

# CRD - AMC to Part 145

Comment	Response
<b>145.A.10 Scope</b>	
<b>Paragraph</b>	
<b>Cmt. 1 / British Airways Engineering UK</b>	
Under "Note: Aircraft maintained in accordance with "progressive" type programmes..." Issue: Definition of 'progressive' type programme is required.	Existing TGL 6 text. No text changed.
<b>Cmt. 1 / British Airways Engineering UK</b>	
ECAR- Part 145.A, as currently written, makes no provision for an alternative to JAR-145.95 Equivalent Safety Case. Under this, the NAA was able to exempt an organisation from a requirement within JAR-145 provided that an equivalent safety case could be established. This flexibility is no longer available.  In addition, the exemption proposed under draft ECAR-145 Part 2.60 of restricting this urgent operational circumstances or needs, but only on a temporary basis, has been deleted.	In the EU environment, this provision can no longer apply. This possibility is covered by Article 10 to the Basic Regulation although the scope is more limited.  Paragraph 145.B.60 has been reintroduced.  No text changed.
<b>Cmt. 8 / KLM UK Engineering</b>	
ECAR- Part 145.A, as currently written, makes no provision for an alternative to JAR-145.95 Equivalent Safety Case. Under this, the NAA was able to exempt an organisation from a requirement within JAR-145 provided that an equivalent safety case could be established. This flexibility is no longer available.  In addition, the exemption proposed under draft ECAR-145 Part 2.60 of restricting this urgent operational circumstances or needs, but only on a temporary basis, has been deleted.	In the EU environment, this provision can no longer apply. This possibility is covered by Article 10 to the Basic Regulation although the scope is more limited.  Paragraph 145.B.60 has been reintroduced.  No text changed.
<b>Cmt. 8 / KLM UK Engineering</b>	
Under Note: Aircraft maintained in accordance with (progressive) type programmes Issue: Definition of 'progressive' type programme is required.	Existing TGL 6 text. No text changed.
<b>Cmt. 18 / DGAC, France</b>	
Propose to delete paragraph. JUSTIFICATION: The definitions of line and base maintenance should be more accurate and determined in the rule. See DGAC comment n° 51 to 145.A.20 a) and b). This comment should be related to the DGAC comment on AMC 145.A.30 (g).	This was existing JAR text from JAA TGL 6 and was deemed to be necessary to clarify the rule.  No text changed.
<b>Cmt. 27 / FAA USA</b>	
This information is lacking sufficient detail, presently provided in JAR 145.05 "Definition". We recommend that the proposed AMC 145.A. 10 include all the definitions in JAR in order to centralize information to be utilized by industry and authorities without moving to different documents i.e. EU Law, GM, ACM, and IR. This will also provide a logical information source for international agreements.	In the EU environment, the definitions are dealt with in the cover regulation. Terms not defined in the cover regulation are assumed to have the dictionary definition.  No text changed.

Comment	Response
<p><b>Cmt. 27 / FAA USA</b></p>	
<p>Definition of "Restoration" as stated only includes components. Recommend the definition include Aircraft/ aircraft component as stated in the definition repair.</p>	<p>Text deleted.</p>
<p><b>Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK</b></p>	
<p>Restoration' definition should be placed below 'approved standard' definition as currently sits on its own after Line Maintenance definition</p>	<p>Text deleted.</p>
<p><b>Cmt. 36 / Nayak Aircraft Service NL</b></p>	
<p>Difference between line and base maintenance is not clearly made. The proposed new ECAR text shall lead to discussion. For instance how is B-check defined in the new text? à keep text unchanged as it is described in leaflet 6.</p>	<p>The proposed new text is taken from TGL 6. No text changed.</p>
<p><b>Paragraph (c)</b></p>	
<p><b>Cmt. 27 / FAA USA</b></p>	
<p>By deleting all references to JAR 145.10 ( c) regarding international agreements may cause confusion to member state and industry. Specifically when the EU introduces new countries that are not required to be in full compliance with EASA upon entry into the EU. Suggest : The FAA recognizes that EU law now has a provision for International agreements, however the FAA recommends that EASA include reference to international agreements provide guidance information in this AMC.</p>	<p>Another mechanism for complying with Part-145 is via a bilateral agreement. Such agreement does not require compliance with all elements of Part-145. It is not deemed appropriate to include references to bilateral agreements in Part-145 as an amendment or deletion would require a revision to the rule. No text changed.</p>
<p><b>Paragraph c</b></p>	
<p><b>Cmt. 8 / KLM UK Engineering</b></p>	
<p>ECAR-145.10 (c): An organization which is registered and located outside the Member States will only be granted approval in respect of any such location outside the Member States when in compliance with this ECAR-145 if EASA is satisfied that there is a need for such approval maintain aircraft/aircraft components at that location and when in compliance with this ECAR-145.  Issue: JAR-145 allowed for the recognition of another NAA's approval (outside of Member states). It appears that all maintenance organisations outside of Member states will not require full EASA approval.  Scenario: An EU Member state-based airline requiring maintenance in the United States, will now have to ensure that the proposed maintenance organisation has full EASA 145 approval prior to commencement of contract. ECAR-145.15 (c) states that EASA (shall assume responsibilities, function and tasks normally discharged by the Member state), however it is unclear when the Agency will be suitably resourced to do so. In addition, the latest version of the proposed draft Part 145 Section A, makes no mention of the requirement, as stated above.</p>	<p>This rule material has been deleted. No text changed.</p>

