (i) do not apply.'

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

4. Attachments to comments

DGAC - Comments of GIPAG on the proposition of the Task Force - 17 10 2012.pdf
Attachment #1 to comment #169

EASA NPA 2012-17 comments.pdf
Attachment #2 to comment #75

IHP_Flugzeug_MoSe_NPA_2012_17.pdf
Attachment #3 to comment #90

IHP_Segelflugzeug_NPA_2012_17.pdf
Attachment #4 to comment #90

IHP_Heißluftballon_NPA_2012_17.pdf
Attachment #5 to comment #90

Instruction ARC EASA Form 15 issue 3_tcm334-337169.pdf
Attachment #6 to comment #140

MIP_Flugzeug_NPA_2012_17.pdf
Attachment #7 to comment #97

MIP_Heißluftballon_NPA_2012_17.pdf
Attachment #8 to comment #97

MIP_Segelflugzeug_NPA_2012_17.pdf
Attachment #9 to comment #97

MIP_MoSe_NPA_2012_17.pdf
Attachment #10 to comment #97

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

5. Appendices

This section contains the draft AMC/GM prepared to complement Opinion 10/2013. This material is included for information only, as the Decision containing AMC and GM will be published by the Agency when the related Implementing Rules are adopted by the Commission.

The content of the Appendices is as follows:

— Appendix I: draft amendment to Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 (Cover Regulation)

— Appendix II: draft amendment to Annex I (Part-M)

— Appendix III: draft amendment to Annex II (Part-145)

— Appendix IV: draft amendment to AMC to Part-M

— Appendix V: draft amendment to GM to Part-M

— Appendix VI: draft amendment to AMC to Part-145

— Appendix VIII: draft amendment to GM to Part-145

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

5.1 Appendix I: draft amendment to Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 (Cover Regulation)

Article 2 is amended as follows:

Article 2 Definitions

…

(k) 'ELA1 aircraft' means the following manned European Light Aircraft:

(i) an aeroplane with a Maximum Take-off Mass (MTOM) of 1200 kg or less that is not classified as complex motor-powered aircraft;

(ii) a sailplane or powered sailplane of 1200 kg MTOM or less;

(iii) a balloon with a maximum design lifting gas or hot air volume of not more than 3400 m^3 for hot air balloons, 1050 m^3 for gas balloons, 300 m^3 for tethered gas balloons;

(iv) an airship designed for not more than four occupants and a maximum design lifting gas or hot air volume of not more than 3400 m^3 for hot air airships and 1000 m^3 for gas airships;

(l) 'ELA2 aircraft' means the following manned European Light Aircraft:

(i) an aeroplane with a Maximum Take-off Mass (MTOM) of 2000 kg or less that is not classified as complex motor-powered aircraft;

(ii) a sailplane or powered sailplane of 2000 kg MTOM or less;

(iii) a balloon;

(iv) a hot air ship;

(v) a gas airship complying with all of the following characteristics:

- 3 % maximum static heaviness,
- non-vectored thrust (except reverse thrust),
- conventional and simple design of structure, control system and ballonet system, and
- non-power assisted controls;

(vi) a Very Light Rotorcraft.

~~(l)~~ (m) 'LSA aircraft' means a light sport aeroplane which has all of the following characteristics:

(i) Maximum Take-off Mass (MTOM) of not more than 600 kg;

(ii) a maximum stalling speed in the landing configuration (VS0) of not more than 45 knots Calibrated Airspeed (CAS) at the aircraft's maximum certificated takeoff mass and most critical centre of gravity;

(iii) a maximum seating capacity of no more than two persons, including the pilot;

(iv) a single, non-turbine engine fitted with a propeller;

(v) a non-pressurised cabin;

~~(m)~~ (n) 'principal place of business' means the head office or the registered office of the undertaking within which the principal financial functions and operational control of the activities referred to in this Regulation are exercised.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Article 3 is amended as follows:

Article 3 Continuing airworthiness requirements

…

5. Maintenance programmes approved in accordance with the requirements applicable before the entry into force of this amending Regulation are deemed to be approved in accordance with the new requirements.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

5.2 Appendix II: draft amendment to Annex I (Part-M)

The Table of Contents within Part-M is amended as follows:

CONTENTS

…

SECTION A – TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

…

SUBPART F – MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION

…

M.A.607 Certifying staff and airworthiness review staff

…

M.A.614 Maintenance and airworthiness review records

…

…

…

Point M.A.201 is amended as follows:

M.A.201 Responsibilities

(a) The owner is responsible for the continuing airworthiness of an aircraft and shall ensure that no flight takes place unless:

1. the aircraft is maintained in an airworthy condition, and;
2. any operational and emergency equipment fitted is correctly installed and serviceable or clearly identified as unserviceable, and;
3. the airworthiness certificate remains valid, and;
4. the maintenance of the aircraft is performed in accordance with the ~~approved~~ maintenance programme as specified in M.A.302.

(b) When the aircraft is leased, the responsibilities of the owner are transferred to the lessee if:

1. the lessee is stipulated on the registration document, or;
2. detailed in the leasing contract.

When reference is made in this Part to the 'owner', the term owner covers the owner or the lessee, as applicable.

(c) Any person or organisation performing maintenance shall be responsible for the tasks performed.

(d) The pilot-in-command or, in the case of commercial air transport, the operator shall be responsible for the satisfactory accomplishment of the pre-flight inspection. This inspection must be carried out by the pilot or another qualified person but need not be carried out by an approved maintenance organisation or by Part-66 certifying staff.

(e) In order to satisfy the responsibilities of paragraph (a),

(i) the owner of an aircraft may contract the tasks associated with continuing airworthiness to a continuing airworthiness management organisation approved in accordance with Section A, Subpart G of this Annex (Part M). In this case, the continuing airworthiness management organisation assumes responsibility for the proper accomplishment of these tasks. The contract described in Appendix I shall be used in this case.

(ii) An owner who decides to manage the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft under its own responsibility, without a contract in accordance with Appendix I, may nevertheless make a limited contract with:

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

— a continuing airworthiness management organisation approved in accordance with Section A, Subpart G of this Annex (Part-M) , or

— in the case of ELA2 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, a Part-145 or M.A. Subpart F maintenance organisation,

for the development of the maintenance programme and processing its approval in accordance with point M.A.302. In that case, the limited contract transfers the responsibility for the development and, except in the case where a declaration is issued by the owner in accordance with M.A.302(h), processing the approval of the maintenance programme to the contracted ~~continuing airworthiness management~~ organisation.

(f) In the case of large aircraft, in order to satisfy the responsibilities of paragraph (a) the owner of an aircraft shall ensure that the tasks associated with continuing airworthiness are performed by an approved continuing airworthiness management organisation. A written contract shall be made in accordance with Appendix I. In this case, the continuing airworthiness management organisation assumes responsibility for the proper accomplishment of these tasks.

(g) Maintenance of large aircraft, aircraft used for commercial air transport and components thereof shall be carried out by a Part-145 approved maintenance organisation.

(h) In the case of commercial air transport the operator is responsible for the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft it operates and shall:

1. be approved, as part of the air operator certificate issued by the competent authority, pursuant to M.A. Subpart G for the aircraft it operates; and
2. be approved in accordance with Part-145 or contract such an organisation; and
3. ensure that paragraph (a) is satisfied.

(i) When an operator is requested by a Member State to hold a certificate for commercial operations, other than for commercial air transport, it shall:

1. be appropriately approved, pursuant to M.A. Subpart G, for the management of the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft it operates or contract such an organisation; and
2. be appropriately approved in accordance with M.A. Subpart F or Part-145, or contract such organisations; and
3. ensure that paragraph (a) is satisfied.

(j) The owner/operator is responsible for granting the competent authority access to the organisation/aircraft to determine continued compliance with this Part.

Point M.A.301 is amended as follows:

M.A.301 Continuing airworthiness tasks

…

3. the accomplishment of all maintenance, in accordance with the M.A.302 ~~approved~~ aircraft maintenance programme;

…

Point M.A.302 is amended as follows:

M.A.302 Aircraft maintenance programme

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

(a) Maintenance of each aircraft shall be organised in accordance with an aircraft maintenance programme.

(b) The aircraft maintenance programme and any subsequent amendments shall be approved by the competent authority.

(c) When the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft is managed by a continuing airworthiness management organisation approved in accordance with Section A, Subpart G of this Annex (Part M) or when there is a limited contract between the owner and this organisation in accordance with point M.A.201(e)(ii), the aircraft maintenance programme and its amendments may be approved through an indirect approval procedure.

(i) In that case, the indirect approval procedure shall be established by the continuing airworthiness management organisation as part of the Continuing Airworthiness Management Exposition and shall be approved by the competent authority responsible for that continuing airworthiness management organisation.

(ii) The continuing airworthiness management organisation shall not use the indirect approval procedure when this organisation is not under the oversight of the Member State of Registry, unless an agreement exists in accordance with point M.1, paragraph 4(ii) or 4(iii), as applicable, transferring the responsibility for the approval of the aircraft maintenance programme to the competent authority responsible for the continuing airworthiness management organisation.

(d) The aircraft maintenance programme must establish compliance with:

(i) instructions issued by the competent authority;

(ii) instructions for continuing airworthiness:

— issued by the holders of the type certificate, restricted type-certificate, supplemental type-certificate, major repair design approval, ETSO authorisation or any other relevant approval issued under Regulation (EC) No 1702/2003 and its Annex (Part-21), and

— included in the certification specifications referred to in point 21A.90B or 21A.431B of the Annex (Part-21) to Regulation (EC) No 1702/2003, if applicable;

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

(e) The aircraft maintenance programme shall contain details, including frequency, of all maintenance to be carried out, including any specific tasks linked to the type and the specificity of operations.

(f) For large aircraft, when the maintenance programme is based on maintenance steering group logic or on condition monitoring, the aircraft maintenance programme shall include a reliability programme.

(g) The aircraft maintenance programme shall be subject to periodic reviews and amended accordingly when necessary. These reviews will ensure that the programme continues to be valid in light of the operating experience and instructions from the competent authority whilst taking into account new and/or modified maintenance instructions promulgated by the type certificate and supplementary type certificate holders and any other organisation that publishes such data in accordance with Annex (Part-21) to Regulation (EC) No 1702/2003.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

(h) In the case of ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, compliance with paragraphs (b), (c), (d), (e), and (g) may be replaced by compliance with all the following conditions:

1. The aircraft maintenance programme shall clearly identify the owner and the specific aircraft to which it refers, including any installed engine and propeller.

2. The aircraft maintenance programme shall either:

— comply with the 'Minimum Inspection Programme', contained in paragraph (i) below, corresponding to the particular aircraft, or

— comply with paragraphs (d) and (e) above.

The maintenance programme shall not be less restrictive than the 'Minimum Inspection Programme'.

3. The aircraft maintenance programme shall include all the mandatory continuing airworthiness requirements, such as repetitive Airworthiness Directives, the Airworthiness Limitation Section (ALS) of the Instructions for Continued Airworthiness (ICA) or specific maintenance requirements contained in the Type Certificate Data Sheet (TCDS).

In addition, the aircraft maintenance programme shall identify any additional maintenance tasks to be performed because of the specific aircraft type, aircraft configuration and type and specificity of operation. The following elements shall be taken into consideration as a minimum:

— Specific installed equipment and modifications of the aircraft.

— Repairs incorporated in the aircraft.

— Life limited components and flight safety critical components.

— Maintenance recommendations, such as Time Between Overhaul (TBO) intervals, recommended through service bulletins, service letters, and other non-mandatory service information.

— Applicable operational directives/requirements related to the periodic inspection of certain equipment.

— Special operational approvals.

— Use of the aircraft and operational environment.

— Pilot-owner maintenance (if applicable).

4. If the maintenance programme is not approved by the competent authority (directly or by the M.A. Subpart G organisation via an indirect approval procedure), the aircraft maintenance programme shall contain a signed statement where the owner declares that this is the aircraft maintenance programme for the particular aircraft registration and he/she declares to be fully responsible for its content and, in particular, for any deviations introduced as regards the Design Approval Holder recommendations.

5. The aircraft maintenance programme shall be reviewed at least annually in conjunction with the airworthiness review, as required in point M.A.710(h). This review shall be accomplished by the person who performed the airworthiness review. If the airworthiness review shows discrepancies linked to deficiencies in the content of the maintenance programme, the owner shall amend the maintenance programme as agreed with the competent authority.

(i) In the case of ELA1 aircraft other than airships, not involved in commercial operations, the 'Minimum Inspection Programme' referred to in paragraph (h) above shall comply with the following conditions:

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

1. It shall contain the following inspection intervals:
   - For ELA1 aeroplanes and ELA1 Touring Motor Gliders (TMG), every annual or 100 h interval, whichever comes first. A tolerance of 1 month or 10 h may be applied to that interval as long as the next interval is calculated from the date or hours originally scheduled.
   - For ELA1 sailplanes, ELA1 powered sailplanes other than TMG and ELA1 balloons, every annual interval. A tolerance of 1 month may be applied to that interval as long as the next interval is calculated from the date originally scheduled.

2. It shall contain the following:
   - Servicing tasks as required by the manufacturer's requirements.
   - Inspection of markings.
   - Review of weighing records and weighing in accordance with existing Commission Regulation (EU) 800/2013, point NCC.POL.105.
   - Operational test of transponder (if existing).
   - Operational test of pitot-static system.
   - In the case of ELA1 aeroplanes:
     - Operational checks for power and rpm, magnetos, fuel and oil pressure, engine temperatures.
     - For engines equipped with automated engine control, the published run-up procedure.
     - For dry-sump engines, engines with turbochargers and liquid-cooled engines, an operational check for signs of disturbed fluid circulation.
   - Inspection of the condition and attachment of the structural items, systems and components corresponding to the following areas:
     - For ELA1 aeroplanes:
       - Airframe
       - Cabin and cockpit
       - Landing gear
       - Wing and centre section
       - Flight controls
       - Empennage
       - Avionics and electrics
       - Powerplant
       - Clutches and gearboxes
       - Propeller
       - Miscellaneous systems such as the ballistic rescue system
     - For ELA1 sailplanes and ELA1 powered sailplanes:
       - Airframe
       - Cabin and cockpit
       - Landing gear

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

- Wing and centre section
- Empennage
- Avionics and electrics
- Powerplant (when applicable)
- Miscellaneous systems such as removable ballast, drag chute and controls, and water ballast system

- For ELA1 hot-air balloons:
  - Envelope
  - Burner
  - Basket
  - Fuel containers
  - Equipment and instruments
- For ELA1 gas balloons:
  - Envelope
  - Basket
  - Equipment and instruments

Until such time as this regulation specifies a 'Minimum Inspection Programme' for airships, their maintenance programme shall comply with paragraphs (d) and (e) above.

Point M.A.604 is amended as follows:

M.A.604 Maintenance organisation manual

(a) The maintenance organisation shall provide a manual containing at least the following information:

1. a statement signed by the accountable manager to confirm that the organisation will continuously work in accordance with Part-M and the manual at all times, and;
2. the organisation's scope of work, and;
3. the title(s) and name(s) of person(s) referred to in M.A.606(b), and;
4. an organisation chart showing associated chains of responsibility between the person(s) referred to in M.A.606(b), and;
5. a list of certifying staff and, if applicable, airworthiness review staff and staff responsible for the development and processing of the maintenance programme, with their scope of approval, and;
6. a list of locations where maintenance is carried out, together with a general description of the facilities, and;
7. procedures specifying how the maintenance organisation ensures compliance with this Part, and;
8. the maintenance organisation manual amendment procedure(s).

(b) The maintenance organisation manual and its amendments shall be approved by the competent authority.

(c) Notwithstanding paragraph (b) minor amendments to the manual may be approved through a procedure (hereinafter called indirect approval).

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Point M.A.606 is amended as follows:

M.A.606 Personnel requirements

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

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

(c) All paragraph (b) persons shall be able to show relevant knowledge, background and appropriate experience related to aircraft and/or component maintenance.

(d) The organisation shall have appropriate staff for the normal expected contracted work. The use of temporarily sub-contracted staff is permitted in the case of higher than normally expected contracted work and only for personnel not issuing a certificate of release to service.

(e) The qualification of all personnel involved in maintenance, airworthiness reviews and development of maintenance programmes shall be demonstrated and recorded.

(f) Personnel who carry out specialised tasks such as welding, non-destructive testing/inspection other than colour contrast shall be qualified in accordance with an officially recognised standard.

(g) The maintenance organisation shall have sufficient certifying staff to issue M.A.612 and M.A.613 certificates of release to service for aircraft and components. They shall comply with the requirements of Part-66.

(h) By derogation from paragraph (g), the organisation may use certifying staff qualified in accordance with the following provisions when providing maintenance support to operators involved in commercial operations, subject to appropriate procedures to be approved as part of the organisation's manual:

1. For a repetitive pre-flight airworthiness directive which specifically states that the flight crew may carry out such airworthiness directive, the organisation may issue a limited certifying staff authorisation to the aircraft commander on the basis of the flight crew licence held, provided that the organisation ensures that sufficient practical training has been carried out to ensure that such person can accomplish the airworthiness directive to the required standard;

2. In the case of aircraft operating away from a supported location the organisation may issue a limited certifying staff authorisation to the aircraft commander on the basis of the flight crew licence, provided that the organisation ensures that sufficient practical training has been carried out to ensure that such person can accomplish the task to the required standard.

(i) If the organisation performs airworthiness reviews and issues the corresponding airworthiness review certificate for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations in accordance with M.A.901(l), it shall have airworthiness review staff qualified and authorised in accordance with M.A.901(l)1.

(j) If the organisation is involved in the development and processing of approval of the maintenance programme for ELA2 aircraft not involved in commercial operations in accordance with M.A.201(e)(ii), it shall have qualified staff who shall be able to show relevant knowledge and experience.

Point M.A.607 is amended as follows:

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

M.A.607 Certifying staff and airworthiness review staff

(a) In addition to M.A.606(g), certifying staff can only exercise their privileges, if the organisation has ensured:

1. that certifying staff can demonstrate that they meet the requirements of point 66.A.20(b) of Annex III (Part 66), except when Annex III (Part 66) refers to Member State regulation, in which case they shall meet the requirement of such regulation, and;

2. that certifying staff have an adequate understanding of the relevant aircraft and/or aircraft component(s) to be maintained together with the associated organisation procedures.

(b) In the following unforeseen cases, where an aircraft is grounded at a location other than the main base where no appropriate certifying staff is available, the maintenance organisation contracted to provide maintenance support may issue a one-off certification authorisation:

1. to one of its employees holding type qualifications on aircraft of similar technology, construction and systems; or

2. to any person with not less than three years maintenance experience and holding a valid ICAO aircraft maintenance licence rated for the aircraft type requiring certification provided there is no organisation appropriately approved under this Part at that location and the contracted organisation obtains and holds on file evidence of the experience and the licence of that person.

All such cases must be reported to the competent authority within seven days of the ~~issuance~~ issue of such certification authorisation. The approved maintenance organisation issuing the one-off certification authorisation shall ensure that any such maintenance that could affect flight safety is re-checked.

(c) The approved maintenance organisation shall record all details concerning certifying staff and airworthiness review staff and maintain a current list of all certifying staff and airworthiness review staff together with their scope of approval as part of the organisation's manual pursuant to point M.A.604(a)5.

Point M.A.614 is amended as follows:

M.A.614 Maintenance and airworthiness review records

(a) The approved maintenance organisation shall record all details of work carried out. Records necessary to prove all requirements have been met for the ~~issuance~~ issue of the certificate of release to service including the sub–contractor's release documents and for the issue of any airworthiness review certificates shall be retained.

(b) The approved maintenance organisation shall provide a copy of each certificate of release to service to the aircraft owner, together with a copy of any specific repair/modification data used for repairs/modifications carried out.

(c) The approved maintenance organisation shall retain a copy of all maintenance records and any associated maintenance data for three years from the date the aircraft or aircraft component to which the work relates was released from the approved maintenance organisation. In addition, it shall retain a copy of all the records related to the issue of airworthiness review certificates for three years from the date of issue and shall provide a copy of them to the owner of the aircraft.

1. The records under this paragraph shall be stored in a manner that ensures protection from damage, alteration and theft.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

2. All computer hardware used to ensure backup shall be stored in a different location from that containing the working data in an environment that ensures they remain in good condition.

3. Where an approved maintenance organisation terminates its operation all retained maintenance records covering the last three years shall be distributed to the last owner or customer of the respective aircraft or component or shall be stored as specified by the competent authority.

Point M.A.615 is amended as follows:

M.A.615 Privileges of the organisation

The maintenance organisation approved in accordance with Section A, Subpart F of this Annex (Part M), may:

(a) maintain any aircraft and/or component for which it is approved at the locations specified in the approval certificate and the maintenance organisation manual;

(b) arrange for the performance of specialized services under the control of the maintenance organisation at another organisation appropriately qualified, subject to appropriate procedures being established as part of the Maintenance Organisation Manual approved by the competent authority directly;

(c) maintain any aircraft and/or component for which it is approved at any location subject to the need of such maintenance arising either from the unserviceability of the aircraft or from the necessity of supporting occasional maintenance, subject to the conditions specified in the Maintenance Organisation Manual;

(d) issue certificates of release to service on completion of maintenance, in accordance with point M.A.612 or point M.A.613;

(e) perform airworthiness reviews and issue the corresponding airworthiness review certificate for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, under the conditions specified in point M.A.901(l), if specifically approved to do so;

(f) develop the maintenance programme and process its approval in accordance with point M.A.302 for ELA2 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, under the conditions specified in point M.A.201(e)(ii), and limited to the aircraft ratings listed in the approval certificate.

The organisation shall only maintain an aircraft or component for which it is approved when all the necessary facilities, equipment, tooling, material, maintenance data, and certifying staff are available.