Comment	Response
<b>Paragraph</b> <i>Definition Line Maintenance</i>	
<b>Cmt.</b> 27 / FAA USA	
Line Maintenance definition includes maintenance activities that could be considered as same complexity as base maintenance, without meeting the necessary facilities requirements as set forth in IR 145.A.25 (a) (1). AMC 145 A 25 (a) (3) "line station" recommends hangar accommodations be demonstrated in the event of inclement weather. This requirement is broad in nature and may not be considered as part of the certification approval process unless mandated by the IR.	Existing JAA text. No text changed.
<b>Paragraph</b> <i>ECAR 145 A 10-Leaflet 6</i>	
<b>Cmt.</b> 31 / Martinair Holland NV	
AMC 145.A.10 - Leaflet 6: AMC 145.A.10 only copies the definition form Leaflet 6 paragraph 4.3. The rest of the text of Leaflet 6 is not transferred into Part 145, AMC 145 of GM 145 as stated in the explanatory note. The remaining text of Leaflet 6 should be incorporated in GM 145.A.10.	The remainder of the text defined in TGL 6 deals with references to JAR 145 Section 2 text. Elements of this text have been added to the GM to 145.A.10. Text changed but not as requested.
<b>Paragraph</b> <i>par 2</i>	
<b>Cmt.</b> 27 / FAA USA	
The accountable manager requirements spans over multiple facilities in multiple countries that may not be located in the same area/country as any of the facilities. This seems to be more responsibility than one person can be held accountable for.	The accountable manager is assisted by a team of nominated persons. He/she has corporate authority for the organisation. Existing JAA text. No text changed
<b>Paragraph</b> <i>para 1</i>	
<b>Cmt.</b> 34 / ASA Sweden	
The first paragraph of para 1 seems to contain definitions. All definitions form part of the requirements and should be found in its respective Part of the requirements.	Text changed.
<b>Paragraph</b> <i>Paragraph 3</i>	
<b>Cmt.</b> 29 / CAA-UK	
Class A2 should be 5700kg and less to be consistent with rule Should include Class A4 rating as there is likely to be one man organisations supporting this sector.	This text is in guidance material. Text changed.
<b>Paragraph</b> <i>Paragraph 5.2 and 5.3</i>	
<b>Cmt.</b> 29 / CAA-UK	
There should be a space between 5.2 and 145.A.35 and 5.3 and 145.A.65(c) Para 5.2 poor wording 'As the basis for approval is was one person....' Add 'the' before EASA Form 4 Para 5.3 Caution should not be numbered 5.4	This text is in guidance material. Text changed but not as requested.

Comment

Response

Paragraph *paragraph 6*

Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK

Change 'an Part 145 approval maintenance organisation' to 'a Part 145 approved maintenance organisation'

This text is in guidance material.

Text changed.

Comment	Response
145.A.15	
Paragraph 1	
Cmt. 1 / British Airways Engineering UK	
Delete AMC and include text in Part 145.A.15	The form which a competent authority uses for application cannot be mandated via EU law as there is no safety related issue. Therefore the use of the Form 2 is recommended in the AMC.  Text not changed.
Cmt. 8 / KLM UK Engineering	
Delete AMC and include text in Part 145.A.15	The form which a competent authority uses for application cannot be mandated via EU law as there is no safety related issue. Therefore the use of the Form 2 is recommended in the AMC.  Text not changed.
Cmt. 21 / ERA	
If "in a form and in a manner established by the competent authority" means that application should be made on an EASA Form 2, why does it simply not just state that for in Part 145? This way we would not require a paragraph within the AMC explaining this	The form which a competent authority uses for application cannot be mandated via EU law as there is no safety related issue. Therefore the use of the Form 2 is recommended in the AMC.  Text not changed.
Cmt. 27 / FAA USA	
General Comment: AMC 145.15 (c) Application procedures do not describe how an A outside the EU may apply and who to apply too.  Proposed Text; Add IR 145.15 (c) Applicants located outside the EASA member countries. All applications for IR-145 approvals must be made to EASA etc.	Part 145.A.15 requires application to be made to the competent authority as defined in 145.1. The competent authority in this case is the Agency.  No text changed.
Paragraph 2	
Cmt. 1 / British Airways Engineering UK	
"Where maintenance facilities are located in more than one Member state the investigation and continued oversight of the approval must be carried out in conjunction with the Member states in whose territory the other maintenance facilities are located." Issue: From the information provided at present, it is unclear how EASA intend to manage cross state approvals.	Part 145.A.15 requires application to be made to the competent authority as defined in 145.1. The competent authority in this case is the authority where the principle place of business is located. This authority is responsible for the approval and coordinates the oversight even in the case of cross-state approvals.  No text changed.

Comment	Response
145.A.20	
Paragraph	
Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK	
Paragraph 3 last sentence: replace 'Part M' with 'Part 145' as Part M is not relevant here Paragrah 5 Typo replace 'An' with 'A' at the start of the first sentence	Text changed but not as requested.
Paragraph Table 2	
Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK	
The ATA chapters in Table 2 are not up to date and do not reflect the current ATA's use on aircraft systems and components	ATA chapters have been transferred from the existing JAA text. . The impact of introducing a revised ATA list will be dealt with by the Agency at a later date.  No text changed.

Comment	Response
145.A.25	
Paragraph (a)	
Cmt. 18 / DGAC, France	
<p>AMC 145.A.25(a) Facility requirements</p> <p>1. Where the hangar is not owned by the organisation, it may be necessary to establish proof of permanent tenancy. In addition, sufficiency of hangar space to carry out planned base maintenance should be demonstrated by the preparation of a projected aircraft hangar visit plan relative to the maintenance programme. The aircraft hangar visit plan should be updated on a regular basis.</p> <p>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 component workshop structures should prevent the ingress of rain, hail, ice, snow, wind and dust etc. Aircraft hangar and component workshop floors should be sealed to minimise dust generation.</p> <p>3. For line maintenance of aircraft, hangars are not essential but it is recommended that access to hangar accommodation within an appropriate time be demonstrated for usage during inclement weather for minor scheduled work and lengthy defect rectification.</p> <p>4. Aircraft maintenance staff should be provided with an area where they may study maintenance instructions and complete maintenance records in a proper manner.</p> <p>4.JUSTIFICATION: See DGAC comment n° 52 to 145.A.25 (a) "Implementation problem - For Base Maintenance, it must be crystal clear that permanent facilities are available. - For Line Maintenance, interventions between two planned works in case of inclement weather and/or for significant work and/or defect rectification may require appropriate shelter. Therefore, the availability of aircraft hangar shall be contracted permanently or on request (with a determined delay of disposal) for line maintenance depending on specific situation (type and number of aircraft maintained, distance from main base maintenance facilities, ...)."</p>	<p>Existing AMC to JAR-145.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
Cmt. 21 / ERA	
<p>Can the Agency please explain why it "may be necessary to establish proof of tenancy" and under what circumstances proof would be required?</p>	<p>Existing AMC to JAR-145.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>

Comment	Response
145.A.30	
Paragraph	
Cmt. 4 / <i>British Airways Maintenance Glasgow</i>	
Further clarification required on the role and training requirement for B1/B2 Support Staff required for Base Maintenance. There is ambiguity in Part 145 when reference is made between B1/B2 Certifying and B1/B2 Support Staff.	Existing JAA text (JAA AMC 145.35(a) to (j)) No text changed.
Paragraph (b) para 3	
Cmt. 34 / <i>ASA Sweden</i>	
The indicated paragraphs seem to contain requirements. Delete the paragraphs and insert the requirements in Part 145 or change the wording to clarify the non-mandatory status of the AMC.	This is more specific information detailing what part of the organisation the person responsible for. No text changed.
Paragraph (b) para 4	
Cmt. 34 / <i>ASA Sweden</i>	
The indicated paragraph seem to contain requirements. Delete the paragraph and insert the requirements in Part 145 or change the wording to clarify the non-mandatory status of the AMC.	This is more specific information detailing what part of the organisation the person responsible for. No text changed.
Paragraph (b) para 5	
Cmt. 34 / <i>ASA Sweden</i>	
The indicated paragraph seem to contain requirements. Delete the paragraph and insert the requirements in Part 145 or change the wording to clarify the non-mandatory status of the AMC.	This is more specific information detailing what part of the organisation the person responsible for. No text changed.
Paragraph (b) para 8	
Cmt. 34 / <i>ASA Sweden</i>	
The indicated paragraph seem to contain requirements. Delete the paragraph and insert the requirements in Part 145 or change the wording to clarify the non-mandatory status of the AMC.	This is more specific information detailing what part of the organisation the person responsible for. No text changed.
Paragraph (b) paragraph 7	
Cmt. 29 / <i>CAA-UK</i>	
Member state' should be replaced by 'Competent Authority'	Text changed.

Comment	Response
<b>Paragraph (d)</b>	
<b>Cmt. 18 / DGAC, France</b>	
<p>AMC 145.A.30 (d) Personnel requirements  1. Has sufficient staff means that the organisation employs or contracts such staff of which at least half the staff that perform maintenance in each workshop, hangar or flight line or any shift should be permanently employed to ensure organisational stability. Contract staff, being part time or full time should be made aware that when working for the organisation they are subjected to compliance with the organisation's procedures specified in the maintenance organisation exposition relevant to their duties. For the purpose of this sub-paragraph, employed means the person is directly employed as an individual by the maintenance organisation approved under Part-145 whereas contracted means the person is employed by another organisation and contracted by that organisation to the maintenance organisation approved under Part-145.</p> <p>4.JUSTIFICATION:  The important idea of this paragraph is that "at least half the staff performing maintenance should be permanent employs of the organisation.  The major point about this subject is not the nature of the contract under which those personnel are contracted or employed (ie, the nature of those contracts varies between the members states).  As a remark, it has to be underlined that a newly "directly employed person" is by no means more effective than a person "contracted" since a long time. See DGAC comment n° 19 to M.A.606 Personnel requirements.</p>	<p>Existing JAA text (AMC to JAR 145).  No text changed.</p>
<b>Paragraph (d) Paragraph 6</b>	
<b>Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK</b>	
<p>Delete the word 'relevant' from first sentence as it is superfluous and does not read very well</p>	Text changed.
<b>Paragraph (e)</b>	
<b>Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK</b>	
<p>Part145.A.30(e) requires the competence assessment of all staff involved in maintenance to be established in accordance with a procedure agreed by the competent authority. However there is no section in The MOE layout for these procedures to be detailed. Propose a new section 3.14 titled 'Competence assessment of personnel' is added to the MOE layout.</p>	Text changed.
<b>Paragraph (f) 4</b>	
<b>Cmt. 20 / CAA Netherlands</b>	
<p>CAA-NL suggests the last sentence to be placed in section B, it is an obligation for the Authority.</p>	Text changed but not as proposed.

Comment	Response
Paragraph (g)	
Cmt. 18 / DGAC, France	
Propose to delete paragraph. JUSTIFICATION: The definition of minor scheduled line maintenance should be in the rule. See DGAC comment n°54 to 145.A.30 (g).	<p>In the case of Part-M these lists were put in the rule as Part-M is addressed to individuals (owners or licensed engineers) they do not have the capability to analyse these issues. They are not therefore given latitude.</p> <p>In the case of Part-145, we are dealing with organisations that have a quality system that can analyse these issues and develop other tasks that could lead to frequent amendments to this list. The AMC level allows the Agency to do so.</p> <p>This was also the case in the JAA system.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
Paragraph (g) (1)	
Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK	
included category B1 and B2 certifying staff holding protected rights. This paragraph has been removed and these staff who could certify will not be allowed to certify after 28 September 2003. This will have an impact on the UK industry if these certifying staff can no longer retain their certifying privileges.	<p>According to the Commission Regulation on continuing airworthiness article 7, Member States may elect to not apply the provisions of 145.A.30(g) until 28 September 2008 for aircraft with a MTOM of more than 5700 Kg and 28 September 2008 for the others.</p> <p>This paragraph is therefore no longer necessary.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
Paragraph (g) (2)	
Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK	
included category C certifying staff holding protected rights. This paragraph has been removed and these staff who could certify will not be allowed to certify after 28 September 2003. This will have an impact on the UK industry if these certifying staff can no longer retain their certifying privileges.	<p>According to the Commission Regulation on continuing airworthiness article 7, Member States may elect to not apply the provisions of 145.A.30(g) until 28 September 2008 for aircraft with a MTOM of more than 5700 Kg and 28 September 2008 for the others.</p> <p>This paragraph is therefore no longer necessary.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
Paragraph (h) (1)	
Cmt. 36 / Nanyak Aircraft Service NL	
This paragraph is not clear and shall lead to discussion. Revision and clarification of the explanation of the terms "appropriately qualified certifying staff" is necessary.	Text changed.
Paragraph (h) 1	
Cmt. 18 / DGAC, France	
<p>What is probably meant is that the support staff is qualified in accordance with Part 66 but it is not necessary holding a certifying authorization in accordance with 145.A.35 (b). This should be clearer.</p> <p>See DGAC comment n° 55 on 145.A.30 (h) (1) for support by structure specialist.</p>	<p>Item 1 - Text changed.</p> <p>Item 2 - This issue does not exist in JAR 145, only B1 or B2 licensed staff shall carry out this function-this subject was previously discussed in JAA MST where it was agreed to maintain this system. No text changed.</p>