Point M.A.617 is amended as follows:

M.A.617 Changes to the approved maintenance organisation

In order to enable the competent authority to determine continued compliance with this Part, the approved maintenance organisation shall notify it of any proposal to carry out any of the following changes, before such changes take place:

1. the name of the organisation;

2. the location of the organisation;

3. additional locations of the organisation;

4. the accountable manager;

5. any of the persons specified in paragraph M.A.606(b);

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

6. the facilities, equipment, tools, material, procedures, work scope, ~~and~~ certifying staff and airworthiness review staff that could affect the approval.

In the case of proposed changes in personnel not known to the management beforehand, these changes shall be notified at the earliest opportunity.

Point M.A.707 is amended as follows:

M.A.707 Airworthiness review staff

(a) To be approved to carry out airworthiness reviews and, if applicable, to issue permits to fly, an approved continuing airworthiness management organisation shall have appropriate airworthiness review staff to issue airworthiness review certificates or recommendations referred to in Section A of Subpart I and, if applicable, to issue a permit to fly in accordance with point M.A.711(c):

1. For all aircraft used in commercial air transport, and aircraft above 2730 kg MTOM, except balloons, these staff shall have acquired:

   (a) at least five years experience in continuing airworthiness, and;

   (b) an appropriate license in compliance with Annex III (Part-66) or an aeronautical degree or a national equivalent, and;

   (c) formal aeronautical maintenance training, and;

   (d) a position within the approved organisation with appropriate responsibilities.

   (e) Notwithstanding points (a) to (d), the requirement laid down in point M.A.707(a)1(b) may be replaced by five years of experience in continuing airworthiness additional to those already required by point M.A.707(a)1(a).

2. For aircraft not used in commercial air transport of 2730 kg MTOM and below, and balloons, these staff shall have acquired:

   (a) at least three years experience in continuing airworthiness, and;

   (b) an appropriate license in compliance with Annex III (Part-66) or an aeronautical degree or a national equivalent, and;

   (c) appropriate aeronautical maintenance training, and;

   (d) a position within the approved organisation with appropriate responsibilities;

   (e) Notwithstanding points (a) to (d), the requirement laid down in point M.A.707(a)2(b) may be replaced by four years of experience in continuing airworthiness additional to those already required by point M.A.707(a)2(a).

(b) Airworthiness review staff nominated by the approved continuing airworthiness organisation can only be issued an authorisation by the approved continuing airworthiness organisation when formally accepted by the competent authority after satisfactory completion of an airworthiness review under the supervision of the competent authority or under the supervision of the organisation's airworthiness review staff in accordance with a procedure approved by the competent authority.

(c) The organisation shall ensure that aircraft airworthiness review staff can demonstrate appropriate recent continuing airworthiness management experience.

(d) Airworthiness review staff shall be identified by listing each person in the continuing airworthiness management exposition together with their airworthiness review authorisation reference.

(e) The organisation shall maintain a record of all airworthiness review staff, which shall include details of any appropriate qualification held together with a summary of relevant continuing airworthiness management experience and training and a copy of the

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

authorisation. This record shall be retained until two years after the airworthiness review staff have left the organisation.

(f) By derogation from paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e), for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, the M.A. Subpart G organisation may, if appropriately approved, perform the airworthiness review subject to the following conditions:

1. The organisation nominates airworthiness review staff complying with all the following requirements:

(a) The airworthiness review staff hold a certifying staff authorisation for the corresponding aircraft.

(b) The airworthiness review staff have at least three years of experience as certifying staff .

(c) The airworthiness review staff are independent from the continuing airworthiness management process of the aircraft being reviewed or have overall authority on the continuing airworthiness management process of the complete aircraft being reviewed

(d) The airworthiness review staff have acquired knowledge of the parts of Part-M relevant to continuing airworthiness management.

(e) The airworthiness review staff have acquired proven knowledge of the procedures of the M.A. Subpart G organisation relevant to the airworthiness review and issue of the airworthiness review certificate.

(f) The airworthiness review staff have been formally accepted by the competent authority after having performed an airworthiness review under the supervision of the competent authority or under the supervision of the organisation's airworthiness review staff in accordance with a procedure approved by the competent authority.

(g) the airworthiness review staff have performed at least one airworthiness review in the last twelve month period.

2. The airworthiness review is performed at the same time as the annual inspection contained in the maintenance programme and by the same person who releases such annual inspection.

3. The exposition of the M.A. Subpart G organisation describes all the following:

(a) The procedures for the performance of airworthiness reviews and the issue of the corresponding airworthiness review certificate.

(b) The names of the certifying staff authorised to perform airworthiness reviews and issue the corresponding airworthiness review certificate.

(c) The procedures for the review of the maintenance programme.

Point M.A.710 is amended as follows:

M.A.710 Airworthiness review

…

(h) For ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations for which the aircraft maintenance programme has been established in accordance with M.A.302(h), the aircraft maintenance programme shall be reviewed in conjunction with the airworthiness review. This review shall be accomplished by the person who performed the airworthiness review.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

~~(h)~~ (i) Should the outcome of the airworthiness review be inconclusive or should the review under point M.A.710(h) show discrepancies on the aircraft linked to deficiencies in the content of the maintenance programme, the competent authority shall be informed as soon as practicable but in any case within 72 hours of the organisation identifying the condition to which the review relates. The airworthiness review certificate shall not be issued until all findings have been closed.

Point M.A.901 is amended as follows:

M.A.901 Aircraft airworthiness review

To ensure the validity of the aircraft airworthiness certificate, an airworthiness review of the aircraft and its continuing airworthiness records shall be carried out periodically.

(a) An airworthiness review certificate is issued in accordance with Appendix III (EASA Form 15a, ~~or~~ 15b, or 15c) on completion of a satisfactory airworthiness review. The airworthiness review certificate is valid one year;

(b) An aircraft in a controlled environment is an aircraft (i) continuously managed during the previous 12 months by a unique continuing airworthiness management organisation approved in accordance with Section A, Subpart G, of this Annex (Part M), and (ii) which has been maintained for the previous 12 months by maintenance organisations approved in accordance with Section A, Subpart F of this Annex (Part M), or with Annex II (Part 145). This includes maintenance tasks referred to in point M.A.803(b) carried out and released to service in accordance with point M.A.801(b)2 or point M.A.801(b)3;

(c) For all aircraft used in commercial air transport, and aircraft above 2730 kg MTOM, except balloons, that are in a controlled environment, the organisation referred to in (b) managing the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft may, if appropriately approved, and subject to compliance with paragraph (k):

1. issue an airworthiness review certificate in accordance with point M.A.710, and;
2. for the airworthiness review certificates it has issued, when the aircraft has remained within a controlled environment, extend twice the validity of the airworthiness review certificate for a period of one year each time;

(d) For all aircraft used in commercial air transport and aircraft above 2 730 kg MTOM, except balloons, that (i) are not in a controlled environment, or (ii) which continuing airworthiness is managed by a continuing airworthiness management organisation that does not hold the privilege to carry out airworthiness reviews,the airworthiness review certificate shall be issued by the competent authority upon satisfactory assessment based on a recommendation made by a continuing airworthiness management organisation appropriately approved in accordance with Section A, Subpart G of this Annex (Part M) sent together with the application from the owner or operator. This recommendation shall be based on an airworthiness review carried out in accordance with point M.A.710;

(e) For aircraft not used in commercial air transport of 2730 kg MTOM and below, and balloons, any continuing airworthiness management organisation approved in accordance with Section A, Subpart G of this Annex (Part M) and appointed by the owner or operator may, if appropriately approved and subject to paragraph (k):

1. issue the airworthiness review certificate in accordance with point M.A.710, and;
2. for airworthiness review certificates it has issued, when the aircraft has remained within a controlled environment under its management, extend twice the validity of the airworthiness review certificate for a period of one year each time;

(f) By derogation from points M.A.901(c)2 and M.A.901(e)2, for aircraft that are in a controlled environment, the organisation referred to in (b) managing the continuing

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

airworthiness of the aircraft, subject to compliance with paragraph (k), may extend twice for a period of one year each time the validity of an airworthiness review certificate that has been issued by the competent authority or by another continuing airworthiness management organisation approved in accordance with Section A, Subpart G of this Annex (Part M);

(g) By derogation from points M.A.901(e) and M.A.901(i)2, for ELA1 aircraft not used in commercial air transport and not affected by point M.A.201(i), the airworthiness review certificate may also be issued by the competent authority upon satisfactory assessment, based on a recommendation made by certifying staff formally approved by the competent authority and complying with provisions of Annex III (Part-66) as well as requirements laid down in point M.A.707(a)2(a), sent together with the application from the owner or operator. This recommendation shall be based on an airworthiness review carried out in accordance with point M.A.710 and shall not be issued for more than two consecutive years;

(h) Whenever circumstances reveal the existence of a potential safety threat, the competent authority shall carry out the airworthiness review and issue the airworthiness review certificate itself;

(i) In addition to paragraph (h), the competent authority may also carry out the airworthiness review and issue the airworthiness review certificate itself in the following cases:

1. when the aircraft is managed by a continuing airworthiness management organisation approved in accordance with Section A, Subpart G of this Annex (Part M) located in a third country,

2. for all balloons and any other aircraft of 2 730 kg MTOM and below, if it is requested by the owner;

(j) When the competent authority carries out the airworthiness review and/or issues the airworthiness review certificate itself, the owner or operator shall provide the competent authority with:

1. the documentation required by the competent authority; and

2. suitable accommodation at the appropriate location for its personnel; and

3. when necessary, the support of personnel appropriately qualified in accordance with Annex III (Part-66) or equivalent personnel requirements laid down in point 145.A.30(j)(1) and (2) of Annex II (Part 145);

(k) An airworthiness review certificate cannot be issued nor extended if there is evidence or reason to believe that the aircraft is not airworthy;

(l) For ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, the Part-145 or M.A. Subpart F maintenance organisation performing the annual inspection contained in the maintenance programme may, if appropriately approved, perform the airworthiness review and issue the corresponding airworthiness review certificate, subject to the following conditions:

1. The organisation nominates airworthiness review staff complying with all the following requirements:

(a) The airworthiness review staff hold a certifying staff authorisation for the corresponding aircraft.

(b) The airworthiness review staff have at least three years of experience as certifying staff.

(c) The airworthiness review staff are independent from the continuing airworthiness management process of the aircraft being reviewed or have overall authority on the continuing airworthiness management process of the complete aircraft being reviewed.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

(d) The airworthiness review staff have acquired knowledge of the parts of Part-M relevant to continuing airworthiness management.

(e) The airworthiness review staff have acquired proven knowledge of the procedures of the maintenance organisation relevant to the airworthiness review and issue of the airworthiness review certificate.

(f) The airworthiness review staff have been formally accepted by the competent authority after having performed an airworthiness review under the supervision of the competent authority or under the supervision of the organisation's airworthiness review staff in accordance with a procedure approved by the competent authority.

(g) the airworthiness review staff have performed at least one airworthiness review in the last twelve-month period.

2. The airworthiness review is performed at the same time as the annual inspection contained in the maintenance programme and by the same person who releases such annual inspection, being possible to use the 90 days anticipation provision contained in M.A.710(d).

3. The airworthiness review includes a full documented review in accordance with point M.A.710(a).

4. The airworthiness review includes a physical survey of the aircraft in accordance with points M.A.710(b) and (c).

5. An airworthiness review certificate EASA Form 15c is issued, on behalf of the maintenance organisation, by the person who performed the airworthiness review when satisfied that:

(a) the airworthiness review has been completely and satisfactorily carried out; and

(b) the maintenance programme has been reviewed in accordance with point M.A.710(h); and

(c) there is no non-compliance which is known to endanger flight safety.

6. A copy of the airworthiness review certificate issued is sent to the competent authority of the Member State of Registry of the aircraft within 10 days of the date of issue.

7. The competent authority of the Member State of Registry is informed within 72 hours if the organisation has determined that the airworthiness review is inconclusive or if the review under point M.A.901(l)5(b) above shows discrepancies on the aircraft linked to deficiencies in the content of the maintenance programme.

8. The manual or exposition of the maintenance organisation describes all the following:

(a) The procedures for the performance of airworthiness reviews and the issue of the corresponding airworthiness review certificate.

(b) The names of the certifying staff authorised to perform airworthiness reviews and issue the corresponding airworthiness review certificate.

(c) The procedures for the review of the maintenance programme.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Point M.A.904 is amended as follows:

M.A.904 Airworthiness review of aircraft imported into the EU

…

(b) When satisfied that the aircraft is in compliance with the relevant requirements, the continuing airworthiness management organisation or maintenance organisation, if applicable, shall send a documented recommendation for the issuance of an airworthiness review certificate to the Member State of Registry.

…

Point M.B.301 is amended as follows:

M.B.301 Maintenance programme

(a) Except for those cases where the owner has issued a declaration for the maintenance programme in accordance with point M.A.302(h), the competent authority shall verify that the maintenance programme is in compliance with M.A.302.

(b) Except where stated otherwise in points M.A.302(c) and M.A.302(h) the maintenance programme and its amendments shall be approved directly by the competent authority.

(c) In the case of indirect approval, the maintenance programme procedure shall be approved by the competent authority through the continuing airworthiness management exposition.

(d) In order to approve a maintenance programme according to paragraph (b), the competent authority shall have access to all the data required in points M.A.302(d), (e), ~~and~~ (f) and (h).

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Appendix III is amended as follows:

Appendix III: Airworthiness review certificate – EASA Form 15

[MEMBER STATE]
A Member of the European Union (*)
.
AIRWORTHINESS REVIEW CERTIFICATE
.
ARC reference: ……..
.
Pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council for the time being into force, the following continuing airworthiness management organisation, approved in accordance with Section A, Subpart G of Annex I (Part M) to Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003
.
[NAME OF ORGANISATION APPROVED AND ADDRESS]
Approval reference : [MEMBER STATE CODE].MG.[NNNN].
.
hereby certifies that it has performed an airworthiness review in accordance with point M.A.710 of Annex I to Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 on the following aircraft :
.
Aircraft manufacturer:……
Manufacturer's designation:……..
Aircraft registration:……..
Aircraft serial number:…….
.
and this aircraft is considered airworthy at the time of the review.
.
Date of issue: ..... Date of expiry: ……
Airframe Flight Hours (FH) at date of issue (**): ……..
Signed: ..... Authorisation No: ……...
.
1st Extension: The aircraft has remained in a controlled environment in accordance with point M.A.901 of Annex I to Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 for the last year. The aircraft is considered to be airworthy at the time of the issue.
Date of issue: ..... Date of expiry: ……
Airframe Flight Hours (FH) at date of issue (**): ……..
Signed: ..... Authorisation No: ……...
Company Name: ..... Approval reference: ……
.
2nd Extension: The aircraft has remained in a controlled environment in accordance with point M.A.901 of Annex I to Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 for the last year. The aircraft is considered to be airworthy at the time of the issue.
Date of issue: ..... Date of expiry: ……
Airframe Flight Hours (FH) at date of issue (**): ……..
Signed: ..... Authorisation No: ……...
Company Name: ..... Approval reference: ……

(*) Delete for non-EU Member States.
(**) Except for balloons and airships

EASA Form 15b Issue ~~3~~4

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

[MEMBER STATE]
A Member of the European Union (*)

.

.AIRWORTHINESS REVIEW CERTIFICATE

.

ARC reference: …….

.

Pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council for the time being into force, the [COMPETENT AUTHORITY OF THE MEMBER STATE] hereby certifies that the following aircraft :

Aircraft manufacturer:……
Manufacturer's designation:……..
Aircraft registration:……..
Aircraft serial number:…….

is considered airworthy at the time of the review.

Date of issue: ..... Date of expiry: ……
Airframe Flight Hours (FH) at date of issue (**): ……..
Signed: ..... Authorisation No: ……...

1st Extension: The aircraft has remained in a controlled environment in accordance with point M.A.901 of Annex I to Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 for the last year. The aircraft is considered to be airworthy at the time of the issue.
Date of issue: ..... Date of expiry: ……
Airframe Flight Hours (FH) at date of issue (**): ……..
Signed: ..... Authorisation No: ……...
Company Name: ..... Approval reference: ……

2nd Extension: The aircraft has remained in a controlled environment in accordance with point M.A.901 of Annex I to Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 for the last year. The aircraft is considered to be airworthy at the time of the issue.
Date of issue: ..... Date of expiry: ……
Airframe Flight Hours (FH) at date of issue (**): ……..

Signed: ..... Authorisation No: ……...
Company Name: ..... Approval reference: ……

(*) Delete for non-EU Member States.
(**) Except for balloons and airships

EASA Form 15a Issue ~~3~~4

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

[MEMBER STATE]
A Member of the European Union (*)

AIRWORTHINESS REVIEW CERTIFICATE (**)

ARC reference: ……..

Pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council for the time being into force, the following maintenance organisation, approved in accordance with (mark as applicable):

☐ Section A, Subpart F of Annex I (Part-M) to Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003, or

☐ Section A of Annex II (Part-145) to Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003

[NAME OF ORGANISATION APPROVED AND ADDRESS]

Approval reference: [MEMBER STATE CODE]. [MF or 145].[NNNN]

hereby certifies that it has performed an airworthiness review in accordance with point M.A.901(l) of Annex I to Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 on the following aircraft :

Aircraft manufacturer:……
Manufacturer's designation:……..
Aircraft registration:……..
Aircraft serial number:…….

and this aircraft is considered airworthy at the time of the review.

Date of issue: ..... Date of expiry: ……
Airframe Flight Hours (FH) at date of issue (***): ……..
Signed: ..... Authorisation No: ……...

_____

(*) Delete for non-EU Member States.
(**) Applicable only to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations.

(***) Except for balloons and airships

EASA Form 15c Issue 1

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Appendix IV is amended as follows:

Appendix IV: Class and ratings system to be used for the approval of maintenance organisations referred to in Annex I (Part-M) Subpart F and Annex II (Part-145)

1. Except as stated otherwise for the smallest organisations in paragraph 12, the table referred to in point 13 provides the standard system for the approval of maintenance organisation under Subpart F of Annex I (Part-M) and Annex II (Part-145). An organisation must be granted an approval ranging from a single class and rating with limitations to all classes and ratings with limitations.

2. In addition to the table referred to in point 13, the approved maintenance organisation is required to indicate its scope of work in its maintenance organisation manual/exposition. See also paragraph 11.

3. Within the approval class(es) and rating(s) granted by the competent authority, the scope of work specified in the maintenance organisation exposition defines the exact limits of approval. It is therefore essential that the approval class(es) and rating(s) and the organisations scope of work are matching.

4. *A category A class rating* means that the approved maintenance organisation may carry out maintenance on the aircraft and any component (including engines and/or Auxiliary Power Units (APUs), in accordance with aircraft maintenance data or, if agreed by the competent authority, in accordance with component maintenance data, only whilst such components are fitted to the aircraft. Nevertheless, such A-rated approved maintenance organisation may temporarily remove a component for maintenance, in order to improve access to that component, except when such removal generates the need for additional maintenance not eligible for the provisions of this paragraph. This will be subject to a control procedure in the maintenance organisation exposition to be approved by the competent authority. The limitation section will specify the scope of such maintenance thereby indicating the extent of approval.

5. *A category B class rating* means that the approved maintenance organisation may carry out maintenance on the uninstalled engine and/or APU and engine and/or APU components, in accordance with engine and/or APU maintenance data or, if agreed by the competent authority, in accordance with component maintenance data, only whilst such components are fitted to the engine and/or APU. Nevertheless, such B-rated approved maintenance organisation may temporarily remove a component for maintenance, in order to improve access to that component, except when such removal generates the need for additional maintenance not eligible for the provisions of this paragraph. The limitation section will specify the scope of such maintenance thereby indicating the extent of approval. A maintenance organisation approved with a category B class rating may also carry out maintenance on an installed engine during 'base' and 'line' maintenance subject to a control procedure in the maintenance organisation exposition to be approved by the competent authority. The maintenance organisation exposition scope of work shall reflect such activity where permitted by the competent authority.

6. *A category C class rating* means that the approved maintenance organisation may carry out maintenance on uninstalled components (excluding engines and APUs) intended for fitment to the aircraft or engine/APU. The limitation section will specify the scope of such maintenance thereby indicating the extent of approval. A maintenance organisation approved with a category C class rating may also carry out maintenance on an installed component during base and line maintenance or at an engine/APU maintenance facility subject to a control procedure in the maintenance organisation exposition to be approved by the competent authority. The maintenance organisation exposition scope of work shall reflect such activity where permitted by the competent authority.

7. A category D class rating is a self-contained class rating not necessarily related to a specific aircraft, engine or other component. The D1 - Non Destructive Testing (NDT)

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

rating is only necessary for an approved maintenance organisation that carries out NDT as a particular task for another organisation. A maintenance organisation approved with a class rating in A or B or C category may carry out NDT on products it is maintaining subject to the maintenance organisation exposition containing NDT procedures, without the need for a D1 class rating.

8. In the case of maintenance organisations approved in accordance with Annex II (Part-145), *category A class ratings* are subdivided into 'Base' or 'Line' maintenance. Such an organisation may be approved for either 'Base' or 'Line' maintenance or both. It should be noted that a 'Line' facility located at a main base facility requires a 'Line' maintenance approval.

9. The *limitation* section is intended to give the competent authorities the flexibility to customise the approval to any particular organisation. Ratings shall be mentioned on the approval only when appropriately limited. The table referred to in point 13 specifies the types of limitation possible. Whilst maintenance is listed last in each class rating it is acceptable to stress the maintenance task rather than the aircraft or engine type or manufacturer, if this is more appropriate to the organisation (an example could be avionic systems installations and related maintenance). Such mention in the limitation section indicates that the maintenance organisation is approved to carry out maintenance up to and including this particular type/task.