Comment	Response
<b>Paragraph (i)</b>	
<p><b>Cmt. 1 / British Airways Engineering UK</b></p> <p>Component Certifying staff must comply with ECAR-66.</p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>At this time, it appears that there is no specified scope for the implementation of ECAR for Component certifying staff, i.e. licence structure; qualification requirements; protection rights; implementation date and transition period, etc. From the information currently available, it is unclear when the Agency will be suitably resourced to do so.</p>	<p>Part-66 refers to national requirements at this time.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<p><b>Cmt. 1 / British Airways Engineering UK</b></p> <p>Component certifying staff shall comply with Part 66.</p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>At this time, it appears that there is no specified scope for the implementation of ECAR for Component certifying staff, i.e. licence structure; qualification requirements; protection rights; implementation date and transition period, etc. From the information currently available, it is unclear when the Agency will be suitably resourced to do so.</p>	<p>Part-66 refers to national requirements at this time.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<p><b>Cmt. 8 / KLM UK Engineering</b></p> <p>145.A.30 (i): Component certifying staff shall comply with Part 66.</p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>At this time, it appears that there is no specified scope for the implementation of ECAR for Component certifying staff, i.e. licence structure; qualification requirements; protection rights; implementation date and transition period, etc. From the information currently available, it is unclear when the Agency will be suitably resourced to do so.</p>	<p>Part-66 refers to national requirements at this time.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<b>Paragraph (j) (1)</b>	
<p><b>Cmt. 8 / KLM UK Engineering</b></p> <p>145.A.30 (j) (1) &amp; (2): (1 For 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 is registered, subject to the conditions specified in Appendix 4 to this part.</p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>EU based Part-145 approved maintenance organisations are being discriminated against due to their location.</p> <p>Scenario:</p> <p>An EU-based airline may only man line stations outside the EU with staff who are qualified in accordance with the national aviation regulations of the state in which the organisation is registered", whereas a non-EU based Part-145 maintenance organisation, e.g. South African Airways, may use staff who are qualified "in accordance with the national aviation regulations of the state in which the line station is based. This is considered to be commercially restrictive.</p>	<p>This is a derogation to allow flexibility. Normally, the certifying staff of the Part-145 organisation must be qualified to Part-66</p> <p>No text changed.</p>

Comment	Response
<b>Paragraph (j) (1) &amp; (2)</b>	
<p><b>Cmt. 1 / British Airways Engineering UK</b></p> <p>(1)"For 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 is registered, subject to the conditions specified in Appendix 4 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 4 to this part.</p> <p>Issue:  EU based Part-145 approved maintenance organisations are being discriminated against due to their location.  Scenario:  An EU-based airline may only man line stations outside the EU with staff who are qualified in accordance with the national aviation regulations of the state in which the organisation is registered", whereas a non-EU based Part-145 maintenance organisation, e.g. South African Airways, may use staff who are qualified "in accordance with the national aviation regulations of the state in which the line station is based. This is considered to be commercially restrictive.</p>	<p>This is a derogation to allow flexibility. Normally, the certifying staff of the Part-14 organisation must be qualified to Part-66</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<b>Paragraph (j) (2)</b>	
<p><b>Cmt. 8 / KLM UK Engineering</b></p> <p>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 4 to this part.</p> <p>Issue:  EU based Part-145 approved maintenance organisations are being discriminated against due to their location.  Scenario:  An EU-based airline may only man line stations outside the EU with staff who are qualified (in accordance with the national aviation regulations of the state in which the organisation is registered), whereas a non-EU based Part-145 maintenance organisation, e.g. South African Airways, may use staff who are qualified "in accordance with the national aviation regulations of the state in which the line station is based. This is considered to be commercially restrictive.</p>	<p>This is a derogation to allow flexibility. Normally, the certifying staff of the Part-14 organisation must be qualified to Part-66</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<b>Paragraph (j) (3)</b>	
<p><b>Cmt. 36 / Nayak Aircraft Service NL</b></p> <p>All certifying staff authorization have a validation period of 24 months. The authorization given to a commander or flight engineer should be equalized to this given time frame. Propose different text: "The authorization should have a finite life of 24 months?..".</p>	<p>145.A.30(j)4 is an exemption to the standard which is to have Part-66 qualified certifying staff. This provision is given in certain limited cases. It is not the flight crew's vocation to certify for maintenance. They are not normal certifying staff.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>

Comment	Response
<b>Paragraph</b> (j) (4)	
<b>Cmt.</b> 29 / CAA-UK	
This AMC is applicable to 145.A.30 (j) (3) as well as (j) (4) so the AMC should be AMC145.A.30 (j) (3) and (4)	145.A.30 (j) (3) is related to repetitive pre- flight AD which specifically state that flight crew may apply it. AMC 145.A.30(j)(4) doesn't apply.  No text changed.
<b>Paragraph</b> (j) (4) Paragraph 1	
<b>Cmt.</b> 29 / CAA-UK	
Typo in first sentence (FE//) should be (F/EL)	Text changeed.
<b>Paragraph</b> (j) (4) Paragraph 2	
<b>Cmt.</b> 29 / CAA-UK	
Paragraph 2 (i) (d) allows a task or check carried out by a pilot (other than listed) as agreed by the agency whereas paragraph 2(ii) allows a task or check carried out by the flight engineer (other than listed) by the competent authority. There should be consistency in the requirements (and to the Cat A certifier tasks in 145.A.30 (g) (2) (q) which is agreed by the Agency.	Text changed.
<b>Paragraph</b> (j) (5) (i) and (ii)	
<b>Cmt.</b> 1 / British Airways Engineering UK	
AMC references above are incorrect, in that AMC 145.A.30 (j) (5) (i) refers to staff not employed by the maintenance organisation, but should refer to staff employed by the maintenance organisation [as per Part 145.A.30 (j) (5) (i)]. Likewise, AMC 145.A.30 (j) (5) (ii) refers to staff employed by the maintenance organisation, but should refer to staff not employed by the maintenance organisation [as per Part 145.A.30 (j) (5) (ii)].	Text changed.
<b>Paragraph</b> (j) (5) (i) d	
<b>Cmt.</b> 1 / British Airways Engineering UK	
"A detailed step by step work sheet should be defined by the organisation, communicate to the one-off authorisation holder and signed off by the one-off authorisation holder when completing the work steps." Issue: All details of any work completed and certified must be recorded in the Aircraft Technic Log, with reference made to any additional work sheets as required.	Existing JAA text (TGL42).  No text changed.

Comment	Response
<b>Paragraph</b> (j) (5) (ii)	
<p><b>Cmt. 1 / British Airways Engineering UK</b></p> <p>to any person with not less than 5 years maintenance experience and holding a valid ID 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.</p> <p>Issue: The alternative situation allowed for in part (ii) above has been severely restricted by inclusion of the reference to the proviso that no appropriately approved organisation exist at the location.</p> <p>Scenario: An EU-based airline chooses for commercial reasons, to contract line maintenance support to a non-ECAR.145 organisation, at a line station where ECAR-145 maintenance support is available. Then in the case of an unforeseen maintenance requirement, the primary contracted maintenance organisation would have to contract-in a separate ECAR-145 organisation to complete the task, which is considered commercially restrictive.</p>	<p>This is a one off authorisation. It is not acceptable under normal circumstances to contract line maintenance to a non Part-145 organisation. There is no change from the JAR-OPS and JAR-145 principles.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<p><b>Cmt. 1 / British Airways Engineering UK</b></p> <p>a) "The person holds authorisations of equivalent level and scope on other aircraft type of similar technology, construction and systems."</p> <p>Issue: The above paragraph should be deleted, as it is a duplication of the text in Part 145.</p> <p>b) "The completed task can be verified by visual examination and/or normal system operation."</p> <p>Issue: This paragraph is an additional restriction, not referenced in Part 145, and should be removed.</p>	<p>a) This is intended to give information on what the quality department should control.</p> <p>b) The certifying staff is either not fully qualified on the aircraft type or not known to the organisation, therefore a control is necessary as the organisation is taking final responsibility for the work carried out.</p> <p>Text changed but not as proposed.</p>
<p><b>Cmt. 8 / KLM UK Engineering</b></p> <p>145.A.30 (j) (5) (ii):</p> <p>a) The person holds authorisations of equivalent level and scope on other aircraft type of similar technology, construction and systems.</p> <p>Issue: The above paragraph should be deleted, as it is a duplication of the text in Part 145.</p> <p>b) The completed task can be verified by visual examination and/or normal system operation.</p> <p>Issue: This paragraph is an additional restriction, not referenced in Part 145, and should be removed.</p>	<p>a) This is intended to give information on what the quality department should control.</p> <p>b) The certifying staff is either not fully qualified on the aircraft type or not known to the organisation, therefore a control is necessary as the organisation is taking final responsibility for the work carried out.</p> <p>Text changed but not as proposed.</p>

Comment	Response
<p><b>Cmt. 8 / KLM UK Engineering</b></p> <p>145.A.30 (j) (5) (ii): to any person with not less than 5 years maintenance experience and holding a valid IC aircraft maintenance licence rated for the aircraft type requiring certification provided that 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.</p> <p>Issue: The alternative situation allowed for in part (ii) above has been severely restricted by inclusion of the reference to the proviso that no appropriately approved organisation exist at the location.</p> <p>Scenario: An EU-based airline chooses for commercial reasons, to contract line maintenance support to a non-ECAR.145 organisation, at a line station where ECAR-145 maintenance support is available. Then in the case of an unforeseen maintenance requirement, the primary contracted maintenance organisation would have to contract-in a separate ECAR-145 organisation to complete the task, which is considered commercially restrictive.</p>	<p>This is a one off authorisation. It is not acceptable under normal circumstances to contract line maintenance to a non Part-145 organisation. There is no change from the JAR-OPS and JAR-145 principles.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<p><b>Cmt. 34 / ASA Sweden</b></p> <p>The AMC seems to contain a requirement. Delete the paragraph and insert the requirement in Part 145 or change the wording to clarify the non-mandatory status of the AMC.</p>	<p>Text changed.</p>
<p><b>Paragraph (j) (5) and (5) i</b></p>	
<p><b>Cmt. 15 / Lufthansa Technik AG</b></p> <p>The involvement of the quality department for a one-off authorisation may be one solution to ensure proper and independent examination of all aspects of a dedicated situation, but not the only one. Taking the principle of Part-145 into consideration quality management concentrating on the audit function and management reporting function but should not be involved into the day-by-day business in order to be independent from the processes it shall survey. Proposal: Procedures must be in place acceptable to the (qualified authority of the) member state in order to ensure proper and independent examination of all aspects of a dedicated situation.</p>	<p>Existing JAA text (TGL 42).</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<p><b>Cmt. 16 / Lufthansa Technik</b></p> <p>The involvement of the quality department for a one-off authorisation may be one solution to ensure proper and independent examination of all aspects of a dedicated situation, but not the only one. Taking the principle of Part-145 into consideration quality management concentrating on the audit function and management reporting function but should not be involved into the day-by-day business in order to be independent from the processes it shall survey. Proposal: Procedures must be in place acceptable to the (qualified authority of the) member state in order to ensure proper and independent examination of all aspects of a dedicated situation.</p>	<p>Existing JAA text (TGL 42).</p> <p>No text changed.</p>

Comment	Response
<b>Paragraph (j) 4</b>	
<b>Cmt. 15 / Lufthansa Technik AG</b>	
<p>3. The authorisation should have a finite life of 12 months subject to satisfactory recurrent training on the applicable aircraft type.  Argument: There is no substantiation to tighten this limit to 6 months; it would be an undue burden for both industry and pilots/flight engineers</p>	Text changed.
<b>Cmt. 18 / DGAC, France</b>	
<p>AMC 145.A.30(j)(4)  1. For the issue of a limited certification authorisation the commander or flight engineer should hold either, a valid air transport pilots license (ATPL), commercial pilots license (CPL) or flight engineer (FE//) licence in accordance with JAR-FCL, or, a licence accepted as such by the appropriate Authority of the member state the EASA agreed equivalent standard, on the aircraft type. In addition the limited certification authorisation is subject to the maintenance organisation exposition containing procedures to address the personnel requirements of 145.A.30 (e) and associated AMC and guidance material. Such ... ..by the Agency.</p> <p>2. (ii) Holders of a valid JAR FCL Flight engineers licence, or , a licence accepted as such by the appropriate Authority of the member state the EASA agreed equivalent standard, on the aircraft type may only exercise this limited certification authorisation privilege while performing the duties of a flight engineer.  In addition to ... .. that the task is simple.</p> <p>3. The authorisation should have a finite life of six months subject to satisfactory recurrent training on the applicable aircraft type.</p> <p>4.JUSTIFICATION:  The EASA will have the power to regulate the recognition process for licences issued by non members states authorities, but each national competent Authority has and will still have to formally validate each individual license accordingly.  See current DGAC comment to AMC MA 803</p>	Text changed.
<b>Cmt. 27 / FAA USA</b>	
<p>AMC 145.A. 30 (j) (4) and IR-145.A.30 Allows the AMO to authorize the "Commander or flight Engineer to perform maintenance when they meet certain requirements specified in the AMC.  The IR -145 and the AMC allows the AMO to authorize the Commander or flight Engineer to perform maintenance. This is an operational decision and should be made by the AC holder at best with the recommendation of the AMO.  FAA position: any new BASA/MIP would specify this as a new special condition. This cannot be authorized on a U.S. registered aircraft.</p>	<p>Existing JAA text (TGL 38).  No text changed.</p>
<b>Paragraph (j) 4, item 3</b>	
<b>Cmt. 16 / Lufthansa Technik</b>	
<p>3. The authorisation should have a finite life of 12 months subject to satisfactory recurrent training on the applicable aircraft type.  Argument: There is no substantiation to tighten this limit to 6 months; it would be an undue burden for both industry and pilots/flight engineers.</p>	Text changed.