10. When reference is made to *series, type and group* in the limitation section of class A and B, series means a specific type series such as Airbus 300 or 310 or 319 or Boeing 737-300 series or RB211-524 series or Cessna 150 or Cessna 172 or Beech 55 series or continental O-200 series, etc; type means a specific type or model such as Airbus 310-240 type or RB 211-524 B4 type or Cessna 172RG type; any number of series or types may be quoted; group means for example Cessna single piston engine aircraft or Lycoming non-supercharged piston engines etc.

11. When a *lengthy capability list* is used which could be subject to frequent amendment, then such amendment may be in accordance with the indirect approval procedure referred to in points M.A.604(c) and M.B.606(c) or 145.A.70(c) and 145.B.40, as applicable.

12. A maintenance organisation which employs only one person to both plan and carry out all maintenance can only hold a limited scope of approval rating. The maximum permissible limits are:

CLASS	RATING	LIMITATION
CLASS AIRCRAFT	RATING A2 AEROPLANES 5 700 KG AND BELOW	PISTON ENGINE 5 700 KG AND BELOW
CLASS AIRCRAFT	RATING A3 HELICOPTERS	SINGLE PISTON ENGINE 3 175 KG AND BELOW
CLASS AIRCRAFT	RATING A4 AIRCRAFT OTHER THAN A1, A2 AND A3	NO LIMITATION
CLASS ENGINES	RATING B2 PISTON	LESS THAN 450 HP
CLASS COMPONENTS RATING OTHER THAN COMPLETE ENGINES OR APU'S.	C1 TO C22	AS PER CAPABILITY LIST
CLASS SPECIALISED	D1 NDT	NDT METHOD(S) TO BE SPECIFIED.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

It should be noted that such an organisation may be further limited by the competent authority in the scope of approval dependent upon the capability of the particular organisation.

13. *Table*

CLASS	RATING	LIMITATION	BASE	LINE
AIRCRAFT	A1 Aeroplanes above 5 700 kg	[Rating reserved to Maintenance Organisations approved in accordance with Annex II (Part-145)] [Shall state aeroplane manufacturer or group or series or type and/or the maintenance tasks] *Example: Airbus A320 Series*	[YES/ NO]*	[YES/ NO]*
	A2 Aeroplanes 5 700 kg and below	[Shall state aeroplane manufacturer or group or series or type and/or the maintenance tasks] *Example: DHC-6 Twin Otter Series* State whether the issue of airworthiness review certificates is authorised or not (only possible for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations)	[YES/ NO]*	[YES/ NO]*
	A3 Helicopters	[Shall state helicopter manufacturer or group or series or type and/or the maintenance task(s)] *Example: Robinson R44*	[YES/ NO]*	[YES/ NO]*
	A4 Aircraft other than A1, A2 and A3	[Shall state aircraft category (sailplane, balloon, airship, etc.), manufacturer or group or series or type and/or the maintenance task(s).] State whether the issue of airworthiness review certificates is authorised or not (only possible for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations)	[YES/ NO]*	[YES/ NO]*
ENGINES	B1 Turbine	[Shall state engine series or type and/or the maintenance task(s)] *Example: PT6A Series*		
	B2 Piston	[Shall state engine manufacturer or group or series or type and/or the maintenance task(s)]		
	B3 APU	[Shall state engine manufacturer or series or type and/or the maintenance task(s)]		
COMPONENTS OTHER THAN COMPLETE ENGINES OR APUs	C1 Air Cond & Press	[Shall state aircraft type or aircraft manufacturer or component manufacturer or the particular component and/or cross refer to a capability list in the exposition and/or the maintenance task(s).]		
	C2 Auto Flight			
	C3 Comms and Nav			
	C4 Doors - Hatches			
	C5 Electrical Power & Lights			
	C6 Equipment			

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	C7 Engine - APU	*Example: PT6A Fuel Control*
	C8 Flight Controls	
	C9 Fuel	
	C10 Helicopter - Rotors	
	C11 Helicopter - Trans	
	C12 Hydraulic Power	
	C13 Indicating - recording system	
	C14 Landing Gear	
	C15 Oxygen	
	C16 Propellers	
	C17 Pneumatic & Vacuum	
	C18 Protection ice/rain/fire	
	C19 Windows	
	C20 Structural	
	C21 Water ballast	
	C22 Propulsion Augmentation	
SPECIALISED SERVICES	D1 Non Destructive Testing	[Shall state particular NDT method(s)]

* Delete as appropriate

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Appendix V is amended as follows:

Appendix V: Maintenance organisation approval referred to in Annex I (Part-M) Subpart F

Page 1 of …

[MEMBER STATE](*)
A Member of the European Union (**)

MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION APPROVAL CERTIFICATE

Reference: [MEMBER STATE CODE (*)].MF.[XXXX]

Pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council and to Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 for the time being in force and subject to the condition specified below, the [COMPETENT AUTHORITY OF THE MEMBER STATE (*)] hereby certifies:

[COMPANY NAME AND ADDRESS]

as a maintenance organisation in compliance with Section A, Subpart F of Annex I (Part-M) of Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003, approved to maintain the products, parts and appliances listed in the attached approval schedule and issue related certificates of release to service using the above references and, when stipulated, to issue airworthiness review certificates after an airworthiness review as specified in point M.A.901(l) of Annex I (Part-M) of the same regulation for those aircraft listed in the attached approval schedule.

CONDITIONS:

1. This approval is limited to that specified in the scope of work section of the approved maintenance organisation manual as referred to in Section A of Subpart F of Annex I (Part-M), and

2. This approval requires compliance with the procedures specified in the approved maintenance organisation manual, and

3. This approval is valid whilst the approved maintenance organisation remains in compliance with Annex I (Part-M) of Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003.

4. Subject to compliance with the foregoing conditions, this approval shall remain valid for an unlimited duration unless the approval has previously been surrendered, superseded, suspended or revoked.

Date of original issue: .....

Date of this revision: .....

Revision No: ……

Signed: .....

For the competent authority: [COMPETENT AUTHORITY OF THE MEMBER STATE (*)]

EASA Form 3-MF Issue ~~2~~ 3
* or EASA if EASA is the competent authority
** Delete for non-EU Member States or EASA

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

.

Page 2 of …

MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION APPROVAL SCHEDULE

Reference: [MEMBER STATE CODE*].MF.XXXX

Organisation: [COMPANY NAME AND ADDRESS]

CLASS	RATING	LIMITATION
AIRCRAFT (**)	(***)	(***) State whether the issue of airworthiness review certificates is authorised or not (only possible for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations)
	(***)	(***) State whether the issue of airworthiness review certificates is authorised or not (only possible for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations)
ENGINES (**)	(***)	(***)
	(***)	(***)
COMPONENTS OTHER THAN COMPLETE ENGINES OR APUs (**)	(***)	(***)
	(***)	(***)
	(***)	(***)
	(***)	(***)
	(***)	(***)
	(***)	(***)
SPECIALISED SERVICES (**)	(***)	(***)
	(***)	(***)

This approval is limited to the products, parts and appliances and to the activities specified in the scope of work section of the approved maintenance organisation manual ,

Maintenance Organisation Manual reference:.....

Date of original issue: .....

Date of last revision approved : ..... Revision No: ……

Signed: .....

For the competent authority:[COMPETENT AUTHORITY OF THE MEMBER STATE(*)]

EASA Form 3-MF Issue ~~2~~ 3

(*) or EASA if EASA is the competent authority
** Delete as appropriate if the organisation is not approved.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

*** Complete with the appropriate rating and limitation

Appendix VIII is amended as follows:

Appendix VIII: Limited Pilot-Owner Maintenance

…

(b) Tasks

…

8. is listed in Appendix VII or is a component maintenance task in accordance with points M.A.502(a), (b), (c) or (d);

9. is part of the annual or 100 h check contained in the Minimum Inspection Programme described in M.A.302(i).

The criteria 1 to 9 ~~8~~ listed above cannot be overridden by less restrictive instructions issued in accordance with 'M.A.302(d) Maintenance Programme'.

…

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

5.3 Appendix III: draft amendment to Annex II (Part-145)

The Table of Contents within Part-145 is amended as follows:

CONTENTS

…

SECTION A – TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

…

145.A.35 Certifying staff and support staff

145.A.36 Records of airworthiness review staff

145.A.40 Equipment, tools and material

…

145.A.55 Maintenance and airworthiness review records

…

…

Point 145.A.30 is amended as follows:

145.A.30 Personnel requirements

(a) The organisation shall appoint an accountable manager who has corporate authority for ensuring that all maintenance required by the customer can be financed and carried out to the standard required by this Part. The accountable manager shall:

1. ensure that all necessary resources are available to accomplish maintenance in accordance with 145.A.65(b) to support the organisation approval.
2. establish and promote the safety and quality policy specified in 145.A.65(a).
3. demonstrate a basic understanding of this Part.

(b) The organisation shall nominate a person or group of persons, whose responsibilities include ensuring that the organisation complies with this Part. Such person(s) shall ultimately be responsible to the accountable manager.

1. The person or persons nominated shall represent the maintenance management structure of the organisation and be responsible for all functions specified in this Part.
2. The person or persons nominated shall be identified and their credentials submitted in a form and manner established by the competent authority.
3. The person or persons nominated shall be able to demonstrate relevant knowledge, background and satisfactory experience related to aircraft or component maintenance and demonstrate a working knowledge of this Part.
4. Procedures shall make clear who deputises for any particular person in the case of lengthy absence of the said person.

(c) The accountable manager under paragraph (a) shall appoint a person with responsibility for monitoring the quality system, including the associated feedback system as required by 145.A.65(c). The appointed person shall have direct access to the accountable manager to ensure that the accountable manager is kept properly informed on quality and compliance matters.

(d) The organisation shall have a maintenance man-hour plan showing that the organisation has sufficient staff to plan, perform, supervise, inspect and quality monitor the organisation in accordance with the approval. In addition the organisation shall have a

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

procedure to reassess work intended to be carried out when actual staff availability is less than the planned staffing level for any particular work shift or period.

(e) The organisation shall establish and control the competence of personnel involved in any maintenance, development of maintenance programmes, airworthiness reviews, management and/or quality audits in accordance with a procedure and to a standard agreed by the competent authority. In addition to the necessary expertise related to the job function, competence must include an understanding of the application of human factors and human performance issues appropriate to that person's function in the organisation. 'Human factors' means principles which apply to aeronautical design, certification, training, operations and maintenance and which seek safe interface between the human and other system components by proper consideration of human performance. 'Human performance' means human capabilities and limitations which have an impact on the safety and efficiency of aeronautical operations.

(f) The organisation shall ensure that personnel who carry out and/or control a continued airworthiness non-destructive test of aircraft structures and/or components are appropriately qualified for the particular non-destructive test in accordance with the European or equivalent Standard recognised by the Agency. Personnel who carry out any other specialised task shall be appropriately qualified in accordance with officially recognised Standards. By derogation to this paragraph those personnel specified in paragraphs (g) and (h)(1) and (h)(2), qualified in category B1 or B3 in accordance with Annex III (Part-66) may carry out and/or control colour contrast dye penetrant tests.

(g) Any organisation maintaining aircraft, except where stated otherwise in point (j), shall in the case of aircraft line maintenance, have appropriate aircraft rated certifying staff qualified as category B1, B2, B3, as appropriate, in accordance with Annex III (Part-66) and point 145.A.35.

In addition, such organisations may also use appropriately task trained certifying staff holding the privileges described in points 66.A.20(a)(1) and 66.A.20(a)(3)(ii) and qualified in accordance with Annex III (Part-66) and point 145.A.35 to carry out minor scheduled line maintenance and simple defect rectification. The availability of such certifying staff shall not replace the need for category B1, B2, B3 certifying staff, as appropriate.

(h) Any organisation maintaining aircraft, except where stated otherwise in paragraph (j) shall:

1. in the case of base maintenance of large aircraft, have appropriate aircraft type rated certifying staff qualified as category C in accordance with Part-66 and 145.A.35. In addition the organisation shall have sufficient aircraft type rated staff qualified as category B1, B2 as appropriate in accordance with Part-66 and 145.A.35 to support the category C certifying staff.

   (i) B1 and B2 support staff shall ensure that all relevant tasks or inspections have been carried out to the required standard before the category C certifying staff issues the certificate of release to service.

   (ii) The organisation shall maintain a register of any such B1 and B2 support staff.

   (iii) The category C certifying staff shall ensure that compliance with paragraph (i) has been met and that all work required by the customer has been accomplished during the particular base maintenance check or work package, and shall also assess the impact of any work not carried out with a view to either requiring its accomplishment or agreeing with the operator to defer such work to another specified check or time limit.

2. in the case of base maintenance of aircraft other than large aircraft have either:

   (i) appropriate aircraft rated certifying staff qualified as category B1, B2, B3, as

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

appropriate, in accordance with Annex III (Part-66) and point 145.A.35 or,

(ii) appropriate aircraft rated certifying staff qualified in category C assisted by support staff as specified in point 145.A.35(a)(i).

(i) Component certifying staff shall comply with Part-66.

(j) By derogation to paragraphs (g) and (h), in relation to the obligation to comply with Annex III (Part-66), the organisation may use certifying staff qualified in accordance with the following provisions:

1. For organisation facilities located outside the Community territory certifying staff may be qualified in accordance with the national aviation regulations of the State in which the organisation facility is registered subject to the conditions specified in Appendix IV to this Part.

2. For line maintenance carried out at a line station of an organisation which is located outside the Community territory, the certifying staff may be qualified in accordance with the national aviation regulations of the State in which the line station is based, subject to the conditions specified in Appendix IV to this Part.

3. For a repetitive pre-flight airworthiness directive which specifically states that the flight crew may carry out such airworthiness directive, the organisation may issue a limited certification authorisation to the aircraft commander and/or the flight engineer on the basis of the flight crew licence held. However, the organisation shall ensure that sufficient practical training has been carried out to ensure that such aircraft commander or flight engineer can accomplish the airworthiness directive to the required standard.

4. In the case of aircraft operating away from a supported location the organisation may issue a limited certification authorisation to the commander and/or the flight engineer on the basis of the flight crew licence held subject to being satisfied that sufficient practical training has been carried out to ensure that the commander or flight engineer can accomplish the specified task to the required standard. The provisions of this paragraph shall be detailed in an exposition procedure.

5. In the following unforeseen cases, where an aircraft is grounded at a location other than the main base where no appropriate certifying staff are available, the organisation contracted to provide maintenance support may issue a one-off certification authorisation:

(i) to one of its employees holding equivalent type authorisations on aircraft of similar technology, construction and systems; or

(ii) to any person with not less than five years maintenance experience and holding a valid ICAO aircraft maintenance licence rated for the aircraft type requiring certification provided there is no organisation appropriately approved under this Part at that location and the contracted organisation obtains and holds on file evidence of the experience and the licence of that person.

All such cases as specified in this subparagraph shall be reported to the competent authority within seven days of the ~~issuance~~ issue of such certification authorisation. The organisation issuing the one-off authorisation shall ensure that any such maintenance that could affect flight safety is re-checked by an appropriately approved organisation.

(k) If the organisation performs airworthiness reviews and issues the corresponding airworthiness review certificate for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations in accordance with M.A.901(l), it shall have airworthiness review staff qualified and authorised in accordance with M.A.901(l)1.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

(l) If the organisation is involved in the development and processing of approval of the maintenance programme for ELA2 aircraft not involved in commercial operations in accordance with M.A.201(e)(ii), it shall have qualified staff who shall be able to show relevant knowledge and experience.

A new point 145.A.36 is introduced as follows:

145.A.36 Records of airworthiness review staff

The organisation shall record all details concerning the airworthiness review staff and maintain a current list of all the airworthiness review staff together with their scope of approval as part of the organisation's exposition pursuant to point 145.A.70(a)6.

The organisation shall retain the record for at least three years after the staff referred to in this paragraph have ceased employment (or engagement as a contractor or volunteer) with the organisation or as soon as the authorisation has been withdrawn. In addition, upon request, the maintenance organisation shall provide the staff referred to in this paragraph with a copy of their personal record on leaving the organisation.

The staff referred to in this paragraph shall be given access on request to their personal records as detailed above.

Point 145.A.55 is amended as follows:

145.A.55 Maintenance and airworthiness review records

(a) The organisation shall record all details of maintenance work carried out. As a minimum, the organisation shall retain records necessary to prove that all requirements have been met for the ~~issuance~~ issue of the certificate of release to service, including subcontractor's release documents, and for the issue of any airworthiness review certificate.

(b) The organisation shall provide a copy of each certificate of release to service to the aircraft operator, together with a copy of any specific repair/modification data used for repairs/modifications carried out.

(c) The organisation shall retain a copy of all detailed maintenance records and any associated maintenance data for three years from the date the aircraft or component to which the work relates was released from the organisation. In addition, it shall retain a copy of all the records related to the issue of airworthiness review certificates for three years from the date of issue and shall provide a copy of them to the owner of the aircraft.

1. The records under this paragraph shall be stored in a manner that ensures protection from damage, alteration and theft.

2. Computer backup discs, tapes etc. shall be stored in a different location from that containing the working discs, tapes etc., in an environment that ensures they remain in good condition.

3. Where an organisation approved under this Part terminates its operation all retained maintenance records covering the last ~~two~~ three years shall be distributed to the last owner or customer of the respective aircraft or component or shall be stored as specified by the competent authority.

Point 145.A.70 is amended as follows:

145.A.70 Maintenance organisation exposition

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

(a) 'Maintenance organisation exposition' means the document or documents that contain the material specifying the scope of work deemed to constitute approval and showing how the organisation intends to comply with this Part. The organisation shall provide the competent authority with a maintenance organisation exposition, containing the following information:

1. A statement signed by the accountable manager confirming that the maintenance organisation exposition and any referenced associated manuals define the organisation's compliance with this Part and will be complied with at all times. When the accountable manager is not the chief executive officer of the organisation then such chief executive officer shall countersign the statement;
2. the organisation's safety and quality policy as specified by 145.A.65;
3. the title(s) and name(s) of the persons nominated under 145.A.30(b);
4. the duties and responsibilities of the persons nominated under 145.A.30(b), including matters on which they may deal directly with the competent authority on behalf of the organisation;
5. an organisation chart showing associated chains of responsibility between the persons nominated under 145.A.30(b);
6. a list of certifying staff, ~~and~~ support staff and, if applicable, airworthiness review staff and staff responsible for the development and processing of the maintenance programme, with their scope of approval;
7. a general description of manpower resources;
8. a general description of the facilities located at each address specified in the organisation's approval certificate;
9. a specification of the organisation's scope of work relevant to the extent of approval;
10. the notification procedure of 145.A.85 for organisation changes;
11. the maintenance organisation exposition amendment procedure;
12. the procedures and quality system established by the organisation under 145.A.25 to 145.A.90 and any additional procedure followed in accordance with Part-M;
13. a list of commercial operators, where applicable, to which the organisation provides an aircraft maintenance service;
14. a list of subcontracted organisations, where applicable, as specified in 145.A.75(b);
15. a list of line stations, where applicable, as specified in 145.A.75(d);
16. a list of contracted organisations, where applicable.

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

(c) Notwithstanding paragraph (b) minor amendments to the exposition may be approved through an exposition procedure (hereinafter called indirect approval).

Point 145.A.75 is amended as follows:

145.A.75 Privileges of the organisation

In accordance with the exposition, the organisation shall be entitled to carry out the following tasks:

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

(a) Maintain any aircraft and/or component for which it is approved at the locations identified in the approval certificate and in the exposition;

(b) Arrange for maintenance of any aircraft or component for which it is approved at another organisation that is working under the quality system of the organisation. This refers to work being carried out by an organisation not itself appropriately approved to carry out such maintenance under this Part and is limited to the work scope permitted under 145.A.65(b) procedures. This work scope shall not include a base maintenance check of an aircraft or a complete workshop maintenance check or overhaul of an engine or engine module;

(c) Maintain any aircraft or any component for which it is approved at any location subject to the need for such maintenance arising either from the unserviceability of the aircraft or from the necessity of supporting occasional line maintenance, subject to the conditions specified in the exposition;

(d) Maintain any aircraft and/or component for which it is approved at a location identified as a line maintenance location capable of supporting minor maintenance and only if the organisation exposition both permits such activity and lists such locations;

(e) Issue certificates of release to service in respect of completion of maintenance in accordance with 145.A.50~~.~~;

(f) Perform airworthiness reviews and issue the corresponding airworthiness review certificate for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, under the conditions specified in point M.A.901(l), if specifically approved to do so;

(g) Develop the maintenance programme and process its approval in accordance with point M.A.302 for ELA2 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, under the conditions specified in point M.A.201(e)(ii), and limited to the aircraft ratings listed in the approval certificate.

Point 145.A.85 is amended as follows:

145.A.85 Changes to the organisation

The organisation shall notify the competent authority of any proposal to carry out any of the following changes before such changes take place to enable the competent authority to determine continued compliance with this Part and to amend, if necessary, the approval certificate, except that in the case of proposed changes in personnel not known to the management beforehand, these changes must be notified at the earliest opportunity:

1. the name of the organisation;
2. the main location of the organisation;
3. additional locations of the organisation;
4. the accountable manager;
5. any of the persons nominated under 145.A.30(b);
6. the facilities, equipment, tools, material, procedures, work scope, ~~or~~ certifying staff and airworthiness review staff that could affect the approval.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Appendix III is amended as follows:

Appendix III: Maintenance organisation approval referred to in Annex II (Part-145)

Page 1 of 2

[MEMBER STATE(*)]
A Member of the European Union (**)

MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION APPROVAL CERTIFICATE

Reference: [MEMBER STATE CODE(*)].145.XXXX

Pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council and to Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003 for the time being in force and subject to the condition specified below, the [COMPETENT AUTHORITY OF THE MEMBER STATE(*)] hereby certifies:

[COMPANY NAME AND ADDRESS]

as a maintenance organisation in compliance with Section A of Annex II (Part-145) of Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003, approved to maintain products, parts and appliances listed in the attached approval schedule and issue related certificates of release to service using the above references and, when stipulated, to issue airworthiness review certificates after an airworthiness review as specified in point M.A.901(l) of Annex I (Part-M) to the same Regulation for those aircraft listed in the attached approval schedule.