Comment	Response
<b>Paragraph</b> (j) 5	
<b>Cmt.</b> 27 / FAA USA	
<p>AMC145.A.30(j)(5) and IR-145.A.30 Allows the AMO to authorize a "One Off" maintenance authorization when that person does not meet the IR personnel certification requirements.</p> <p>The IR -145 and the AMC allows the AMO to authorize this one off person to perform maintenance. This is an operational decision and should be made by the AOC holder at best with the recommendation of the AMO.</p> <p>FAA position: Any new BASA/MIP would specify this as a new special condition. This cannot be authorized on a U.S. registered aircraft.</p>	<p>Existing JAA text (TGL 38).</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<b>Paragraph</b> (j)(4)	
<b>Cmt.</b> 29 / CAA-UK	
<p>Sub-paragraph 3 prescribes a 6 month maximum period of validity for flight crew authorisations. This is half the current period allowed (in TGL38) and commercial captains should be expected to be able to retain the level of knowledge required to discharge their duties for a 12 month period. There does not appear any justification in changing this rule from JAR145 rules</p>	Text changed.
<b>Cmt.</b> 36 / Nayak Aircraft Service NL	
<p>All certifying staff authorization have a validation period of 24 months. The authorization given to a commander or flight engineer should be equalized to this given time frame. Propose different text: "The authorization should have a finite life of 24 months?..".</p>	<p>145.A.30(j)4 is an exemption to the standard which is to have Part-66 qualified certifying staff. This provision is given in certain limited cases. It is not the flight crew's vocation to certify for maintenance. They are not normal certifying staff.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<b>Paragraph</b> (j)(4) ECAR 145 A 30 (j) (3-4) Leaflet 38	
<b>Cmt.</b> 31 / Martinair Holland NV	
<p>Crew License for limited maintenance actions TGL 38 states a validity of 1 year and a training 1x per year. AMC 145.A.30(j)(4) 3 now states a finite life of 6 months. Why do those periods differ from the period for JAR 145 continuation training, which is 2 years. Changing this period to 2 years would make it possible to incorporate the continuation training of limited line maintenance authorised crew into continuation training for other ECAR Part 145 personnel. Please amend text accordingly.</p>	Text changed but not as requested.
<b>Paragraph</b> @	
<b>Cmt.</b> 29 / CAA-UK	
Delete 'senior' as this is not used in rule and should read 'nominated persons'	Text changed.
<b>Paragraph</b> 4	
<b>Cmt.</b> 8 / KLM UK Engineering	
<p>145.A.30(j)(5)(i)d): A detailed step by step work sheet should be defined by the organisation, communicated to the one-off authorisation holder and signed off by the one-off authorisation holder when completing the work steps.</p> <p>Issue: All details of any work completed and certified must be recorded in the Aircraft Technical Log, with reference made to any additional work sheets as required.</p>	<p>Existing JAA text (TGL42).</p> <p>No text changed.</p>

Comment

Response

Paragraph J (5) (i) (d)

Cmt. 5 / Monarch Aircraft Engineering Ltd

A detailed step by step work sheet should be defined by the organisation, communicated to the one-off authorisation holder and signed off by the one-off authorisation holder when completing the work steps.  
All details of any work completed and certified must be recorded in the Aircraft Technician Log. Staff remotely located cannot determine the full extent of the work required only detail what scope of work may be certified.

Existing JAA text (TGL42).

No text changed.

Comment	Response
145.A.35	
Paragraph (a)	
Cmt. 1 / British Airways Engineering UK	
<p>"Category B1 and B2 qualified/authorised support staff" means those category B1 and B2 staff in the base maintenance environment who do not hold direct certification privileges</p> <p>Issue: All reference, through out ECAR-145, to "Category B1 and B2 support staff" should read "Category B1 and B2 qualified/authorised support staff" in order to indicate the level of training, knowledge and experience exercised in support of the Category C certifying staff. For example, paragraph (f) makes no mention of the need to assess all prospective support staff for their "competence, qualification and capability to carry out" their intended duties. Likewise, paragraph (g) makes no mention of the need to issue B1 and B2 qualified/authorised support staff with a certification authorisation "that clearly specifies the scope and limits of such authorisation."</p>	<p>Existing JAA text. (AMC to JAR 145)</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
Cmt. 8 / KLM UK Engineering	
<p>145.A.35 (a): Category B1 and B2 qualified/authorised support staff" means those category B1 and B2 staff in the base maintenance environment who do not hold direct certification privileges</p> <p>Issue: All reference, through out ECAR-145, to (Category B1 and B2 support staff) should read (Category B1 and B2 qualified/authorised support staff) in order to indicate the level of training, knowledge and experience exercised in support of the Category C certifying staff. For example, paragraph (f) makes no mention of the need to assess all prospective support staff for their (competence, qualification and capability to carry out) their intended duties. Likewise, paragraph (g) makes no mention of the need to issue B1 and B2 qualified/authorised support staff with a certification authorisation (that clearly specifies the scope and limits of such authorisation.)</p>	<p>Existing JAA text. (AMC to JAR 145)</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK	
<p>The last sentence of the first paragraph has the weight categories as 'aeroplanes of 5700Kg and above and helicopters of 3175kg and above' this is inconsistent with Part 66 and should be 'aeroplanes above 5700Kg and helicopters above 3175kg.'</p>	Text changed.
Paragraph (b)	
Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK	
<p>Paragraph does not allow an authorisation to issued for an overseas based organization that uses an equivalent licence to Part 66. Suggested wording ".....holds a valid Part 66 aircraft maintenance licence or equivalent accepted under Part145 Appendix 4"</p>	<p>145.A.35(b) starts with "excepting those cases listed in 145.A.30(j)". The cases mentioned are exempted from this paragraph. The issue is deemed to be adequately addressed.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
Paragraph (i)	
Cmt. 1 / British Airways Engineering UK	
<p>"Certifying staff shall produce their certification authorisation to any authorised person within 24 hours."</p> <p>Issue: A time limit of 24 hours is too restrictive, the requirements should read "within a reasonable time", as stated in JAR.145.35 (j).</p>	<p>Existing AMC to JAR 145 promoted to rule material for enforcement purposes.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>

Comment	Response
<b>Cmt. 4 / British Airways Maintenance Glasgow</b>	
Further explanation required. What is the structure and training requirement of Part-66 for Component Certifying Staff.	National regulations apply (see Part-66 Section A Subpart C)
<b>Cmt. 8 / KLM UK Engineering</b>	No text changed.
145.A.35 (I): Certifying staff shall produce their certification authorisation to any authorised person within 24 hours.  Issue: A time limit of 24 hours is too restrictive, the requirements should read "within a reasonable time, as stated in JAR.145.35 (j)".	Existing AMC to JAR 145 promoted to rule material for enforcement purposes.  No text changed.
<b>Paragraph (j) (4)</b>	
<b>Cmt. 1 / British Airways Engineering UK</b>	
"In addition, upon request, the maintenance organisation shall furnish certifying staff with a copy of their record on leaving the organisation."  Issue: A definition of what constitutes a "record" is required, as in some cases, this may be a considerable document. To this end, it is proposed that a standard format should be adopted, consisting of a summary of the requirements as stated in 145.A.35 (j) (1 to 4)	The content of the records is described in the AMC. Requiring a standard format is deemed practicable as the records may vary from person to person.  Text not changed.
<b>Cmt. 8 / KLM UK Engineering</b>	
145.A.35 (j) (4): In addition, upon request, the maintenance organisation shall furnish certifying staff with copy of their record on leaving the organisation.  Issue: A definition of what constitutes a (record) is required, as in some cases, this may be a considerable document. To this end, it is proposed that a standard format should be adopted, consisting of a summary of the requirements as stated in 145.A.35 (j) (1 to 4)	The content of the records is described in the AMC. Requiring a standard format is deemed practicable as the records may vary from person to person.  Text not changed.
<b>Paragraph (j) paragraph 4</b>	
<b>Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK</b>	
Delete 'certifying' from the last line as this should include the need to investigate the records of B1 and B2 support staff (that are not necessarily certifying staff).	Text changed.

Comment	Response
145.A.40	
Paragraph (a)	
Cmt. 27 / FAA USA	
<p>AMC 145 A.40(a) &amp; (b) speaks to calibration standards. However the guidance does not identify acceptable calibration standards. The FAA believes that EASA being the regulatory body for the EC must identify the acceptable tool/equipment calibration standards. If the NAA's each use different calibration standards then the FAA envisions a potential 15 different standards, this will impact any new MIP agreement.</p>	<p>This issue could be addressed in the negotiations on bilateral agreements between the USA and the EC. No text changed.</p>
Paragraph (b)	
Cmt. 27 / FAA USA	
<p>AMC 145 A.40(a) &amp; (b) speaks to calibration standards. However the guidance does not identify acceptable calibration standards. The FAA believes that EASA being the regulatory body for the EC must identify the acceptable tool/equipment calibration standards. If the NAA's each use different calibration standards then the FAA envisions a potential 15 different standards, this will impact any new MIP agreement.</p>	<p>This issue could be addressed in the negotiations on bilateral agreements between the USA and the EC. No text changed.</p>

Comment	Response
145.A.42	
Paragraph	
Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK	
Abbreviation 'MOE' should be expanded to the full wording: 'Maintenance Organisation Exposition'	Text changed.
Paragraph (c)	
Cmt. 18 / DGAC, France	
<p>Amend paragraph 1 as follows:  § 1. The agreement by the competent authority for the fabrication of parts by the approved maintenance organisation should be formalised through the approval of a detailed procedure in the maintenance organisation manual. This AMC contains principles and conditions to be taken into account for the preparation of an acceptable procedure for the fabrication of parts by the approved maintenance organisation."  Most of this AMC should be included in the rule.  4.JUSTIFICATION:  The regulation does not require a specific approval of the fabrication procedure. This procedure is just one of the procedure included in the maintenance organisation manual which is globally approved under M.A.604(b)</p>	<p>Manufacturing of parts is specifically addressed in Part-21 paragraph 21A.439(c) if the parts are not released this is not considered an approval activity.  No text changed.</p>
Paragraph (c) 6	
Cmt. 16 / Lufthansa Technik	
<p>"...the organisation cannot fabricate the part unless the TC/STC-holder or Part-21 design organisation gives an approved alternative."  Add: Part-21 design organisation</p>	<p>Existing JAA Text (TGL 9)  No text changed.</p>

Comment	Response
<b>Paragraph (a)</b>	
<b>Cmt. 13 / Finnair</b>	
<p>For the purpose of Part 145, a document equivalent to an EASA Form 1 may be:</p> <p>(a) a release document issued by an organisation under the terms of a bilateral agreement signed by the European Union;</p> <p>(b) a JAA Form 1 issued prior to 27 March 2007 by a JAR 145 organisation approved by JAA Full Member Authority and within the JAA mutual recognition system;</p> <p>(c) A release document issued by an organisation approved under the terms of a JAA maintenance bilateral agreement including JAA accepted FAA and TCA approved organisations;</p> <p>(d) in the case of new aircraft components that were released from manufacturing prior to the IR-21 compliance date the component should be accompanied by a JAA Form One issued by a JAR 21 organisation approved by a JAA Full Member Authority and within the JAA mutual recognition system;</p> <p>(e) a JAA Form 1 issued prior to 27 March 2007 by a maintenance organisation approved by a competent authority in accordance with its national regulations;</p> <p>(f) a release document acceptable to a competent authority according to the provisions of a bilateral agreement between the competent authority and a third country until superseded by the corresponding agreement signed by the European Union. This provision is valid provided the above agreements between the competent authority and a third country are notified to the Commission and to the other competent authorities in accordance with Article 9 of EC Regulation 1592/2002.</p> <p>Reason: 1) Definition of document equivalent to EASA Form 1 should be equal in Part 1 and Part M and include also JAA accepted FAA and TCA approved organisations. 2) To allow reasonable time to operators/maintenance organisation for changing their component maintenance arrangements and to EU to provide bilateral agreements.</p>	Text changed but not as requested.
<b>Cmt. 15 / Lufthansa Technik AG</b>	
This § should be identical with Part M.A. 501 (a) or reference should be made.	Text harmonised.
<b>Cmt. 15 / Lufthansa Technik AG</b>	
Add TGL 11 § 6.2.1. as a new subparagraph since handling and eligibility of PMA parts not yet described.	PMA parts are covered under Part-21 and therefore by AMC 145.A.42(e) Text not changed.
<b>Cmt. 16 / Lufthansa Technik</b>	
This § should be identical with Part M.A. 501 (a) or reference should be made.	Text harmonised.
<b>Cmt. 16 / Lufthansa Technik</b>	
Add TGL 11 § 6.2.1. as a new subparagraph since handling and eligibility of PMA parts not yet described.	PMA parts are covered under Part-21 and therefore by AMC 145.A.42(e) Text not changed.