CONDITIONS:

1. This approval is limited to that specified in the scope of work section of the approved maintenance organisation exposition as referred to in Section A of Annex II (Part-145), and
2. This approval requires compliance with the procedures specified in the approved maintenance organisation exposition, and
3. This approval is valid whilst the approved maintenance organisation remains in compliance with Annex II (Part-145) of Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003.
4. Subject to compliance with the foregoing conditions, this approval shall remain valid for an unlimited duration unless the approval has previously been surrendered, superseded, suspended or revoked.

Date of original issue:.....

Date of this revision: ….....

Revision No: .....

Signed: .....

For the competent authority: [COMPETENT AUTHORITY OF THE MEMBER STATE(*)]

EASA Form 3-145 Issue ~~2~~ 3

(*) or EASA if EASA is the competent authority.
(**) Delete for non-EU Member States or EASA.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION APPROVAL SCHEDULE

Reference: [MEMBER STATE CODE(*)].145.[XXXX]

Organisation: [COMPANY NAME AND ADDRESS]

CLASS	RATING	LIMITATION	BASE	LINE
AIRCRAFT (**)	(***)	(***) (****)	[YES/NO](**)	[YES/NO](**)
	(***)	(***) (****)	[YES/NO](**)	[YES/NO](**)
	(***)	(***) (****)	[YES/NO](**)	[YES/NO](**)
	(***)	(***) (****)	[YES/NO](**)	[YES/NO](**)
ENGINES (**)	(***)	(***)		
	(***)	(***)		
COMPONENTS OTHER THAN COMPLETE ENGINES OR APUs (**)	(***)	(***)		
	(***)	(***)		
	(***)	(***)		
	(***)	(***)		
	(***)	(***)		
SPECIALISED SERVICES (**)	(***)	(***)		
	(***)	(***)		

This approval schedule is limited to those products, parts and appliances and to the activities specified in the scope of work section of the approved maintenance organisation exposition,
Maintenance Organisation Exposition reference: .....
Date of original issue: .....
Date of last revision approved: .....Revision No: .....
Signed: .....

For the competent authority:[COMPETENT AUTHORITY OF THE MEMBER STATE (*)]

EASA Form 3-145 Issue ~~2~~ 3

(*) or EASA if EASA is the competent authority.

(**) Delete as appropriate if the organisation is not approved.

(***) Complete with the appropriate rating and limitation.

(****) State whether the issue of airworthiness review certificates is authorised or not (only possible for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations when the organisation performs the airworthiness review together with the annual inspection contained in the maintenance programme).

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

5.4 Appendix IV: draft amendment to AMC to Part-M

AMC M.A.201(e) Responsibilities

The limited contract for the development and, when applicable, processing of the approval of the aircraft maintenance programme should cover the responsibilities related to M.A.302(d), M.A.302(e) and M.A.302(g). ~~This contract may also entitle the M.A. Subpart G organisation to use the indirect approval procedure described in M.A.302(c).~~

In the case of ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, the limited contract between the owner and the CAMO/maintenance organisation should cover the following aspects:

— Whether the maintenance programme will be based on the 'Minimum Inspection Programme' described in M.A.302(i);

— The obligation for the CAMO/maintenance organisation to develop and propose to the owner a maintenance programme which:

- identifies the owner and the specific aircraft, engine, and propeller (as applicable);
- includes all mandatory maintenance information and any additional tasks derived from the evaluation of the recommendations issued by the Design Approval Holder;
- does not go below the requirements of the Minimum Inspection Programme
- is customised to the particular aircraft type, configuration and operation, in accordance with paragraph M.A.302(h)3

— Whether the maintenance programme is going to be approved by the competent authority or the owner is going to issue a declaration for the maintenance programme.

- In the case of approval by the competent authority, whether indirect approval by the CAMO is permitted or not.
- In the case of declaration by the owner, a statement in the contract making clear that the owner assumes full responsibility for any deviations introduced to the maintenance programme proposed by the CAMO/maintenance organisation.

Point AMC M.A.302 is amended as follows:

AMC M.A.302 Aircraft maintenance programme

NOTE: This AMC is not applicable to those ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations for which the owner has elected to apply the provisions of point M.A.302(h). For those cases, refer to AMC M.A.302(h).

1. The term 'maintenance programme' is intended to include scheduled maintenance tasks the associated procedures and standard maintenance practises. The term 'maintenance schedule' is intended to embrace the scheduled maintenance tasks alone.

2. The aircraft should only be maintained to one approved maintenance programme at a given point in time. Where an owner or operator wishes to change from one approved programme to other, a transfer check or inspection may need to be performed in order to implement the change.

3. The maintenance programme details should be reviewed at least annually. As a minimum revisions of documents affecting the programme basis need to be considered by the owner or operator for inclusion in the maintenance programme during the annual review. Applicable mandatory requirements for compliance with

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Part-21 should be incorporated into the owner or operator's maintenance programme as soon as possible

4. The aircraft maintenance programme should contain a preface which will define the maintenance programme contents, the inspection standards to be applied, permitted variations to task frequencies and, where applicable, any procedure to manage the evolution of established check or inspection intervals.

   Appendix I to AMC M.A.302 provides detailed information on the contents of an approved aircraft maintenance programme.

5. Repetitive maintenance tasks derived from modifications and repairs should be incorporated into the approved maintenance programme.

Point AMC M.A.302(d) is amended as follows:

AMC M.A.302(d) Aircraft maintenance programme ~~compliance~~

1. An owner or operator's maintenance programme should normally be based upon the maintenance review board (MRB) report where applicable, the maintenance planning document (MPD), the relevant chapters of the maintenance manual or any other maintenance data containing information on scheduling. Furthermore, an owner or operator's maintenance programme should also take into account any maintenance data containing information on scheduling for components.

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

   — in the absence of specific recommendations of the Type Certificate Holder.

   — to provide alternate instructions to those described in the subparagraph 1 above, with the objective of providing flexibility to the operator.

3. Where an aircraft type has been subjected to the MRB report process, an operator should normally develop the initial operator's aircraft maintenance programme based upon the MRB report.

4. Where an aircraft is maintained in accordance with an aircraft maintenance programme based upon the MRB report process, any associated programme for the continuous surveillance of the reliability, or health monitoring of the aircraft should be considered as part of the aircraft maintenance programme.

5. Aircraft maintenance programmes for aircraft types subjected to the MRB report process should contain identification cross reference to the MRB report tasks such that it is always possible to relate such tasks to the current approved aircraft maintenance programme. This does not prevent the approved aircraft maintenance programme from being developed in the light of service experience to beyond the MRB report recommendations but will show the relationship to such recommendations

6. Some approved aircraft maintenance programmes, not developed from the MRB process, utilise reliability programmes. Such reliability programmes should be considered as a part of the approved maintenance programme.

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

   — Escalation of the interval for certain tasks based on reliability data or other supporting information. Appendix I recommends that the maintenance

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

programme contains the corresponding escalation procedures. The escalation of these tasks is directly approved by the competent authority, except in the case of ALIs (Airworthiness Limitations), which are approved by the Agency.

— More restrictive intervals than those proposed by the TC holder as a result of the reliability data or because of a more stringent operational environment.

— Additional tasks at the discretion of the operator.

A new point AMC M.A.302(e) is introduced as follows:

AMC M.A.302(e) Aircraft maintenance programme

Except for complex motor-powered aircraft, the aircraft maintenance programme may take the format of the following example:

Example of Aircraft Maintenance Programme (for aircraft other than 'complex motor-powered aircraft')	
Owner ☐ - Lessee ☐ - CAMO ☐ (The person/organisation responsible for the continuing airworthiness according to M.A.201) 'I will ensure that the aircraft is maintained in accordance with this maintenance programme and that the maintenance programme will be reviewed and updated as required' Signature **1**	
Name/Address:	Contact: Telephone: E-mail: Fax: **2**
Aircraft Registration: **3**	
Aircraft Manufacturer:	Engine Manufacturer:
Aircraft Type/Model:	Engine Type/Model):
Aircraft Serial number:	Propeller Manufacturer:
	Propeller Type/Model: **4**

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Basic information for the maintenance programme:

- **either maintenance data from the Design Approval Holder, or**
- **in the case of ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, the maintenance tasks contained in the Part-M M.A.302(i) 'Minimum Inspection Programme'**

Directly list the details of each maintenance task for the aircraft/engine/propeller (description, interval, etc.) or, as an alternative, provide such details by reference to particular documents/manuals/checklists (including revision level status, which should be updated at the time of the Periodic Reviews referred to in Table 3).

In the case of ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, if the option selected is to follow the maintenance data from the Design Approval Holder, at least the maintenance manuals and the maintenance schedules in the latest version should be followed.

In the case of ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, if the option selected is to follow the 'Minimum Inspection Programme', the owner should review the maintenance data from the Design Approval Holder to identify if there are specific inspections to be performed at intervals different to 100 h and/or annual interval.

Enter in Table 2 any deviations to the Design Approval Holder recommendations, together with the alternative inspections/tasks to be performed. This may include a change to the recommended intervals or the decision not to perform a particular recommended maintenance task.

Indicate the option selected:

Minimum Inspection Programme ☐

Design Approval Holder Data ☐

NOTE: Regardless of the option selected, the maintenance programme shall not be less restrictive than the 'Minimum Inspection Programme' (see M.A.302(h)2).

List of maintenance tasks for the aircraft/engine/propeller or reference to particular documents/manuals/checklists (including revision level):

5

Specific equipment and modifications: Are there any additional maintenance measures required due to specific installed equipment and/or modifications of the aircraft? If yes, enter in Table 1.	Yes ☐ No ☐ **6**

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Repairs: Are there any additional maintenance measures required due to repairs incorporated on the aircraft? If yes, enter in Table 1.	Yes ☐ No ☐ **7**
Mandatory Continuing Airworthiness Instructions (ALIs, CMRs, specific maintenance requirements contained in the TCDS, etc.): Are there any mandatory continuing airworthiness requirements? If yes, enter in Table 1.	Yes ☐ No ☐ **8**
Repetitive Airworthiness Directives (AD): Are there any applicable airworthiness directives which are repetitive? If yes, enter in Table 1.	Yes ☐ No ☐ **9**
Maintenance recommendations: Are there any other maintenance measures, such as TBO intervals, recommended through service bulletins, service letters, etc.? If yes, enter in Table 1. Enter in Table 2 any deviations to the maintenance recommendations mentioned above, together with the alternative inspections/tasks to be performed. This may include a change to the recommended intervals or the decision not to perform a particular recommended maintenance task.	Yes ☐ No ☐ **10**
Operational and airspace directives/requirements: Are there any applicable national*/European operational and/or airspace directives/requirements such as inspection of airspeed indicator, altimeter, compass, transponder, etc.? If yes, enter in Table 1. * Only applicable if the national operational and airspace rules have not been superseded by European rules.	Yes ☐ No ☐ **11**
Special operational approvals: Are there any additional maintenance measures due to specific Special Approvals (E.g. Reduced Vertical Separation Minima RVSM, Minimum Navigation Performance Specification MNPS, Basic Area Navigation B-NAV)? If yes, enter in Table 1.	Yes ☐ No ☐ **12**
Use of the aircraft and operational environment: Are there any additional maintenance measures required due to the use of the aircraft and the operational environment? If yes, enter in Table 1. In the case of high utilisation aircraft (aircraft flying more than 200 hours per year) using the 'Minimum Inspection Programme', consideration should be given to additional inspections required by the Design Approval Holder (at intervals higher than 100 h). Enter in Table 2 any deviations to the Design Approval Holder recommendations, together with the alternative inspections/tasks to be performed. This may include a change to the recommended intervals or the decision not to perform a particular recommended maintenance task.	Yes ☐ No ☐ **13**

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Pilot-Owner Maintenance (for privately operated non-complex motor-powered aircraft of 2730 kg MTOM and below, sailplanes, powered-sailplanes and balloons): Are there any maintenance actions performed by the Pilot-owner (ref. Part-M, M.A.803)? Enter in Table 1: • The list of tasks • The name of the pilot-owner(s) or the alternative procedure described in AMC M.A.803 point 3.	Yes ☐ No ☐ **14**

Table 1 (see fields 6 through 14)

Interval	Task description	References (incl. revision date)
Specific equipment and modifications		
Repairs		
Mandatory Continuing Airworthiness Instructions (ALIs, CMRs, etc.)		
Repetitive Airworthiness Directives		
Maintenance recommendations (see deviations in Table 2)		
Operational Directives/requirements		

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Special operational approvals		
Use of the aircraft and operational environment		
Pilot-owner maintenance		

The above Pilot-Owner maintenance will be performed in accordance with Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003, Part-M.

Pilot-owner name:_____ **Licence Number:**_____

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

NOTE: If there are several Pilot-Owners, include a separate list for each Pilot-Owner.

Table 2 (deviations from recommended maintenance intervals, see fields 5, 10 and 13)

Interval		**Task description**	**Alternative inspections/tasks**
Recommended	**Changed to**		

Table 3 (Record of periodic reviews of the maintenance programme)

(In accordance with M.A.302(g) or M.A.302(h)5, as applicable)

Describe whether the review has resulted or not in changes to the Maintenance Programme (any changes introduced will be described in Table 4 below)	Date and signature

Table 4 (Revision control of the maintenance programme)

Rev. No	Content of revision	Date and signature

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Approval/Declaration of the Maintenance Programme (select one of the following three approval options):

Declaration by the owner (only for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations and under the conditions of Part-M, M.A.302(h))**:**

I hereby declare that this is the maintenance programme applicable to the aircraft referred to in fields 3 and 4 and I am fully responsible for its content and, in particular, for any deviations introduced as regards the Design Approval Holder recommendations. I am fully aware that this aircraft cannot be operated for commercial operations.

Name/Signature:
_____

Date of signature: _____

Approved by the contracted CAMO (only in those cases where the organisation has an 'indirect approval procedure' approved by their competent authority and limited to those cases where such authority is also responsible for the approval of the maintenance programme):

Approval reference No of the CAMO: _____

Name/Signature:
_____

Date of signature: _____

Approved by the competent authority responsible for the maintenance programme:

Competent Authority: _____

Name/Signature/Stamp:
_____

Date of signature: _____

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Point AMC M.A.302(f) is amended as follows:

AMC M.A.302(f) Aircraft maintenance programme ~~— reliability programmes~~

1. Reliability programmes should be developed for aircraft maintenance programmes based upon maintenance steering group (MSG) logic or those that include condition monitored components or that do not contain overhaul time periods for all significant system components.
2. Reliability programmes need not be developed for aircraft not considered as large aircraft or that contain overhaul time periods for all significant aircraft system components.
3. The purpose of a reliability programme is to ensure that the aircraft maintenance programme tasks are effective and their periodicity is adequate.
4. The reliability programme may result in the escalation or deletion of a maintenance task, as well as the de-escalation or addition of a maintenance task
5. A reliability programme provides an appropriate means of monitoring the effectiveness of the maintenance programme.
6. Appendix I to AMC M.A.302 and M.B.301 (d) gives further guidance.

A new point AMC M.A.302(h) is introduced as follows:

AMC M.A.302(h) Aircraft maintenance programme

NOTE: This AMC is applicable to those ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations for which the owner has elected to apply the provisions of point M.A.302(h).

1. The aircraft should only be maintained according to one maintenance programme at a given point in time. Where an owner wishes to change from one programme to another because of a change in the type of operation, a transfer check or inspection may need to be performed to implement the change.
2. The maintenance programme may take the format of the example provided in AMC M.A.302(e).
3. During the annual review of the maintenance programme, the following should be taken into consideration:

   — The results of the maintenance performed during that year, which may reveal that the current maintenance programme is not adequate.

   — The results of the airworthiness review performed on the aircraft, which may reveal that the current maintenance programme is not adequate.

   — Revisions introduced on the documents affecting the programme basis, such as the M.A.302(i) 'Minimum Inspection Programme' or the Design Approval Holder data.

   — Applicable mandatory requirements for compliance with Part-21, such as Airworthiness Directives, Airworthiness Limitations, Certification Maintenance Requirements and specific maintenance requirements contained in the Type Certificate Data Sheet (TCDS).

   For the purpose of reviewing the results of the maintenance performed during that year, the airworthiness review staff should request the owner/CAMO the records of all the maintenance performed during that year, including unscheduled maintenance.

   When reviewing the results of the maintenance performed during that year and the results of the airworthiness review, attention should be paid as to whether the defects found may have been prevented by introducing in the maintenance programme

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

certain recommendations from the Design Approval Holder which were initially disregarded by the owner.

A new point AMC M.A.302(i) is introduced as follows:

AMC M.A.302(i) Aircraft maintenance programme

This AMC contains an acceptable 'Minimum Inspection Programme' for ELA1 aircraft other than airships, not involved in commercial operations, grouped in the following categories:

— ELA1 Aeroplanes;

— ELA1 Sailplanes and ELA1 powered sailplanes;

— ELA1 Balloons.

These 'Minimum Inspection Programmes' may be used in order to define the basic information for the maintenance programme as required by M.A.302(h)2. However, the maintenance programme must be customised as required by M.A.302(h)3, which may be done by using the template contained in AMC M.A.302(e).

Minimum Inspection Programme for ELA1 aeroplanes not involved in commercial operations

To be performed every annual/100 h interval, whichever comes first.

A tolerance of 1 month or 10 h may be applied. However, the next interval counts from the date/hours originally scheduled (without the tolerance).

Note 1: Use the manufacturer's maintenance manual to accomplish each task/inspection.

Note 2: Proper function of backup or secondary systems and components should be included for every instance where a check is performed for improper installation/operation.

ELA1 aeroplanes not involved in commercial operations	
System/component /area	**Task & Inspection detail**
GENERAL	
General	Remove or open all necessary inspection plates, access doors, fairings, and cowlings. Clean the aircraft and aircraft engine as required.
Lubrication/servicing	Lubricate and replenish fluids in accordance with manufacturer's requirements.
Markings	Check that side and under-wing registration markings are correct. If applicable, check that an exemption for alternate display is approved. Identification plate for National Aviation Authority registered aircraft is present. Other identification markings on fuselage in accordance with local (national) rules.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Weighing:	Review weighing record to establish accuracy against installed equipment. Weigh the aircraft as required by Regulation Part-NCO.
AIRFRAME	
Fabric and skin	Inspect for deterioration, distortion, other evidence of failure, and defective or insecure attachment of fittings. NOTE: When checking composite structures, check for signs of impact or pressure damage that may indicate underlying damage.
Fuselage structure	Check frames, formers, tubular structure, braces, and attachments. Inspect for signs of corrosion.
Systems and components	Inspect for improper installation, apparent defects, and unsatisfactory operation.
Pitot/static system	Inspect for security, damage, cleanliness, and condition. Drain any water from condensation drains.
General	Inspect for lack of cleanliness and loose equipment that might foul the controls.
Tow hooks	Inspect for condition of moving parts and wear. Check service life. Carry out operational test.
CABIN AND COCKPIT	
Seats, safety belts and harnesses	Inspect for poor condition and apparent defects. Check for service life.
Windows, canopies and windshields	Inspect for deterioration and damage, and for function of emergency jettison.
Instrument panel assemblies	Inspect for poor condition, mounting, marking, and (where practicable) improper operation. Check markings of instruments in accordance with Flight Manual.
Flight and engine controls	Inspect for improper installation and improper operation.
Speed/weight/ manoeuvre placard	Check placard is correct and legible and accurately reflects the status of the aircraft.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

All systems	Inspect for improper installation, poor general condition, apparent and obvious defects, and insecurity of attachment.
LANDING GEAR	
Shock-absorbing devices	Inspect for improper oleo fluid level. Inspect for wear and deformation of rubber pads, bungees, and springs.
All units	Inspect for poor condition and insecurity of attachment.
Retracting and locking mechanism	Inspect for improper operation.
Linkages, trusses and members	Inspect for undue or excessive wear fatigue and distortion.
Hydraulic lines	Inspect for leakage. Check service life.
Electrical system	Inspect for chafing and improper operation of switches.
Wheels	Inspect for cracks, defects, and condition of bearings.
Tires	Inspect for wear and cuts.
Brakes	Inspect for improper adjustment and wear. Carry out operational test.
Floats and skis	Inspect for insecure attachment and obvious or apparent defects.
WING AND CENTRE SECTION	
All components	Inspect all components of the wing and centre section assembly for poor general condition, fabric or skin deterioration, distortion, evidence of failure, insecurity of attachment.
Connections	Inspect main connections (e.g. between wings, fuselage, wing tips) for proper fit, play within tolerances, wear or corrosion on bolts and bushings.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

FLIGHT CONTROLS	
Control circuit/stops	Inspect control rods and cables. Check that the control stops are secure and make contact.
Control surfaces	Inspect aileron, flap, elevator, air brake and rudder assemblies, hinges, control connections, springs/bungees, tapes and seals. Check full range of motion and free play.
Trim systems	Inspect trim surfaces, controls, and connections. Check full range of motion.
EMPENNAGE	
All components and systems	Inspect all components and systems that make up the complete empennage assembly for poor general condition, fabric or skin deterioration, distortion, evidence of failure, insecure attachment, improper component installation, and improper component operation.
AVIONICS AND ELECTRICS	
Batteries	Inspect for improper installation, improper charge and spillage and corrosion.
Radio and electronic equipment	Inspect for improper installation and insecure mounting. Carry out ground function test.
Wiring and conduits	Inspect for improper routing, insecure mounting, and obvious defects.
Bonding and shielding	Inspect for improper installation, poor condition, and chafing and wear of insulation.
Antennas	Inspect for poor condition, insecure mounting, and improper operation.
POWERPLANT	
Engine section	Inspect for visual evidence of excessive oil, fuel or hydraulic leaks and sources of such leaks.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Studs and nuts	Inspect for looseness, signs of rotation and obvious defects.
Internal engine	Inspect for cylinder compression (record measures for each cylinder) and for metal particles or foreign matter in oil filter, screens and sump drain plugs. If there is weak cylinder compression, inspect for improper internal condition and improper internal tolerances.
Engine mounts	Inspect for cracks, looseness of mounting, and looseness of the engine to mount attachment.
Flexible vibration dampeners	Inspect for poor condition and deterioration.
Engine controls	Inspect for defects, improper travel, and improper safetying.
Lines, hoses and clamps	Inspect for leaks, improper condition, and looseness.
Exhaust stacks	Inspect for cracks, defects, and improper attachment.
Turbocharger and intercooler	Inspect for leaks, improper condition, and looseness of connections and fittings.
Liquid cooling systems	Inspect for leaks and proper fluid level.
Electronic engine control	Inspect for signs of chafing and proper electronics and sensor installation.
Accessories	Inspect for apparent defects in security of mounting.
All systems	Inspect for improper installation, poor general condition, defects and insecure attachment.
Cowling	Inspect for cracks and defects. Check cowling flaps.
Cooling baffles and seals	Inspect for defects, improper attachment, and wear.
Fuel tanks	Inspect for improper installation and connection.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

CLUTCHES AND GEARBOXES	
Filters, screens, and chip detectors	Inspect for metal particles and foreign matter.
Exterior	Inspect for oil leaks.
Output shaft	Inspect for excessive bearing play and condition.
PROPELLER	
Propeller assembly	Inspect for cracks, nicks, binds, and oil leakage.
Propeller bolts	Inspect for improper torque, looseness, signs of rotation, and lack of safetying.
Propeller control mechanism	Inspect for improper operation, insecure mounting, and restricted travel.
Anti-icing devices	Inspect for improper operation and obvious defects.
MISCELLANEOUS	
Ballistic rescue system	Inspect for proper installation, unbroken activation mechanism, proper securing while on ground, validity of inspection periods of pyrotechnic devices, and parachute packing intervals.
Other miscellaneous items	Inspect installed miscellaneous items that are not otherwise covered by this listing for improper installation and improper operation.
OPERATIONAL CHECKS	
Power and rpm	Check that power output, static and idle rpm are within published limits.
Magnetos	Check for normal function.
Fuel and oil pressure	Check they are within normal values.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Engine temperatures	Check they are within normal values.
Engine	For engines equipped with automated engine control (e.g. FADEC), perform the published run-up procedure and check for discrepancies.
Engine	For dry-sump engines and engines with turbochargers and for liquid cooled engines, check for signs of disturbed fluid circulation.
Pitot-static system	Perform operational check.
Transponder	Perform operational check.

Minimum Inspection Programme for ELA1 sailplanes and ELA1 powered sailplanes not involved in commercial operations

To be performed:

— every annual/100 h interval (for Touring Motor Gliders, TMG), whichever comes first, or

— every annual interval (for the rest).

A tolerance of 1 month or 10 h, as applicable, may be applied. However, the next interval counts from the date/hours originally scheduled (without the tolerance).

Note 1: Use the manufacturer's maintenance manual to accomplish each task/inspection.

Note 2: In the case of TMGs, it is acceptable to control the hours of use of the aircraft, engine and propeller as separate entities. Any maintenance check to be done between two consecutive annual/100 h inspections may be performed separately on the aircraft, engine and propeller depending on when each element reaches the corresponding hours. However, at the time of the annual/100 h inspection, all the elements must be covered.

Note 3: Proper function of backup or secondary systems and components should be included for every instance where a check is performed for improper installation/operation.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

ELA1 sailplanes and ELA1 powered sailplanes not involved in commercial operations	
System/component /area	**Task & Inspection detail**
GENERAL	
General - all tasks	The aircraft must be clean prior to inspection. Inspect for security, damage, wear, integrity, drain/vent holes clear, signs of overheating, leaks, chafing, cleanliness and condition as appropriate to the particular task. Whilst checking Glass Reinforced Plastic (GRP) composite structures, check for signs of impact or pressure damage that may indicate underlying damage.
Lubrication/servicing	Lubricate and replenish fluids in accordance with manufacturer's requirements.
Markings	Check that side and under-wing registration markings are correct. If applicable, check that an exemption for alternate display is approved. Identification plate for National Aviation Authority registered aircraft is present. Other identification markings on fuselage in accordance with local (national) rules.
Weighing:	Review weighing record to establish accuracy against installed equipment. Weigh the aircraft as required by Regulation Part-NCO.
AIRFRAME	
Fuselage paint/gel coat including registration markings	Inspect external surface and fairings, gel coat, fabric covering or metal skin, and paintwork. Check that registration marks are correctly applied.
Fuselage structure	Check frames, formers, tubular structure, skin, and attachments. Inspect for signs of corrosion on tubular framework.
Nose fairing	Inspect for evidence of impact with ground or objects.
Release hook(s)	Inspect nose and Centre of Gravity (C of G) release hooks and controls. Check operational life. Carry out operational test. If more than one release hook or control is fitted, check operation of all release hooks from all positions.
Pot pitot/ventilator	Check alignment of probe, check operation of ventilator.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Pitot/static system	Inspect pitot probes, static ports all tubing (as accessible) for security, damage, cleanliness, and condition. Drain any water from condensate drains.
Bonding/vents drains	Check all bonding leads & straps. Check that all vents and drains are clear from debris.
CABIN AND COCKPIT	
Cleanliness/loose articles	Check under cockpit floor/seat pan and in rear fuselage for debris and foreign items.
Canopy, locks & jettison	Inspect canopy, canopy frame and transparencies for cracks, unacceptable distortion, and discolouration. Check operation of all locks and catches. Carry out an operational test of the canopy jettison system from all positions.
Seat/cockpit floor	Inspect seat(s). Check that all loose cushions are correctly installed and, as appropriate, energy absorbing foam cushions are fitted correctly. Ensure that all seat adjusters fit and lock correctly.
Harness(es)	Inspect all harnesses for condition and wear of all fastenings, webbing, and fittings. Check operation of release and adjustments.
Rudder pedal assemblies	Inspect rudder pedal assemblies and adjusters.
Instrument panel assemblies	Inspect instrument panel and all instruments/equipment. Check instrument readings are consistent with ambient conditions. Check marking of all switches, circuit breakers, and fuses. Check operation of all installed equipment as possible in accordance with manufacturer's instructions. Check markings of instruments in accordance with Flight Manual.
Oxygen system	Inspect oxygen system. Check bottle hydrostatic test date expiry in accordance with manufacturer's recommendations. Ensure that bottle is not completely empty (200 psi min) and refill with aviator's oxygen only. Clean masks and regulators with approved cleaning wipes. Ensure that oxygen installation is recorded on weight and C of G schedule. CAUTION: OBSERVE ALL SAFETY PRECAUTIONS.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Colour coding of controls	Ensure that controls are colour coded and in good condition, as follows: Tow release: Yellow Air Brakes: Blue Trimmer: Green Canopy normal operation: White Canopy jettison: Red Other controls: clearly marked but not using any of the above colours.
Equipment stowed in centre section	Check for security and condition. Check validity of any safety equipment. Check manufacturer's and NAA (if required) data plates.
Speed/weight/ manoeuvre placard	Check that the placard is correct and legible and accurately reflects the status of the aircraft.
LANDING GEAR	
Front skid/nose wheel & mounts	Inspect for evidence of hard/heavy landings. Check skid wear. Inspect wheel, tyre, and wheel box. Check tyre pressure.
Main wheel & brake assembly	Check for integrity of hydraulic seals and leaks in pipe work. Check life of hydraulic hoses and components if specified by the manufacturer. Remove brake drums, check brake lining wear. Check disk/drum wear. Refit drum. Check brake adjustment. CAUTION: BRAKE DUST MAY CONTAIN ASBESTOS. Check operation of brake. Check level of brake fluid and replenish if necessary. Check tyre pressure. CAUTION: CHECK TYPE OF BRAKE FLUID USED AND OBSERVE SAFETY PRECAUTIONS.
Undercarriage suspension	Check springs, bungees, shock absorbers, and attachments. Check for signs of damage. Service strut if applicable.
Undercarriage retract system and doors	Check retraction mechanism and controls, warning system if fitted, gas struts, doors and linkages/springs, over-centre/locking device. Perform retraction test.
Tail skid/wheel	Inspect for evidence of hard/heavy landings. Check skid wear. Inspect wheel, tyre, and wheel box. Check bond of bonded skids. Check tyre pressure.
Wheel brake control circuit	Inspect wheel brake control rods/cables. If combined with air brake, ensure correct rigging relationship. Check parking brake operation if fitted.
WING AND CENTRE SECTION	
Centre section fairing	Inspect for security, damage, and condition.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Wing attachments	Inspect the wing structural attachments. Check for damage, wear, and security. Check for rigging damage. Check condition of wing attachment pins.
Aileron control circuit/ stops	Inspect aileron control rods/cables. Check that control stops are secure and make contact. Inspect self-connecting control devices.
Air brake control circuit	Inspect air brake control rods/cables. Check friction/locking device (if fitted). Inspect self-connecting control devices.
Wing struts/wires	Inspect struts for damage and internal corrosion. Re-inhibit struts internally every 3 years or in accordance with manufacturer's instructions.
Wings including underside registration markings	Check mainplane structure externally and internally as far as possible. Check gel coat, fabric covering, or metal skin. Check that registration marks are correctly applied.
Ailerons & controls	Inspect aileron and flaperon assemblies, hinges, control connections, springs/bungees, tapes, and seals. Ensure that seals do not impair full range of movement.
Air brakes/spoilers	Inspect air brake/spoiler panel(s) operating rods, closure springs, and friction devices as fitted.
Flaps	Check flap system and control. Inspect self-connecting control devices.
Control deflections & free play and record on worksheets	Check and record range of movements and cable tensions, if specified, and check free play.
EMPENNAGE	
Tailplane and elevator	With tailplane de-rigged, check tailplane and attachments, self-connecting and manual control connections. Check gel coat, fabric covering, or metal skin.
Rudder	Check rudder assembly, hinges, attachments, balance weights.
Rudder control circuit/ stops	Inspect rudder control rods/cables. Check that control stops are secure and make contact. Pay particular attention to wear and security of liners and cables in 'S' tubes.
Elevator control circuit/stops	Inspect elevator control rods/cables. Check that control stops are secure and make contact. Inspect self-connecting control devices.
Trimmer control circuit	Inspect trimmer control rods/cables. Check friction/locking device.
Control deflections & free play and record on worksheets	Check and record range of movements and cable tensions, if specified, and check free play.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

AVIONICS AND ELECTRICS	
Electrical installation/fuses	Check all electrical wiring for condition. Check for signs of overheating and poor connections. Check fuses/trips for condition and correct rating.
Battery security & corrosion	Check battery mounting for security and operation of clamp. Check for evidence of electrolyte spillage and corrosion. Check that battery has correct main fuse fitted. It is recommended to carry out battery capacity test on gliders equipped with radio, used for cross-country, controlled airspace, or competition flying.
Radio installations and placards	Check radio installation, microphones, speakers and intercom, if fitted. Check that call sign placard is installed. Carry out ground function test. Record radio type fitted.
Air Speed Indicator calibration	Carry out calibration of the airspeed indicator (in situ permissible) in accordance with manufacturer's instructions - use manufacturer's limits. If not available, maximum error 2 knots (or 3.5 Km/hour).
Altimeter datum	Check barometric sub scale. Maximum error 2 Mb.
Pitot-static system	Perform operational check.
Transponder	Perform operational check.
MISCELLANEOUS	
Removable ballast	Check removable ballast mountings and securing devices (including fin ballast, if applicable) for condition. Check that ballast weights are painted with conspicuous colour. Check that provision is made for the ballast on the loading placard.
Drag chute & controls	Inspect chute, packing and release mechanism. Check packing intervals.
Water ballast system	Check water ballast system, wing and tail tanks as fitted. Check filling points, level indicators, vents, dump and frost drains for operation and leakage. If loose bladders are used, check for leakage and expiry date as applicable.
POWERPLANT (when applicable)	
Engine pylons & mountings	Inspect engine and pylon installation. Check engine compartment and fire sealing.
Gas strut	Check gas strut.
Pylon/engine stops	Check limit stops on retractable pylons. Check restraint cables.
Electric actuator	Inspect electric actuator, motor, spindle drive, and mountings.
Electrical wiring	Inspect all electrical wiring. Pay special attention to wiring that is subject to bending during extension and retraction of engine/pylon.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Limit switches	Check operation of all limit switches & strike plates. Make sure that they are not damaged by impact.
Fuel tank(s)	Check fuel tank mountings and tank integrity. Check fuel quantity indication system if fitted.
Fuel pipes & vents	Check all fuel pipes especially those subject to bending during extension and retraction of engine/pylon. Check that vents are clear. Make sure that overboard drains do not drain into engine compartment. Check self-sealing.
Fuel cock or shut off valve	Check operation of fuel cock or shut-off valve & indications.
Fuel pumps & filters	Clean or replace filters as recommended by manufacturer. Check operation of fuel pumps for engine supply or tank replenishment. Check fuel pump controls and indications.
Decompression valve	Inspect decompression valve and operating control.
Spark plugs	Carry out spark plug service. It is recommended to replace spark plugs at annual intervals.
Harnesses and Magneto	Inspect low tension and high-tension wiring, connectors, spark plug caps. Check magneto to engine timing. Check impulse coupling operation.
Propeller bolts, assembly, mounting, torquing & drive belt	Inspect propeller, hub, folding mechanism, brake, pitch change mechanism, stow sensors.
Doors	Check engine compartment doors, operating cables, rods, and cams.
Safety springs	Check all safety and counterbalance springs.
Extension and retraction	Check that extension and retraction operation times are within limits specified by manufacturer. Check light indications and interlocks for correct operation.
Exhaust	Inspect exhaust system, silencer, shock mounts, and links.
Engine installation	Inspect engine and all accessories. Carry out compression test and record results. Compression test results: No1 (left/front): No2 (right/rear):
Lubrication	Change engine oil and filter. Replenish oil and additive tanks.
Engine instruments	Inspect all engine instruments and controls. Check control unit, mounts, bonding and connections. Carry out internal self-test, if fitted.
Engine battery	If separate from airframe battery, inspect battery and mountings. If main fuse is fitted, check rating and condition.
Engine battery capacity test	Carry out capacity test. Refer to appropriate manual or guidance.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Placards	Check that all placards are in accordance with flight manual and legible.
Oil and fuel leaks	With the engine fully serviced check the fuel and oil system for leaks.

Minimum Inspection Programme for ELA1 balloons not involved in commercial operations

To be performed every annual interval.

A tolerance of 1 month may be applied. However, the next interval counts from the date originally scheduled (without the tolerance).

Note 1: Use the manufacturer's maintenance manual to accomplish each task/inspection.

Note 2: Proper function of backup or secondary systems and components should be included for every instance where a check is performed for improper installation/operation.

ELA1 balloons not involved in commercial operations	
System/ component/area	**Task & Inspection detail**
GENERAL	
Lubrication/servicing	Lubricate and service in accordance with manufacturer's instructions.
Markings	Check that registration markings are correct. If applicable, check that an exemption for alternate display is approved. Identification plate for National Aviation Authority registered aircraft is present. Other identification markings in accordance with local (national) rules.
Weighing	Review weighing record to establish accuracy against installed equipment. Weigh the aircraft as required by Regulation Part-NCO.
A) HOT AIR BALLOONS	
ENVELOPE	

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Identification (type/serial number/registration plate)	Check for presence.
Scoop, parachute, Velcro, fabric and load tapes	Inspect for tears, holes, and burn damages. Perform grab-test in accordance with manufacturer's instructions. If not available, perform grab-test on minimum two gores/panels for each type/colour of fabric (as required by age/condition)
Envelope	Check maximum temperature indication (flag/'tell-tale').
Crown ring, lines, pulleys, rings, wires, karabiners	Inspect for function, security and condition.
BURNER	
Identification (type/serial number)	Check for presence
Frame/suspension	Inspect for deformation, cracks and damages.
Pilot light and valve	Perform functional and leak check.
Blast/silent burner valve	Perform functional and leak check.
Burner hoses	Inspect for porosity, damages, and life time limitation.
Pressure gauge	Inspect for condition and perform functional check.
Hose couplings	Inspect O-rings and sealing valves for condition.
BASKET	
Identification (type/serial number/registration plate)	Check for presence.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Basket weave and top frame (including padding/leather)	Inspect for damages and cracks.
Internal metal frame and welds	Inspect for condition.
Floor and sliding runners	Inspect for breaks, attachment to weave/frame and hide protection.
Basket wires, thimbles and karabiners	Inspect for security and condition.
Carrying handles, grab loops/handles	Inspect for security and condition.
Straps for cylinder attachment	Inspect for security and condition.
Takeoff aid/rope, drop line and pilot restraint	Inspect for security and condition.
FUEL CONTAINERS (cylinders)	
Identification (type/ serial number)	Check for presence.
Cylinders	Check time limitation.
Cylinders	Inspect for body damage and corrosion.
Valves	Perform functional and leak check.
Fill level gauge	Perform functional check.
EQUIPMENT AND INSTRUMENTS	
Altimeter, variometer, combi-instrument	Perform functional (battery) check.
Fire extinguisher	Check expiration date and protection cover.
First-aid kit	Check for completeness and expiration date.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Alternate ignition source	Check for condition.
Communication/ navigation equipment (radio)	Perform operational check.
Transponder	Perform operational check.

B) GAS BALLOONS

ENVELOPE

Type plate	Check for presence.
Registration	Check for presence.
Fabric and net	Inspect for tears, holes, and damages.
Crown vent valve, lines, rings, springs and wires	Inspect for function, security, and condition.
Emergency deflation valve	Inspect for function and condition.

BASKET

Type plate	Check for presence.
Basket weave and top frame (including padding/leather)	Inspect for damages and cracks.
Floor and sliding runners	Inspect for breaks and attachment to weave/frame.
Basket ring	Inspect for damages, cracks, and deformation.
Carrying handles, grab loops/handles	Inspect for security and condition.
Ballast containers	Inspect for condition.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Take-off aid/rope and drop line	Inspect for security and condition.
EQUIPMENT AND INSTRUMENTS	
Altimeter, variometer, combi-instrument	Perform functional (battery) check.
Fire extinguisher	Check expiration date and protection cover.
First-aid kit	Check for completeness and expiration date.
Communication/ navigation equipment (radio)	Perform operation check.
Transponder	Perform operational check.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Point AMC M.A.605(a) is amended as follows:

AMC M.A.605(a) Facilities

1. Where a hangar is not owned by the M.A. Subpart F organisation, it may be necessary to establish proof of tenancy. In addition, sufficiency of hangar space to carry out planned maintenance should be demonstrated by the preparation of a projected aircraft hangar visit plan relative to the aircraft maintenance programme. The aircraft hangar visit plan should be updated on a regular basis.

   For balloons and airships a hangar may not be required where maintenance of the envelope and bottom end equipment can more appropriately be performed outside, providing all necessary maintenance can be accomplished in accordance with M.A.402. For complex repairs or component maintenance requiring an EASA Form 1, suitable approved workshops should be provided. The facilities and environmental conditions required for inspection and maintenance should be defined in the Maintenance Organisation Manual.

   Depending on the scope of work of the maintenance organisation, it may not be necessary to have a hangar available. For example, an organisation maintaining ELA2 aircraft (when not performing major repairs) may perform the work in alternative suitable facilities (and possibly at remote locations) as agreed by the competent authority.

2. Protection from the weather elements relates to the normal prevailing local weather elements that are expected throughout any twelve-month period. Aircraft hangar and aircraft component workshop structures should be to a standard that prevents the ingress of rain, hail, ice, snow, wind and dust etc. Aircraft hangar and aircraft component workshop floors should be sealed to minimise dust generation.

3. Aircraft maintenance staff should be provided with an area where they may study maintenance instructions and complete continuing airworthiness records in a proper manner.

4. Special case for ELA2 aircraft

For ELA2 aircraft, it is acceptable not to have access to a hangar or dedicated workshops. Depending on the scope of work, other facilities are acceptable as long as protection is ensured from inclement weather and contamination. This may include, for example, working in the field or in non-aviation premises (closed or not).

These facilities do not need to be individually approved by the competent authority as long as the maintenance organisation manual describes for each type of facility the scope of work, the tooling and equipment available, and the permitted environmental conditions (weather, contamination).

The organisation should include, as part of the periodic internal organisational review, a sampling of the compliance with these conditions during certain maintenance events.

Point AMC M.A.607 is amended as follows:

AMC M.A.607 Certifying staff and airworthiness review staff

1. Adequate understanding of the relevant aircraft and/or aircraft component(s) to be maintained together with the associated organisation procedures means that the person has received training and has relevant maintenance experience on the product type and associated organisation procedures such that the person understands how the product functions, what are the more common defects with associated consequences.

2. All prospective certifying staff are required to be assessed for competence, qualification and capability related to intended certifying duties. Competence and

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

capability can be assessed by having the person work under the supervision of another certifying person for sufficient time to arrive at a conclusion. Sufficient time could be as little as a few weeks if the person is fully exposed to relevant work. The person need not be assessed against the complete spectrum of intended duties. When the person has been recruited from another approved maintenance organisation and was a certifying person in that organisation then it is reasonable to accept a written confirmation from the previous organisation.

3. The organisation should hold copies of all documents that attest to qualification, and to recent experience.

Point AMC M.A.607(c) is amended as follows:

AMC M.A.607(c) Certifying staff and airworthiness review staff

1. The following minimum information as applicable should be kept on record in respect of each certifying person:
   (a) name;
   (b) date of birth;
   (c) basic training;
   (d) type training;
   (e) recurrent training;
   (f) specialised training;
   (g) experience;
   (h) qualifications relevant to the approval;
   (i) scope of the authorisation and personal authorisation reference;
   (j) date of first issue of the authorisation;
   (k) if appropriate – expiry date of the authorisation.

2. The following minimum information as applicable should be kept on record in respect of each airworthiness review person:
   (a) name;
   (b) date of birth;
   (c) certifying staff authorisation;
   (d) experience as certifying staff on ELA1 aircraft;
   (e) qualifications relevant to the approval (knowledge of relevant parts of Part-M and knowledge of the relevant airworthiness review procedures);
   (f) scope of the airworthiness review authorisation and personal authorisation reference;
   (g) date of the first issue of the airworthiness review authorisation;
   (h) if appropriate - expiry date of the airworthiness review authorisation.

~~2.~~3. Persons authorised to access the system should be maintained at a minimum to ensure that records cannot be altered in an unauthorised manner or that such confidential records become accessible to unauthorised persons.

~~3.~~4. The competent authority should be granted access to the records upon request.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Point AMC M.A.614(a) is amended as follows:

AMC M.A.614(a) Maintenance and airworthiness review records

…

Point AMC M.A.614(c) is amended as follows:

AMC M.A.614(c) Maintenance and airworthiness review records

…

Point AMC M.A.707(b) is amended as follows:

AMC M.A.707(b) Airworthiness review staff

The formal acceptance by the competent authority of the airworthiness review staff is granted through the corresponding EASA Form 4.

~~An airworthiness review 'under supervision' means under the supervision of the competent authority. If the organisation has already properly authorised airworthiness review staff, the competent authority may accept that the supervision be performed by the existing airworthiness review staff in accordance with an approved procedure. In such case,~~ If the airworthiness review is performed under the supervision of existing airworthiness review staff, evidence ~~of the airworthiness review performed under supervision~~ should be provided to the competent authority together with ~~the~~ EASA Form 4. If satisfied, the competent authority will issue the formal acceptance through ~~the~~ EASA Form 4.

Once the airworthiness review staff has been accepted by the competent authority, the inclusion of their name in the exposition (refer to M.A.704(a)5) constitutes the formal authorisation by the organisation.

A new point AMC M.A.707(f) is introduced as follows:

AMC M.A.707(f) Airworthiness review staff

'Independence from the continuing airworthiness management process of the aircraft' means being authorised to perform airworthiness reviews only on aircraft for which the person has not participated in their continuing airworthiness management.

This independence may be achieved, for example, by:

— being authorised to perform airworthiness reviews only on aircraft for which the person has not participated in their management.

— M.A. Subpart G organisations with Part-145/M.A. Subpart F approval, may nominate maintenance personnel from their Part-145/M.A Subpart F organisation as airworthiness review staff as long as they are not involved in the continuing airworthiness management of the aircraft.

— nominating as airworthiness review staff personnel from the Quality Department of the continuing airworthiness management organisation.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Nevertheless, such independence is not necessary if these airworthiness review staff can show 'overall authority on the continuing airworthiness management process of the complete aircraft'. This may be achieved, among other ways, if this person is:

— the Accountable Manager or the nominated Postholder of the CAMO.

— responsible for the complete continuing airworthiness management process of the aircraft being reviewed.

— the only person employed by a one-man CAMO.

A new point AMC M.A.710(h) is introduced as follows:

AMC M.A.710(h) Airworthiness review

This review of the maintenance programme is performed by the person who performed the airworthiness review, which could belong to the competent authority, an M.A. Subpart G organisation or a maintenance organisation.

During the annual review of the maintenance programme, the following should be taken into consideration:

— The results of the maintenance performed during that year, which may reveal that the current maintenance programme is not adequate.

— The results of the airworthiness review performed on the aircraft, which may reveal that the current maintenance programme is not adequate.

— Revisions introduced on the documents affecting the programme basis, such as the M.A.302(i) 'Minimum Inspection Programme' or the Design Approval Holder data.

— Applicable mandatory requirements for compliance with Part-21, such as Airworthiness Directives, Airworthiness Limitations, Certification Maintenance Requirements and specific maintenance requirements contained in the TCDS (Type Certificate Data Sheet).

For the purpose of reviewing the results of the maintenance performed during that year, the airworthiness review staff should request the owner/CAMO the records of all the maintenance performed during that year, including unscheduled maintenance.

When reviewing the results of the maintenance performed during that year and the results of the airworthiness review, attention should be paid as to whether the defects found may have been prevented by introducing in the maintenance programme certain recommendations from the Design Approval Holder which were initially disregarded by the owner.

Point AMC M.A.803 is amended as follows:

AMC M.A.803 Pilot-owner authorisation

…

5. Not holding a valid medical examination does not invalidate the pilot licence (or equivalent) required under point M.A.803(a)1 for the purpose of the Pilot-owner authorisation.

Point AMC M.A.901(a) is amended as follows:

AMC M.A.901(a) Aircraft airworthiness review

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

EASA Form 15a is issued by competent authorities while EASA Form 15b is issued by an M.A. Subpart G organisation and EASA Form 15c is issued by a Part-145 or an M.A. Subpart F maintenance organisation.

A new point AMC M.A.901(l)1 is introduced as follows:

AMC M.A.901(l)1 Aircraft airworthiness review

Independence from the continuing airworthiness management process of the aircraft means being authorised to perform airworthiness reviews only on aircraft for which the person has not participated in their continuing airworthiness management.

Although this may not be relevant for most maintenance organisations (Part-145 or Part-M Subpart F) since these organisations cannot perform the continuing airworthiness management of aircraft (this is a privilege of CAMOs), it needs to be considered by those maintenance organisations (Part-145 or Part-M Subpart F) intending to nominate as airworthiness review staff certifying staff who are also employed/contracted by a CAMO and who have been involved in the continuing airworthiness management of the aircraft being reviewed.

Nevertheless, such independence is not necessary if these airworthiness review staff (who are also employed/contracted by the CAMO) can show 'overall authority on the continuing airworthiness management process of the complete aircraft'. This may be achieved, among other ways, if this person is:

— the Accountable Manager or the nominated Postholder of the CAMO.

— responsible for the complete continuing airworthiness management process of the aircraft being reviewed.

— the only person employed by a one-man CAMO.

Point AMC M.A.904(a)(2) is amended as follows:

AMC M.A.904(a)(2) Airworthiness review of aircraft imported into the EU

…

3. If there is no M.A. Subpart G organisation or maintenance organisation approved for the airworthiness review of the specific aircraft type available, the competent authority may carry out the airworthiness review in accordance with this paragraph and the provisions of M.A.901(h) and M.B.902. In this case, the airworthiness review should be requested to the competent authority with a 30-day notice.

Point AMC M.B.301(c) is amended as follows:

AMC M.B.301(c) Maintenance programme

1. Approval of an aircraft maintenance programme through a procedure established by an M.A. Subpart G organisation should require the organisation to demonstrate to the competent authority that it has competence, procedures and record keeping provisions, which will enable the organisation to analyse aircraft reliability, TC holder's instructions, and other related operating and maintenance criteria.
2. According to the complexity of the aircraft and the nature of the operation, the maintenance programme procedures should contain reliability centred maintenance and condition monitored maintenance programme procedures and have procedures relating to the programme control which contain the following provisions:

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

(a) task escalation or adjustment,

(b) maintenance programme review,

(c) SB or Service Information assessment,

(d) component and structures in service performance review,

(e) maintenance programme revision,

(f) maintenance procedure effectiveness review and amendment,

(g) maintenance review board report (MRBR) or manufacturer maintenance planning document (MPD) review and assessment, as appropriate,

(h) AD review and assessment,

(i) owner/maintenance/M.A. Subpart G organisation liaison,

(j) training.

3. When the competent authority requests, the organisation should make provision for the attendance of a representative of the competent authority ~~representative~~ at meetings held to consider maintenance implications arising from reviews of the above provisions.

Point AMC M.B.603(a) is amended as follows:

AMC M.B.603(a) Issue of approval

1. For approvals involving more than one competent authority, the approval should be granted in conjunction with the competent authorities of the Member States in whose territories the other maintenance organisation facilities are located. For practical reasons the initial approval should be granted on the basis of a joint audit visit by the approving competent authority and competent authorities of the Member States in whose territories the other maintenance organisation facilities are located. Audits related to the continuation of the approval should be delegated to the competent authorities of the Member States in whose territories the other maintenance organisation facilities are located. The resulting audit form and recommendation should then be submitted to the approving competent authority.

2. The approval should be based upon the organisational capability relative to M.A. Subpart F compliance and not limited by reference to individual EASA certificated products.

   For example, if the organisation is capable of maintaining within the limitation of M.A. Subpart F the Cessna 100 series aircraft the approval schedule should state A2 Cessna 100 series and not Cessna 172 RG which is a particular designator for one of many Cessna 100 series.

3. Special case for ELA1 aircraft:

In order to promote standardisation, for this category of aircraft the following approach is recommended:

— Possible ratings to be endorsed in EASA Form 3:

- ELA1 sailplanes;
- ELA1 powered sailplanes and ELA1 aeroplanes;
- ELA1 balloons;
- ELA1 airships.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

— Before endorsing any of those ratings (for example, ELA1 sailplanes) in EASA Form 3, the competent authority should audit that the organisation is capable of maintaining at least one aircraft type (for example, one type of sailplanes within the ELA1 category), including the availability of the necessary facilities, equipment, tooling, material, maintenance data, and certifying staff.

— It is acceptable that the detailed scope of work in the MOM contains the same ratings endorsed in EASA Form 3 (for example, ELA1 sailplanes), without a need to further limit them. However, the maintenance organisation will only be able to maintain a certain aircraft type when all the necessary facilities, equipment, tooling, material, maintenance data, and certifying staff are available.

Point AMC M.B.703 is amended as follows:

AMC M.B.703 Issue of approval

The table shown for the Approval Schedule in EASA Form 14 includes a field designated as 'Aircraft type/series/group'

The intention is to give maximum flexibility to the competent authority to customise the approval to a particular organisation.

Possible alternatives to be included in this field are the following:

— A specific type designation that is part of a type certificate, such as Airbus 340-211 or Cessna 172R.

— A type rating (or series) as listed in Part-66 Appendix I to AMC, which may be further subdivided, such as Boeing 737-600/700/800, Boeing 737-600, Cessna 172 Series.

— An aircraft group such as, for example, 'all sailplanes and powered sailplanes' or 'Cessna single piston engined aircraft' or 'Group 3 aircraft (as defined in 66.A.5)' or 'aircraft below 2730 Kg MTOM'.

Reference to the engine type installed in the aircraft may or may not be included, as necessary.

It is important to note that the scope of work defined in EASA Form 14 is further limited to the one defined in the Continuing Airworthiness Management Exposition (CAME). It is this scope of work in the CAME which ultimately defines the approval of the organisation. As a consequence, it is possible for a competent authority to endorse in EASA Form 14, for example, a scope of work for Group 3 aircraft while the detailed scope of work defined in the CAME does not include all Group 3 aircraft.

Nevertheless, in all cases, the competent authority should be satisfied that the organisation has the capability to manage the ~~requested~~ types/groups/series endorsed in the EASA Form 14.

Since the activities linked to continuing airworthiness management are mainly process-oriented rather than facility/tooling-oriented, changes to the detailed scope of work defined in the CAME (either directly or through a capability list), within the limits already included in EASA Form 14, may be considered as not affecting the approval and not subject to M.A.713. As a consequence, for these changes the competent authority may allow the use by the M.A. Subpart G organisation of the indirect approval procedure defined in M.A.704(c).

In the example mentioned above, before endorsing the Group 3 in EASA Form 14 for the first time, the competent authority should make sure that the organisation is capable of managing this category of aircraft as a whole. In particular, the competent authority should ensure that Baseline/Generic Maintenance Programmes (see M.A.709) or individual maintenance programmes (for contracted customers) are available for all the aircraft which are intended to be initially included in the scope of work detailed in the CAME. Later on, if changes need to be introduced in the detailed scope of work detailed in the CAME to include new aircraft types

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

(within Group 3), this may be done by the M.A. Subpart G organisation through the use of the indirect approval procedure.

Since, as mentioned above, the competent authority should make sure that the organisation is capable of managing the requested category as a whole, it is not reasonable to grant a full Group 3 approval based on an intended scope of work which is limited to, for example, a Cessna 172 aircraft. However, it may be reasonable to grant such full Group 3 approval, after showing appropriate capability, for an intended scope of work covering several aircraft types or series of different complexity and which are representative of the full Group 3.

Special case for ELA1 aircraft:

In order to promote standardisation, for this category of aircraft the following approach is recommended:

— Possible ratings to be endorsed in EASA Form 14:
  - ELA1 sailplanes;
  - ELA1 powered sailplanes and ELA1 aeroplanes;
  - ELA1 balloons;
  - ELA1 airships.

— Before endorsing any of those ratings (for example, ELA1 sailplanes) in EASA Form 14, the competent authority should audit that the organisation is capable of managing at least one aircraft type (for example, one type of sailplanes within the ELA1 category), including the availability of the necessary facilities, data, maintenance programmes, and staff.

— It is acceptable that the detailed scope of work in the CAME contains the same ratings endorsed in EASA Form 14 (for example, ELA1 sailplanes), without a need to further limit them. However, the CAMO will only be able to manage a certain aircraft type when all the necessary facilities, data, maintenance programmes and staff are available.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Appendix IV to AMC M.A.604 is amended as follows:

Appendix IV to AMC M.A.604 Maintenance organisation manual

1. Purpose

The maintenance organisation manual is the reference for all the work carried out by the approved maintenance organisation. It should contain all the means established by the organisation to ensure compliance with Part-M according to the extent of approval and the privileges granted to the organisation.

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

2. Content

A typical Maintenance Organisation Manual for a small organisation (less than 10 maintenance staff) should be designed to be used directly on a day to day basis. The working documents and lists should be directly included into the manual. It should contain the following:

Part A — General

— **Table of contents**

— **List of effective pages**

— **Record of amendments**

— **Amendment procedure**

- Drafting
- Amendments requiring direct approval by the competent authority
- Approval

— **Distribution**

- Name or title of each person holding a copy of the manual

— **Accountable manager statement**

- Approval of the manual
- Statement that the maintenance organisation manual and any incorporated document identified therein reflect the organisation's means of compliance with Part-M
- Commitment to work according to the manual
- Commitment to amend the manual when necessary

Part B — Description

— **Organisation's scope of work**

- Description of the work carried out by the organisation (type of product, type of work) and subcontracted work
- Identification of the level of work which can be performed at each facility.

— **General presentation of the organisation**

- Legal name and social status

— **Name and title of management personnel**

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

- Accountable manager
- Senior managers
- Duties and responsibilities

— **Organisation chart**

— **Certifying staff and airworthiness review staff**

- Minimum qualification and experience
- List of authorised certifying staff and airworthiness review staff, their scope of qualification and the personal authorisation reference

— **Personnel**

- Technical personnel (number, qualifications and experience)
- Administrative personnel (number)

— **General description of the facility**

- Geographical location (map)
- Plan of hangars
- Specialised workshops
- Office accommodation
- Stores
- Availability of all leased facilities.

— **Tools, equipment and material**

- List of tools, equipment and material used (including access to tools used on occasional basis)
- Test apparatus
- Calibration frequencies

— **Maintenance data**

- List of maintenance data used in accordance with M.A.402, and appropriate amendment subscription information (including access to data used on occasional basis).

Part C — General Procedures

— **Organisational review**

- Purpose (to insure that the approved maintenance organisation continues to meet the requirements of Part-M)
- Responsibility
- Organisation, frequency, scope and content (including processing of authority's findings)
- Planning and performance of the review
- Organisational review checklist and forms
- Processing and correction of review findings
- Reporting
- Review of subcontracted work

— **Training**

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

- Description of the methods used to ensure compliance with the personnel qualification and training requirements (certifying staff training, specialised training)
- Description of the personnel records to be retained

— **Subcontracting of specialised services**

- Selection criteria and control
- Nature of subcontracted work
- List of subcontractors
- Nature of arrangements
- Assignment of responsibilities for the certification of the work performed

— **One time authorisations**

- Maintenance checks
- Certifying staff

Part D — Working Procedures

— **Work order acceptance**

— **Preparation and issue of the work package**

- Control of the work order
- Preparation of the planned work
- Work package content (copy of forms, work cards, procedure for their use, distribution)
- Responsibilities and signatures needed for the authorisation of the work

— **Logistics**

- Persons/functions involved
- Criteria for choosing suppliers
- Procedures used for incoming inspection and storage of parts, tools and materials
- Copy of forms and procedure for their use and distribution

— **Execution**

- Persons/functions involved and respective role
- Documentation (work package and work cards)
- Copy of forms and procedure for their use and distribution
- Use of work cards or manufacturer's documentation
- Procedures for accepting components from stores including eligibility check
- Procedures for returning unserviceable components to stores

— **Release to Service – Certifying staff**

- Authorised certifying staff functions and responsibilities

— **Release to Service – Supervision**

Detailed description of the system used to ensure that all maintenance tasks, applicable to the work requested of the approved maintenance organisation, have been completed as required.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

- Supervision content
- Copy of forms and procedure for their use and distribution
- Control of the work package

— **Release to Service – Certificate of release to service**

- Procedure for signing the CRS (including preliminary actions)
- Certificate of release to service wording and standardised form
- Completion of the aircraft continuing airworthiness record system
- Completion of EASA Form 1
- Incomplete maintenance
- Check flight authorisation
- Copy of CRS and EASA Form 1

— **Records**

— **Airworthiness review procedures and records for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations**

— **Development and approval processing for maintenance programmes for ELA2 aircraft not involved in commercial operations**

— **Special procedures**

Such as specialised tasks, disposal of unsalvageable components, re-certification of parts not having an EASA Form 1, etc.

— **Occurrence reporting**

- Occurrences to be reported
- Timeframe of reports
- Information to be reported
- Recipients

— **Management of indirect approval of the manual**

- Amendments content eligible for indirect approval
- Responsibility
- Traceability
- Information to the competent authority
- Final validation

Part E – Appendices

— Sample of all documents used.

— List of maintenance locations.

— List of Part 145 or M.A. Subpart F organisations.

— List of subcontracted specialised services**.**

3. Approval

The competent authority should approve the manual in writing. This will normally be done by approving a list of effective pages.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Minor amendments, or amendments to a large capability list, can be approved indirectly, through a procedure approved by the member state.

4. Continuous compliance with Part-M

When a maintenance organisation manual no longer meets the requirements of this Part-M, whether through a change in Part-M, a change in the organisation or its activities, or through an inadequacy shown to exist by verification inspections conducted under the organisational review, or any other reason that affects the manuals conformity to requirements, the approved maintenance organisation is responsible to prepare and have approved an amendment to its manual.

5. Distribution

The manual describes how the organisation works therefore the manual or relevant parts thereof need to be distributed to all concerned staff in the organisation and contracted organisations.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Appendix VI to AMC M.B.602(f) is amended as follows:

Appendix VI to AMC M.B.602(f) EASA Form 6F

M.A. SUBPART F APPROVAL RECOMMENDATION REPORT ***EASA FORM 6F***

Part 1: General

Name of organisation:

Approval reference:

Requested approval rating/
EASA Form 3 dated*:

Other approvals held (If app.)

Address of facility audited:

Audit period: from to :

Date(s) of audit(s):

Audit reference(s):

Persons interviewed:

Competent authority surveyor: Signature(s):

Competent authority office: Date of EASA Form 6F part 1 completion:

*delete where applicable

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

M.A. SUBPART F APPROVAL RECOMMENDATION REPORT **EASA FORM 6F**

Part 2: M.A. Subpart F Compliance Audit Review

The five columns may be labelled and used as necessary to record the approval product line or facility, including subcontractor's, reviewed. Against each column used of the following M.A. Subpart F subparagraphs please either tick (√) the box if satisfied with compliance or cross (X) the box if not satisfied with compliance and specify the reference of the Part 4 finding next to the box or enter N/A where an item is not applicable, or N/R when applicable but not reviewed.

Para	Subject					
M.A.603	Extent of approval	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
M.A.604	Maintenance Organisation Manual (see Part 3)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
M.A.605	Facilities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
M.A.606	Personnel requirements	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
M.A.607	Certifying staff and airworthiness review staff	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
M.A.608	Components, Equipment and tools	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
M.A.609	Maintenance data	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
M.A.610	Maintenance work orders	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
M.A.611	Maintenance standards	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
M.A.612	Aircraft certificate of release to service	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
M.A.613	Component certificate of release to service	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
M.A.614	Maintenance records	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

M.A.615	Privileges of the organisation								
M.A.616	Organisational review								
M.A.617	Changes to the approved maintenance organisation								
M.A.619	Findings								

Competent authority surveyor(s): Signature(s):

Competent authority office: Date of EASA Form 6F part 2 completion:

M.A. SUBPART F APPROVAL RECOMMENDATION REPORT EASA FORM 6F

PART 3: Compliance with M.A. Subpart F maintenance organisation manual (MOM)

Please either tick (√) the box if satisfied with compliance; or cross (x) if not satisfied with compliance and specify the reference of the Part 4 finding; or enter N/A where an item is not applicable; or N/R when applicable but not reviewed.

Part A	General	
1.1		Table of content
1.2		List of effective pages
1.3		Record of amendments
1.4		Amendment procedure
1.5		Distribution
1.6		Accountable manager's statement

Part B	Description	
2.1		Organisation's scope of work
2.2		General presentation of the organisation
2.3		Name and title of management personnel
2.4		Organisation chart

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

2.5		Certifying staff and airworthiness review staff
2.6		Personnel
2.7		General description of the facility
2.8		Tools, equipment and material
2.9		Maintenance data
Part C	General procedures	
3.1		Organisational review
3.2		Training
3.3		~~Contracting~~ Subcontracting of specialised services
3.4		One time authorisations

M.A. SUBPART F APPROVAL RECOMMENDATION REPORT EASA FORM 6F

PART 3: Compliance with M.A. Subpart F maintenance organisation manual (MOM)

Part D	Working Procedures	
4.1		Work order acceptance
4.2		Preparation and issue of work package
4.3		Logistics
4.4		Execution
4.5		Release to service – Certifying staff
4.6		Release to service – Supervision
4.7		Release to service – Certificate of release to service
4.8		Records
4.9		Airworthiness review procedures and records for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

4.10		Procedures for the development and approval processing for maintenance programmes for ELA2 aircraft not involved in commercial operations
~~4.9~~ 4.11		Special procedures
~~4.10~~ 4.12		Occurrence reporting
~~4.11~~ 4.13		Management of indirect approval of the manual
Part E	Appendices	
5.1		Sample of all documents used
5.2		List of subcontractors.
5.3		List of maintenance locations
5.4		List of Part 145 or M.A. Subpart F organisations

MOM reference: MOM amendment:

Competent authority audit staff: Signature(s):

Competent authority office: Date of EASA Form 6F part 3 completion:

M.A. SUBPART F APPROVAL RECOMMENDATION REPORT ***EASA FORM 6F***

Part 4: Findings regarding M.A. Subpart F compliance status

Each level 1 and 2 finding should be recorded whether it has been rectified or not and should be identified by a simple cross reference to the Part 2 requirement. All non-rectified findings should be copied in writing to the organisation for the necessary corrective action.

Part 2 or 3 ref.	Audit reference(s): Findings		Corrective action		
			Date Due	Date Closed	Reference

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

M.A. SUBPART F APPROVAL RECOMMENDATION REPORT EASA FORM 6F

Part 5: M.A. Subpart F approval or continued approval or change recommendation

Name of organisation:

Approval reference:

Audit reference(s):

The following M.A. Subpart F scope of approval is recommended for this organisation:

Or, it is recommended that the M.A. Subpart F scope of approval specified in EASA Form 3 referenced ..... be continued.

Name of recommending competent authority surveyor:

Signature of recommending competent authority surveyor:

Competent authority office:

Date of recommendation:

EASA Form 6F review (quality check) : Date:

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Appendix VIII to AMC M.A.616 is amended as follows:

Appendix VIII to AMC M.A.616

This is only applicable to organisations with less than 10 maintenance staff members. For larger organisations, the principles and practices of an independent quality system should be used.

Depending on the complexity of the small organisation (number and type of aircraft, number of different fleets, subcontracting of specialised services, etc.), the organisational review system may vary from a system using the principles and practices of a quality system (except for the requirement of independence) to a simplified system adapted to the low complexity of the organisation and the aircraft managed.

As a core minimum, the organisational review system should have the following features, which should be described in the Maintenance Organisation Manual (MOM):

a. Identification of the person responsible for the organisational review programme.

   By default, this person should be the accountable manager, unless he delegates this responsibility to (one of) the M.A.606(b) person(s).

b. Identification and qualification criteria for the person(s) responsible for performing the organisational reviews.

   These persons should have a thorough knowledge of the regulations and of the maintenance organisation procedures. They should also have knowledge of audits, acquired through training or through experience (preferably as an auditor, but also possibly because they actively participated in several audits conducted by the competent authority).

c. Elaboration of the organisational review programme:

   — Checklist(s) covering all items necessary to be satisfied that the organisation delivers a safe product and complies with the regulation. All procedures described in the MOM should be addressed.

   — A schedule for the accomplishment of the checklist items. Each item should be checked at least every 12 months. The organisation may choose to conduct one full review annually or to conduct several partial reviews.

d. Performance of organisational reviews

   Each checklist item should be answered using an appropriate combination of:

   — review of records, documentation, etc.

   — sample check of aircraft under contract or being maintained under a work order.

   — interview of personnel involved.

   — review of discrepancies and difficulty internal reports (e.g. notified difficulties in using current procedures and tools, systematic deviations from procedures, etc.).

   — review of complaints filed by customers after delivery.

e. Management of findings and occurrence reports.

   — All findings should be recorded and notified to the affected persons.

   — All level 1 findings, in the sense of M.A.619(a), should be immediately notified to the competent authority and all necessary actions on aircraft in service should be immediately taken.

   — All occurrence reports should be reviewed with the aim for continuous improvement of the system by identifying possible corrective and preventive actions. This should

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

be done in order to find prior indicators (e.g., notified difficulties in using current procedures and tools, systematic deviations from procedures, unsafe behaviours, etc.), and dismissed alerts that, had they been recognised and appropriately managed before the event, could have resulted in the undesired event being prevented.

— Corrective and preventive actions should be approved by the person responsible for the organisational review programme and implemented within a specified time frame.

— Once the person responsible for the organisational review programme is satisfied that the corrective action is effective, closure of the finding should be recorded along with a summary of the corrective action.

— The accountable manager should be notified of all significant findings and, on a regular basis, of the global results of the organisational review programme.

Following is a typical example of a simplified organisational review checklist, **to be adapted as necessary to cover the MOM procedures:**

1 – Scope of work

Check that:

— All aircraft and components under maintenance or under contract are covered in ~~the~~ EASA Form 3.

— The scope of work in the MOM does not disagree with ~~the~~ EASA Form 3.

— No work has been performed outside the scope of ~~the~~ Form 3 and the MOM.

2 - Maintenance data

— Check that maintenance data to cover the aircraft in the scope of work of the MOM are present and up–to–date.

— Check that no change has been made to the maintenance data from the TC holder without being notified.

3 – Equipment and Tools

— Check the equipment and tools against the lists in the MOM and check if still appropriate to the TC holder's instructions.

— Check tools for proper calibration (sample check).

4 – Stores

— Do the stores meet the criteria in the procedures of the MOM?

— Check by sampling some items in the store for presence of proper documentation and any overdue items.

5 – Certification of maintenance, airworthiness review and development and approval processing of maintenance programmes

— Has maintenance on products and components been properly certified?

— Have implementation of modifications/repairs been carried out with appropriate approval of such modifications/repairs (sample check).

— Have airworthiness reviews been properly performed and the airworthiness review certificate properly issued?

— Have maintenance programmes for ELA2 aircraft not involved in commercial operations been properly developed?

6 – Relations with the owners/operators

— Has maintenance been carried out with suitable work orders?

— When a contract has been signed with an owner/operator, has the obligations of the contracts been respected on each side?

7 – Personnel

— Check that the current accountable manager and other nominated persons are correctly identified in the approved MOM.

— If the number of personnel has decreased or if the activity has increased, check that the staff are still adequate to ensure a safe product.

— Check that the qualification of all new personnel (or personnel with new functions) has been appropriately assessed.

— Check that the staff have been trained, as necessary, to cover changes in:

- regulations,
- competent authority publications,
- the MOM and associated procedures,
- the products in the scope of work,
- maintenance data (significant ADs, SBs, etc.).

8 – Maintenance contracted

— Sample check of maintenance records:

- Existence and adequacy of the work order,
- Data received from the maintenance organisation:
  - Valid CRS including any deferred maintenance,
  - List of removed and installed equipment and copy of the associated EASA Form 1 or equivalent.

— Obtain a copy of the current approval certificate (EASA Form 3) of the maintenance organisations contracted.

9 – Maintenance subcontracted

Check that subcontractors for specialised services are properly controlled by the organisation.

10 – Technical records and record-keeping

— Have the maintenance actions been properly recorded?

— Have the certificates (EASA Form 1 and Conformity certificates) been properly collected and recorded?

— Perform a sample check of technical records to ensure completeness and storage during the appropriate periods.

— Is storage of computerised data properly ensured?

11 – Occurrence reporting procedures

— Check that reporting is properly performed.

— Actions taken and recorded.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Appendix IX to AMC M.A.602 and AMC M.A.702 is amended as follows:

Appendix IX to AMC M.A.602 and AMC M.A.702 EASA Form 2

	Application for	
Competent authority	**Part-M Subpart F Approval***	**initial grant*/ Change***
	Part-145 Approval*	**initial grant*/ Change***
	Part-M Subpart G Approval*	**initial grant*/ Change***

1. **Registered name of applicant**:

2. **Trading name (if different)**:

3. **Addresses requiring approval**:

4. **Tel.**..... **Fax**.....

E-mail.....

5. **Scope of approval relevant to this application: see page 2 for possibilities in the case of a Subpart F/Part-145 approval:**

6. **Position and name of the (proposed*) Accountable Manager**: .....

7. **Signature of the (proposed*) Accountable Manager**: .....

8. **Place**: .....

9. **Date**: .....

Note (1): A note giving the address(es) to which the EASA Form(s) should be sent.

Note (2): An optional note to give information on any fees payable.

* delete as applicable

EASA Form 2 Page 1 of 2

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

SCOPE OF APPROVAL AVAILABLE

CLASS	RATING	LIMITATION	BASE	LINE
AIRCRAFT	A1 Aeroplanes above 5700 kg	[Rating reserved to Maintenance Organisations approved in accordance with Annex II (Part-145)] [State aeroplane manufacturer or group or series or type and/or the maintenance tasks] *Example: Airbus A320 Series*	[YES/ NO]*	[YES/ NO]*
	A2 Aeroplanes 5 700 kg and below	[State aeroplane manufacturer or group or series or type and/or the maintenance tasks] *Example: DHC-6 Twin Otter Series* State whether the issue of airworthiness review certificates is requested or not (only possible for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations)	[YES/ NO]*	[YES/ NO]*
	A3 Helicopters	[State helicopter manufacturer or group or series or type and/or the maintenance task(s)] *Example: Robinson R44*	[YES/ NO]*	[YES/ NO]*
	A4 Aircraft other than A1, A2 and A3	[State aircraft category (sailplane, balloon, airship, etc.), manufacturer or group or series or type and/or the maintenance task(s).] State whether the issue of airworthiness review certificates is requested or not (only possible for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations).	[YES/ NO]*	[YES/ NO]*
ENGINES	B1 Turbine	[State engine series or type and/or the maintenance task(s)] *Example: PT6A Series*		
	B2 Piston	[State engine manufacturer or group or series or type and/or the maintenance task(s)]		
	B3 APU	[State engine manufacturer or series or type and/or the maintenance task(s)]		
COMPONENTS OTHER THAN COMPLETE ENGINES OR APUs	C1 Air Cond & Press C2 Auto Flight C3 Comms and Nav C4 Doors - Hatches C5 Electrical Power & Lights C6 Equipment C7 Engine - APU C8 Flight Controls	[State aircraft type or aircraft manufacturer or component manufacturer or the particular component and/or cross refer to a capability list in the exposition and/or the maintenance task(s).] *Example: PT6A Fuel Control*		

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	C9 Fuel	
	C10 Helicopter - Rotors	
	C11 Helicopter - Trans	
	C12 Hydraulic Power	
	C13 Indicating - recording system	
	C14 Landing Gear	
	C15 Oxygen	
	C16 Propellers	
	C17 Pneumatic & Vacuum	
	C18 Protection ice/rain/fire	
	C19 Windows	
	C20 Structural	
	C21 Water ballast	
	C22 Propulsion Augmentation	
SPECIALISED SERVICES	D1 Non Destructive Testing	[State particular NDT method(s)]

* **Delete as appropriate.**

EASA Form 2 Page 2 of 2

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

5.5 Appendix V: draft amendment to GM to Part-M

A new point GM M.A.201(e), M.A.302(h) and M.A.901(l) is introduced as follows:

GM M.A.201(e), M.A.302(h) and M.A.901(l)

Maintenance Programme development and approval (for private aircraft other than large *)

* Private aircraft means and aircraft for which M.A.201(f), (g), (h), and (i) do not apply.

The following table provides a summary of the provisions contained in M.A.201(e), AMC M.A.201(e), and GM M.A.201(e):

	OPTION 1 (for private aircraft other than large)	**OPTION 2 (for private aircraft other than large)**	**OPTION 3 (for ELA2 aircraft not involved in commercial operations)**
Development and processing of the approval of the maintenance programme	Performed by the owner	Contracted to a CAMO (whether it is done through a full contract for the continuing airworthiness management of the aircraft or through a limited contract for the development and processing of the maintenance programme)	Contracted to a Part-145 or M.A. Subpart F maintenance organisation (see M.A.201(e)(ii))
Approval/Declaration of the maintenance programme	Direct approval by the NAA or Declaration by the owner **(only for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, see M.A.302(h))**	Direct approval by the NAA or Indirect approval by the contracted CAMO or Declaration by the owner **(only for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, see M.A.302(h))**	Direct approval by the NAA or Declaration by the owner **(only for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, see M.A.302(h))**

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Maintenance Programme content and airworthiness review (for all aircraft)

The following table provides a summary of the provisions contained in M.A.302 and AMC M.A.901 in relation to the content of the maintenance programme, its approval and its link with the airworthiness review:

	OPTION 1 (for all aircraft)	**OPTION 2 (for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations)**
Basic information used for the maintenance programme	Maintenance data from the Design Approval Holder (complying with M.A.302(d) and (e))	'Minimum Inspection Programme' (see M.A.302(h)2 and M.A.302(i)) **(not applicable to airships)**
Customisation to a particular aircraft registration	Complying with M.A.302(e) or Using the template in AMC M.A.302(e) **(only for aircraft other than complex)**	Using the template in AMC M.A.302(e)
Approval/Declaration of the maintenance programme	Direct approval by NAA or Indirect approval by contracted CAMO or Declaration by the owner (see M.A.302(h)) **(only for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, see M.A.302(h))**	Direct approval by NAA or Indirect approval by contracted CAMO or Declaration by the owner (see M.A.302(h)) **(only for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, see M.A.302(h))**
Performance of Airworthiness Review and issue of Airworthiness Review Certificate	CAMO or NAA	NAA or CAMO or Part-145/M.A. Subpart F maintenance organisation (when combined with annual inspection, see M.A.901(l))

A new point GM M.A.201(e) is added as follows:

GM M.A.201(e) Aircraft maintenance programme

If an owner decides not to make a contract in accordance with point M.A.201(e), the owner is fully responsible for the proper accomplishment of the corresponding tasks. As a consequence, it is recommended that the owner properly self-assesses his/her own competence to accomplish them or otherwise seeks the proper expertise.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

A new point GM M.A.302(h) is added as follows:

GM M.A.302(h) Aircraft maintenance programme

Responsibilities associated to maintenance programmes developed in accordance with M.A.302(h):

— If the owner has contracted an organisation in accordance with M.A.201(e) (whether it covers the full continuing airworthiness management or it is just for the development of the maintenance programme), this organisation is responsible for developing and proposing to the owner a maintenance programme which:

- indicates whether the maintenance programme is based on the 'Minimum Inspection Programme' described in M.A.302(i);
- identifies the owner and the specific aircraft, engine, and propeller (as applicable);
- includes all mandatory maintenance information and any additional tasks derived from the evaluation of the recommendations issued by the Design Approval Holder;
- justifies any deviations to the recommendations issued by the Design Approval Holder;
- does not go below the requirements of the Minimum Inspection Programme;
- is customised to the particular aircraft type, configuration and operation, in accordance with paragraph M.A.302(h)3.

If the maintenance programme is going to be approved by the competent authority, such competent authority is responsible for evaluating the justifications provided in relation to deviations to the recommendations issued by the Design Approval Holder.

However, when issuing a declaration for the maintenance programme, the owner assumes full responsibility for any deviations introduced to the maintenance programme proposed by the contracted organisation. The organisation which developed the maintenance programme is not responsible for such deviations. These deviations do not need to be justified by the owner.

— If the owner has not contracted an organisation in accordance with M.A.201(e) and has decided to develop the maintenance programme himself/herself, when issuing a declaration for the maintenance programme, the owner assumes full responsibility for its content, including any deviations introduced to the recommendations issued by the Design Approval Holder. In this case, these deviations do not need to be justified. However, the maintenance programme still needs to comply with the requirements contained in M.A.302(h), in particular with the obligation to not go below the requirements of the 'Minimum Inspection Programme' and to comply with the mandatory continuing airworthiness requirements.

If the maintenance programme is going to be approved by the competent authority, the owner needs to provide to such competent authority the justification for the deviations introduced to the Design Approval Holder recommendations.

— The content of the declared (by the owner) maintenance programme cannot be challenged up-front either by the competent authority, the contracted CAMO, or the contracted maintenance organisation. This declared maintenance programme is the basis for adequate planning of maintenance as well as for the airworthiness reviews and the content of the ACAM inspections. Nevertheless, the maintenance programme will be subject to periodic reviews at the occasion of the airworthiness review and the competent authority shall be notified in case of discrepancies linked to deficiencies in the content of the maintenance programme, as described in M.A.302(h)5, M.A.710(h), M.A.710(i), M.A.901(l)5, and M.A.901(l)7. The owner shall amend the maintenance programme accordingly as required by M.A.302(h)5.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

— When the competent authority is notified of deficiencies linked to the content of the declared maintenance programme for a particular aircraft, the competent authority should contact the owner, request a copy of the maintenance programme (if it was declared) and use the information received for the adequate planning of the ACAM programme. Based on the reported deficiencies and the risks identified, the competent authority will adapt accordingly the ACAM programme. This notification will also allow that the competent authority agrees on the changes required to the maintenance programme as required by point M.A.302(h)5.

— Although there is no requirement for the owner to send a copy of the declared maintenance programme to the competent authority, this does not prevent the competent authority from requesting a copy to the owner at any time, even if deficiencies have not been reported.

— Since the maintenance programme has to identify the deviations introduced to the recommendations issued by the Design Approval Holder, the airworthiness reviews and ACAM inspections should place emphasis on the inspection of those areas affected by those deviations in order to make sure that the maintenance programme is effective.

— Since the competent authority is not responsible for the content of a declared maintenance programme, the competent authority cannot authorise deviations to its content.

A new point GM M.A.615 is added as follows:

GM M.A.615 Privileges of the organisation

M.A.615 states that the organisation shall only maintain an aircraft or component for which it is approved when all the necessary facilities, equipment, tooling, material, maintenance data, and certifying staff are available.

This provision is intended to cover the situation where the larger organisation may temporarily not hold all the necessary tools, equipment, etc. for an aircraft type or variant specified in the organisation's approval. This paragraph means that the competent authority need not amend the approval to delete the aircraft type or variants on the basis that it is a temporary situation and there is a commitment from the organisation to re-acquire tools, equipment, etc. before maintenance on the type may recommence.

A new point GM M.A.615(a) is added as follows:

GM M.A.615(a) Privileges of the organisation

This includes also facilities which may not be individually approved by the competent authority, such as those described in AMC M.A.605(a) for ELA2 aircraft.

A new point GM M.A.709 is added as follows:

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

GM M.A.709 Documentation

Paragraph M.A.709(a) refers to continuing airworthiness tasks referred to in point M.A.708. As a consequence, this covers continuing airworthiness management tasks but not airworthiness reviews.

Airworthiness review requirements are established in M.A.710 and the requirements for the corresponding record retention are contained in M.A.714.

A new point GM M.A.710 is introduced as follows:

GM M.A.710 Airworthiness review

Responsibilities of airworthiness review staff:

The following is a summary of the requirements contained in M.A.710 as well as the associated AMCs and Appendixes, in relation to the responsibilities of the airworthiness review staff:

- Airworthiness review staff are responsible for performing both, the documental and the physical survey.
- Procedures must be established by the CAMO in order to perform the airworthiness review, including the depth of samplings (refer to Appendix V to AMC M.A.704, paragraphs 4.2 and 4.3).
- Procedures must make very clear that the final word about the depth of the inspections (both documental and physical) belongs to the airworthiness review staff, who can go beyond the depth contained in the CAME if they find it necessary. At the end, it is the responsibility of the airworthiness review staff to be satisfied that the aircraft complies with Part-M and is airworthy, and the organisation must ensure that no pressure or restrictions are imposed on the airworthiness review staff when performing their duty.
- A compliance report must be produced by the Airworthiness Review Staff, detailing all items checked and the outcome of the review.
- Airworthiness review staff are responsible for the items checked during the airworthiness review. However, they don't take over the responsibilities of the CAMO, Part-145, DOA, POA or any other organisations, not being responsible for problems not detected during the airworthiness review or for the possibility that the approved or declared maintenance programme may not include certain recommendations from the Design Approval Holder. Obviously, if the airworthiness review staff are not independent of the airworthiness management process and were nominated on the basis of the option of having overall authority on such a process, they will be responsible for the full continuing airworthiness of such aircraft. Nevertheless, this responsibility will be a consequence of their position related to M.A.706 and not of their position as airworthiness review staff (M.A.707).
- The issuance of the airworthiness review certificate (ARC) by the airworthiness review staff only certifies that the aircraft is considered airworthy in relation to the scope of the airworthiness review performed and the fact that the airworthiness review staff is not aware of non-compliances which endanger flight safety. Furthermore, it only certifies that the aircraft is considered airworthy at the time of the review.

It is the responsibility of the owner or contracted CAMO to ensure that the aircraft is fully airworthy at any time.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

A new point GM M.A.710(i) is introduced as follows:

GM M.A.710(i) Airworthiness review

The objective of informing the competent authority when the airworthiness review shows discrepancies linked to deficiencies in the content of the maintenance programme is to allow the competent authority to take it into account when planning the ACAM (Aircraft Continuing Airworthiness Monitoring) inspections and to make sure that the competent authority agrees on the amendments required in the maintenance programme as required by point M.A.302(h)5.

A new point GM M.A.901(l)5 is introduced as follows:

GM M.A.901(l)5 Aircraft airworthiness review

As EASA Form 15c is only applicable to ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations, a new EASA Form 15a or 15b has to be issued if the operation of the aircraft changes to commercial. This includes the corresponding approval of the maintenance programme and the performance of an airworthiness review.

A new point GM M.A.901(l)7 is introduced as follows:

GM M.A.901(l)7 Aircraft airworthiness review

The objective of informing the competent authority when the airworthiness review shows discrepancies linked to deficiencies in the content of the maintenance programme is to allow the competent authority to take it into account when planning the ACAM (Aircraft Continuing Airworthiness Monitoring) inspections and to make sure that the competent authority agrees on the amendments required in the maintenance programme as required by point M.A.302(h)5.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

5.6 Appendix VI: draft amendment to AMC to Part-145

A new point AMC 145.A.36 is introduced as follows:

AMC 145.A.36 Records of airworthiness review staff

The following minimum information as applicable should be kept on record in respect of each airworthiness review staff:

(a) name;

(b) date of birth;

(c) certifying staff authorisation;

(d) experience as certifying staff on ELA1 aircraft;

(e) qualifications relevant to the approval (knowledge of relevant parts of Part-M and knowledge of the relevant airworthiness review procedures);

(f) scope of the airworthiness review authorisation and personal authorisation reference;

(g) date of the first issue of the airworthiness review authorisation;

(h) if appropriate, expiry date of the airworthiness review authorisation.

Point AMC 145.A.55(c) is amended as follows:

AMC 145.A.55(c) Maintenance and airworthiness review records

…

Point AMC 145.A.70(a) is amended as follows:

AMC 145.A.70(a) Maintenance organisation exposition

The following information should be included in the maintenance organisation exposition:

The information specified in 145.A.70(a) subparagraphs (6) and (12) to (16) inclusive, whilst a part of the maintenance organisation exposition, may be kept as separate documents or on separate electronic data files subject to the management part of said exposition containing a clear cross-reference to such documents or electronic data files.

The exposition should contain the information, as applicable, specified in this AMC. The information may be presented in any subject order as long as all applicable subjects are covered. Where an organisation uses a different format, for example, to allow the exposition to serve for more than one approval, then the exposition should contain a cross-reference Annex using this list as an index with an explanation as to where the subject matter can be found in the exposition.

The exposition should contain information, as applicable, on how the maintenance organisation complies with Critical Design Configuration Control Limitations' (CDCCL) instructions.

Small maintenance organisations may combine the various items to form a simple exposition more relevant to their needs.

The operator may use electronic data processing (EDP) for publication of the maintenance organisation exposition. The maintenance organisation exposition should be made available to the approving competent authority in a form acceptable to the competent authority. Attention

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

should be paid to the compatibility of EDP publication systems with the necessary dissemination of the maintenance organisation exposition, both internally and externally.

PART 0 GENERAL ORGANISATION (Operators within the European Union)

This section is reserved for those maintenance organisations approved under Part-145 who are also operators within the European Union.

PART 1 MANAGEMENT

1.1 Corporate commitment by the accountable manager

1.2 Safety and quality policy

1.3 Management personnel

1.4 Duties and responsibilities of the management personnel

1.5 Management organisation chart

1.6 List of certifying staff, ~~and~~ support staff and airworthiness review staff

1.7 Manpower resources

1.8 General description of the facilities at each address intended to be approved

1.9 Organisations intended scope of work

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

1.11 Exposition amendment procedures including, if applicable, delegated procedures

PART 2 MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES

2.1 Supplier evaluation and subcontract control procedure

2.2 Acceptance/inspection of aircraft components and material from outside contractors

2.3 Storage, tagging and release of aircraft components and material to aircraft maintenance

2.4 Acceptance of tools and equipment

2.5 Calibration of tools and equipment

2.6 Use of tooling and equipment by staff (including alternate tools)

2.7 Cleanliness standards of maintenance facilities

2.8 Maintenance instructions and relationship to aircraft/aircraft component manufacturers' instructions including updating and availability to staff

2.9 Repair procedure

2.10 Aircraft maintenance programme compliance

2.11 Airworthiness directives procedure

2.12 Optional modification procedure

2.13 Maintenance documentation in use and completion of same

2.14 Technical record control

2.15 Rectification of defects arising during base maintenance

2.16 Release to service procedure

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

2.17 Records for the operator

2.18 Reporting of defects to the competent authority/operator/manufacturer

2.19 Return of defective aircraft components to store

2.20 Defective components to outside contractors

2.21 Control of computer maintenance record systems

2.22 Control of manhour planning versus scheduled maintenance work

2.23 Control of critical tasks

2.24 Reference to specific maintenance procedures such as -

Engine running procedures

Aircraft pressure run procedures

Aircraft towing procedures

Aircraft taxiing procedures

2.25 Procedures to detect and rectify maintenance errors.

2.26 Shift/task handover procedures

2.27 Procedures for notification of maintenance data inaccuracies and ambiguities, to the type certificate holder

2.28 Production planning procedures

2.29 Airworthiness review procedures and records for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations

2.30 Development and approval processing for maintenance programmes for ELA2 aircraft not involved in commercial operations

PART L2 ADDITIONAL LINE MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES

L2.1 Line maintenance control of aircraft components, tools, equipment, etc.

L2.2 Line maintenance procedures related to servicing/fuelling/de-icing, including inspection for/removal of de-icing/anti-icing fluid residues, etc.

L2.3 Line maintenance control of defects and repetitive defects

L2.4 Line procedure for completion of technical log

L2.5 Line procedure for pooled parts and loan parts

L2.6 Line procedure for return of defective parts removed from aircraft

L2.7 Line procedure control of critical tasks

PART 3 QUALITY SYSTEM PROCEDURES

3.1 Quality audit of organisation procedures

3.2 Quality audit of aircraft

3.3 Quality audit remedial action procedure

3.4 Certifying staff and support staff qualification and training procedures

3.5 Certifying staff and support staff records

3.6 Quality audit personnel

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

3.7 Qualifying inspectors

3.8 Qualifying mechanics

3.9 Aircraft or aircraft component maintenance tasks exemption process control

3.10 Concession control for deviation from organisations' procedures

3.11 Qualification procedure for specialised activities such as NDT welding, etc.

3.12 Control of manufacturers' and other maintenance working teams

3.13 Human factors training procedure

3.14 Competence assessment of personnel

3.15 Training procedures for on-the-job training as per Section 6 of Appendix III to Part-66 (limited to the case where the competent authority for the Part-145 approval and for the Part-66 licence is the same).

3.16 Procedure for the issue of a recommendation to the competent authority for the issue of a Part-66 licence in accordance with 66.B.105 (limited to the case where the competent authority for the Part-145 approval and for the Part-66 licence is the same).

PART 4

4.1 Contracting operators

4.2 Operator procedures and paperwork

4.3 Operator record completion

PART 5

5.1 Sample of documents

5.2 List of Subcontractors as per 145.A.75 (b)

5.3 List of Line maintenance locations as per 145.A.75 (d)

5.4 List of contracted organisations as per 145.A.70(a)(16)

PART 6 OPERATORS MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES

This section is reserved for those maintenance organisations approved under Part-145 who are also operators.

PART 7 FAA SUPPLEMENTARY PROCEDURES FOR A FAR PART-145 REPAIR STATION

This section is reserved for those maintenance organisations approved under Part-145 who are also certificated as a FAA FAR Part-145 repair station.

The content of this Part reflects the differences between Part-145 and FAR Parts 43/145 which will change over the time as harmonisation and experience with the FAA progresses.

FAA Advisory Circular 145-7A Appendix 2 contains details of the Part 7 contents.

PART 8 TRANSPORT CANADA CIVIL AVIATION (TCCA) SUPPLEMENTARY PROCEDURES FOR A TCCA AM573 MAINTENANCE ORGANISATION

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

This section is reserved for those Part-145 approved maintenance organisations who are also approved as a TCCA AM 573 maintenance organisation.

The content of this Part reflects the difference between Part-145 and AM 573 and will change over the time as harmonisation and experience with Transport Canada Civil Aviation progresses.

TCCA Aircraft Maintenance & Manufacturing Staff Instruction MSI 10 Appendix A contains details of the Part 8 contents.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Appendix II to AMC 145.B.20(5) is amended as follows:

Appendix II to AMC 145.B.20(5): EASA Form 6

Part-145 APPROVAL RECOMMENDATION REPORT ***EASA FORM 6***
Part 1: General Name of organisation: Approval reference: Requested approval rating/ EASA Form 3 dated*: FAA FAR 145 Cert No (if applicable): Address of Facility Audited: Audit period: From to Date(s) of Audit: Audit reference(s): Persons interviewed: Competent authority surveyor: Signature(s): Competent authority office: Date of EASA Form 6 part 1 completion: *delete where applicable

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Part-145 APPROVAL RECOMMENDATION REPORT		EASA FORM 6				
Part 2: Part-145 Compliance Audit Review The five columns may be labelled and used as necessary to record the approval class and/or product line reviewed. Against each column used of the following Part-145 subparagraphs please either tick (√) the box if satisfied with compliance or cross (X) the box if not satisfied with compliance and specify the reference of the Part 4 finding next to the box, or enter N/A where an item is not applicable, or N/R when applicable but not reviewed.						
Para	Subject					
145.A.25	Facility requirements					
145.A.30	Personnel requirements					
145.A.35	Certifying Staff and support staff					
145.A.36	Records of airworthiness review staff					
145.A.40	Equipment, Tools and material					
145.A.42	Acceptance of Components					
145.A.45	Maintenance Data					
145.A.47	Production Planning					
145.A.50	Certification of Maintenance					
145.A.55	Maintenance Records					
145.A.60	Occurrence Reporting					
145.A.65	Safety and Quality Policy, maintenance procedures and Quality System					
145.A.70	Maintenance Organisation					

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

	Exposition (see Part 3)								
145.A.75	Privileges of the organisation								
145.A.80	Limitations on the organisation								
145.A.85	Changes to the organisation								
145.A.95	Findings								

Competent surveyor(s): Signature(s):

Competent authority office: Date of EASA Form 6 part 2 completion:

Part-145 APPROVAL RECOMMENDATION REPORT EASA FORM 6

PART 3: Compliance with 145.A.70 Maintenance organisation exposition

Please either tick (√) the box if satisfied with compliance; or cross (X) if not satisfied with compliance and specify the reference of the Part 4 finding; or enter N/A where an item is not applicable; or N/R when applicable but not reviewed.

Part 1	**Management**	
1.1		Corporate commitment by the accountable manager
1.2		Safety and Quality Policy
1.3		Management personnel
1.4		Duties and responsibilities of the management personnel
1.5		Management Organisation Chart
1.6		List of Certifying staff, ~~and~~ support staff and airworthiness review staff (Note: a separate document may be referenced)
1.7		Manpower resources
1.8		General description of the facilities at each address intended to be approved
1.9		Organisations intended scope of work
1.10		Notification procedure to the competent authority regarding changes to the organisation's activities/approval/location/personnel
1.11		Exposition amendment procedures

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Part 2	**Maintenance Procedures**	
2.1		Supplier evaluation and subcontract control procedure
2.2		Acceptance/inspection of aircraft components and material from outside contractors
2.3		Storage, tagging, and release of aircraft components and material to aircraft maintenance
2.4		Acceptance of tools and equipment
2.5		Calibration of tools and equipment
2.6		Use of tooling and equipment by staff (including alternate tools)
2.7		Cleanliness standards of maintenance facilities
2.8		Maintenance instructions and relationship to aircraft/aircraft component manufacturers' instructions including updating and availability to staff
2.9		Repair procedure
2.10		Aircraft maintenance programme compliance
2.11		Airworthiness Directives procedure
2.12		Optional modification procedure
2.13		Maintenance documentation in use and completion of same
2.14		Technical record control
2.15		Rectification of defects arising during base maintenance
2.16		Release to service procedure
2.17		Records for the operator
2.18		Reporting of defects to the competent authority/Operator/Manufacturer
2.19		Return of defective aircraft components to store
2.20		Defective components to outside contractors
2.21		Control of computer maintenance record systems
2.22		Control of manhour planning versus scheduled maintenance work
2.23		Control of critical tasks
2.24		Reference to specific maintenance procedures
2.25		Procedures to detect and rectify maintenance errors
2.26		Shift/task handover procedures
2.27		Procedures for notification of maintenance data inaccuracies and ambiguities to the type certificate holder
2.28		Production planning procedures
2.29		Airworthiness review procedures and records for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

2.30		Development and approval processing for maintenance programmes for ELA2 aircraft not involved in commercial operations
Part L2	**Additional Line Maintenance Procedures**	
L2.1		Line maintenance control of aircraft components, tools, equipment, etc.
L2.2		Line maintenance procedures related to servicing/fuelling/de-icing, etc.
L2.3		Line maintenance control of defects and repetitive defects
L2.4		Line procedure for completion of technical log
L2.5		Line procedure for pooled parts and loan parts
L2.6		Line procedure for return of defective parts removed from aircraft
L2.7		Line procedure for control of critical tasks
Part 3	**Quality System Procedures**	
3.1		Quality audit of organisation procedures
3.2		Quality audit of aircraft
3.3		Quality audit remedial action procedure
3.4		Certifying staff qualification and training procedure
3.5		Certifying staff records
3.6		Quality audit personnel
3.7		Qualifying inspectors
3.8		Qualifying mechanics
3.9		Aircraft/aircraft component maintenance tasks exemption process control.
3.10		Concession control for deviation from organisation's procedures
3.11		Qualification procedure for specialised activities such as NDT, welding etc.
3.12		Control of manufacturers' and other maintenance working teams
3.13		Human Factors training procedure
3.14		Competence assessment of personnel

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

3.15		Training procedures for on-the-job training as per Section 6 of Appendix III to Part-66 (limited to the case where the competent authority for the Part-145 approval and for the Part-66 licence is the same).
3.16		Procedure for the issue of a recommendation to the competent authority for the issue of a Part-66 licence in accordance with 66.B.105 (limited to the case where the competent authority for the Part-145 approval and for the Part-66 licence is the same).
Part 4		
4.1		Contracting operators
4.2		Operator procedures/paperwork
4.3		Operator record completion
Part 5	**Appendices**	
5.1		Sample Documents
5.2		List of subcontractors
5.3		List of Line maintenance locations
5.4		List of Part-145 organisations

MOE Reference: MOE Amendment:

Competent authority audit staff: Signature(s):

Competent authority office: Date of EASA Form 6 part 3 completion:

Part-145 APPROVAL RECOMMENDATION REPORT			EASA FORM 6
Part 4: Findings Part-145 Compliance status Each level 1 and 2 finding should be recorded whether it has been rectified or not and should be identified by a simple cross-reference to the Part 2 requirement. All non-rectified findings should be copied in writing to the organisation for the necessary corrective action.			
Part	Audit reference(s):	L	Corrective action

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

2 or 3 ref.	Findings	E V E L	Date Due	Date Closed	 Reference

Part-145 APPROVAL RECOMMENDATION REPORT EASA FORM 6
Part 5: Part-145 Approval or continued approval or change recommendation*
Name of organisation: Approval reference:

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

Audit reference(s):

The following Part-145 scope of approval is recommended for this organisation:

Or, it is recommended that the Part-145 scope of approval specified in EASA Form 3 referenced ..... be continued.

Name of recommending competent authority surveyor:

Signature of recommending competent authority surveyor:

Competent authority office:

Date of recommendation:

EASA Form 6 review (quality check) : Date:

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

5.7 Appendix VII: draft amendment to GM to Part-145

Point GM 145.A.10 is amended as follows:

GM 145.A.10 Scope

This Guidance Material (GM) provides guidance on how the smallest organisations satisfy the intent of Part-145:

1. By inference, the smallest maintenance organisation would only be involved in a limited number of light aircraft, or aircraft components, used for commercial air transport. It is therefore a matter of scale; light aircraft do not demand the same level of resources, facilities or complex maintenance procedures as the large organisation.

2. It is recognised that a Part-145 approval may be required by two quite different types of small organisations, the first being the light aircraft maintenance hangar, the second being the component maintenance workshop, e.g. small piston engines, radio equipment, etc.

3. Where only one person is employed (in fact having the certifying function and others), these organisations approved under Part-145 may use the alternatives provided in point 3.1 limited to the following:

   Class A2 Base and Line maintenance of aeroplanes of 5700 kg and below (piston engines only).

   Class A3 Base and Line maintenance of single-engined helicopters of less than 3175 kg.

   Class A4 Aircraft other than A1, A2 and A3

   Class B2 Piston engines with maximum output of less than 450 HP.

   Class C Components.

   Class D1 Non-destructive Testing.

   3.1 145.A.30 (b): The minimum requirement is for one full-time person who meets the Part-66 requirements for certifying staff and holds the position of 'accountable manager, maintenance engineer and is also certifying staff and, if applicable, airworthiness review staff'. No other person may issue a certificate of release to service and therefore if absent, no maintenance may be released during such absence.

      3.1.1 The quality monitoring function of 145.A.65(c) may be contracted to an appropriate organisation approved under Part-145 or to a person with appropriate technical knowledge and extensive experience of quality audits employed on a part-time basis, with the agreement of the competent authority.

      Note: Full-time for the purpose of Part-145 means not less than 35 hrs per week except during vacation periods.

      3.1.2 145.A.35. In the case of an approval based on one person using a subcontracted quality monitoring arrangement, the requirement for a record of certifying staff is satisfied by the submission to and acceptance by the competent authority of ~~the~~ EASA Form 4. With only one person the requirement for a separate record of authorisation is unnecessary because ~~the~~ EASA Form 3 approval schedule defines the authorisation. An appropriate statement, to reflect this situation, should be included in the exposition.

      3.1.3 145.A.65(c). It is the responsibility of the contracted quality monitoring organisation or person to make a minimum of 2 visits per 12 months and it

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

is the responsibility of this organisation or person to carry out such monitoring on the basis of 1 pre-announced visit and 1 not announced visit to the organisation.

It is the responsibility of the organisation to comply with the findings of the contracted quality monitoring organisation or the person.

CAUTION: it should be understood that if the contracted organisation or the above mentioned person loses or gives up its approval, then the organisation's approval will be suspended.

4. Recommended operating procedure for a Part-145 approved maintenance organisation based upon up to 10 persons involved in maintenance.

4.1 145.A.30 (b): The normal minimum requirement is for the employment on a full-time basis of two persons who meet the competent authorities' requirements for certifying staff, whereby one holds the position of 'maintenance engineer' and the other holds the position of 'quality audit engineer'.

Either person can assume the responsibilities of the accountable manager providing that they can comply in full with the applicable elements of 145.A.30(a), but the 'maintenance engineer' should be the certifying person to retain the independence of the 'quality audit engineer' to carry out audits. Nothing prevents either engineer from undertaking maintenance tasks providing that the 'maintenance engineer' issues the certificate of release to service. This 'maintenance engineer' may also be nominated as airworthiness review staff to carry out airworthiness reviews and issue the corresponding airworthiness review certificate for ELA1 aircraft not involved in commercial operations in accordance with M.A.901(l).

The 'quality audit engineer' should have similar qualifications and status to the 'maintenance engineer' for reasons of credibility, unless he/she has a proven track-record in aircraft quality assurance, in which case some reduction in the extent of maintenance qualifications may be permitted.

In cases where the competent authority agrees that it is not practical for the organisation to nominate a post holder for the quality monitoring function, this function may be contracted in accordance to paragraph 3.1.1.

Point GM 145.A.55(a) is amended as follows:

GM 145.A.55(a) Maintenance and airworthiness review records

…

Point GM 145.A.65(c)1 is amended as follows:

GM 145.A.65(c)1 Safety and quality policy, maintenance procedures and quality system

1. The purpose of this GM is to give guidance on just one acceptable working audit plan to meet part of the needs of 145.A.65 (c)1. There is any number of other acceptable working audit plans.

2. The proposed plan lists the subject matter that should be covered by the audit and attempts to indicate applicability in the various types of workshops and aircraft facilities. The list should therefore be tailored for the particular situation and more than one list may be necessary. Each list should be shown against a timetable to indicate when the particular item is scheduled for audit and when the audit was completed.

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

PARA	Comment	HANGAR	ENGINE	MECH	AVIONIC
			Workshop	Workshop	Workshop
145.A.25		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
145.A.30		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
145.A.35		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
145.A.36		Yes	No	No	No
145.A.40		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
145.A.42		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
145.A.45		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
145.A.47		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
145.A.50		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
145.A.55		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
145.A.60		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
145.A.65		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.1	MOE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.2	MOE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.3	MOE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.4	MOE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.5	MOE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.6	MOE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.7	MOE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.8	MOE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.9	MOE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.10	MOE	Yes	No	No	No
2.11	MOE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.12	MOE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.13	MOE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.15	MOE	Yes	No	No	No
2.16	MOE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.17	MOE	if appl	if appl	if appl	if appl
2.18	MOE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.19	MOE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.20	MOE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.21	MOE	if appl	if appl	if appl	if appl
2.22	MOE	Yes	Yes	No	No
2.23	MOE	Yes	No	No	No

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.

PARA	Comment	HANGAR	ENGINE	MECH	AVIONIC
2.24	MOE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.25	MOE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.26	MOE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.27	MOE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.28	MOE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.29	MOE	Yes	No	No	No
2.30	MOE	Yes	No	No	No
L2.1	MOE	if appl	No	No	No
L2.2	MOE	if appl	No	No	No
L2.3	MOE	if appl	No	No	No
L2.4	MOE	if appl	No	No	No
L2.5	MOE	if appl	No	No	No
L2.6	MOE	if appl	No	No	No
L2.7	MOE	if appl	No	No	No
3.9	MOE	if appl	if appl	if appl	if appl
3.10	MOE	if appl	if appl	if appl	if appl
3.11	MOE	if appl	if appl	if appl	No
3.12	MOE	Yes	Yes	No	No
3.13	MOE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3.14	MOE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
145.A.70		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
145.A.75		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
145.A.80		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
145.A.85		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
145.A.95		if appl	if appl	if appl	if appl

Note 1: 'if appl' means if applicable or relevant.

Note 2: In the line station case all, line stations should be audited at the frequency agreed with the competent authority within the limits of AMC 145.A.65(c)(1).

TE.RPRO.00064-001 © European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA Internet/Intranet.