Comment	Response
<p><b>Cmt. 18 / DGAC, France</b></p> <p>Propose to delete paragraph. PROPOSED TEXT /COMMENT: The documents approved for installation should be in the rule. JUSTIFICATION: See DGAC comments n°3 on article 3 of the maintenance regulation and n°15 on M.A.501(a)</p>	<p>It provides more flexibility to have this information addressed as an AMC.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<p><b>Cmt. 20 / CAA Netherlands</b></p> <p>CAA-NL suggests for clarification to expand text with FAA form 8130-4 and the relevant TCA form from JAA accepted FAA and TCA approved companies</p>	<p>This is covered by "a release document issued by an organisation approved under the terms of a JAA maintenance bilateral agreement until superseded by the corresponding agreement signed by the European Community; "</p> <p>Text changed.</p>
<p><b>Cmt. 21 / ERA</b></p> <p>This paragraph suggests equivalent documents to an EASA Form 1 (for acceptance of new and used components). Can we assume that Canadian CAR573 Organisations &amp; USA FAR145 Repair Stations currently qualified as JAA Accepted Organisations will be covered by AMC 145.A.42(a), paragraph 1 ? Regarding new components, AMC 145.A.42(a), paragraph 5, talks about "a release document issued in accordance with Part-21". According to Part 21 Consultation Document, Subpart K, 21A.307, the only valid document is an EASA Form 1. Can the Agency advise what will happen to all the components manufactured in USA and Canada that are currently accepted with a FAA 8130-3 or TCA 24-0078 Form? None of these manufacturers are currently issuing a Form 1. Finally, JAA Administrative &amp; Guidance Material, Section Two, Part Three, Leaflet 11, paragraph 6, gives guidelines for acceptance of new components, in particular, regarding FAA-PMA parts. However, EASA proposal has eliminated this Leaflet and does not mention anything about FAA-PMA part acceptance. Can the Agency please advise that, like the JAA, it has no problems with the use of PMA parts?</p>	<p>The text has been amended and harmonised with Parts M and 21.</p> <p>Text changed.</p>
<p><b>Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK</b></p> <p>This will create difficulty for industry to know whether a component with a JAA Form 1 is acceptable unless there is a definitive list available on 28 September 2003. Suggest that an acceptable JAA form 1 is one issued prior to 28 September 2004 by a JAR145 organisation approved by a full member state.</p>	<p>Non-EU JAA member States are considered as foreign organisations by the Basic Regulation. Any negotiations with these states will be handled by the European Commission.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<p><b>Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK</b></p> <p>There is a conflict between the acceptance of a component with a JAA Form 1 issued by JAA Full Member Authority and the Commission Regulation Article 4 which recognises approvals issued by a JAA Full Member Authority. A component should not be accepted from an organisation outside of the control of EASA unless there is a bi-lateral agreement between EASA and the JAA Full Member Authority if it is not an EU member.</p>	<p>Non-EU JAA member States are considered as foreign organisations by the Basic Regulation. Any negotiations with these states will be handled by the European Commission.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<p><b>Cmt. 36 / Nayak Aircraft Service NL</b></p> <p>Clarification of which JAA maintenance bilateral agreement is necessary. No reference is made to JAR-145 / ECAR-145 accepted organizations and to the release document FAA 8130.</p>	<p>The existing BASA in place today.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>

Comment	Response
<b>Paragraph (a) (1)</b>	
<b>Cmt. 1 / British Airways Engineering UK</b>	
<p>"A release document issued by an organisation approved under the terms of a JAA maintenance bi-lateral agreement."</p> <p>Issue: Do JAA maintenance bi-lateral agreements transfer across to EASA, or will they have to be re-negotiated?</p>	<p>Existing bilateral agreements remain valid until the EC signs new ones on these issues. (Regulation (EC) No 1592/2002 Article 9)</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<b>Cmt. 8 / KLM UK Engineering</b>	
<p>145.A.42 (a) (1): A release document issued by an organisation approved under the terms of a JAA maintenance bi-lateral agreement.</p> <p>Issue: Do JAA maintenance bi-lateral agreements transfer across to EASA, or will they have to be re-negotiated?</p>	<p>Existing bilateral agreements remain valid until the EC signs new ones on these issues. (Regulation (EC) No 1592/2002 Article 9)</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<b>Paragraph (a) 2</b>	
<b>Cmt. 31 / Martinair Holland NV</b>	
<p>AMC 145.A.42(a)2 mentions the release document issued by an organisation approved under the terms of an EU bilateral agreement but does not mention the release document by name.</p>	<p>The existing BASA in place today.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<b>Paragraph (a) 3</b>	
<b>Cmt. 21 / ERA</b>	
<p>Can the Agency please explain the logic behind the dates of 28 September 2003 &amp; 2004 contained within these paragraphs? These paragraphs would appear to suggest that, from 28 September 2003, a JAA Form One issued by a JAA Full Member State would not be acceptable. Can the Agency please explain what steps will be taken to allow Non-EU member JAA States to continue to issue acceptable release documents for the component on which they have performed maintenance?</p>	<p>Non-EU JAA member States are considered as foreign organisations by the Basic Regulation. Any negotiations with these states will be handled by the European Commission.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<b>Paragraph (a) 4</b>	
<b>Cmt. 20 / CAA Netherlands</b>	
<p>CAA-NL does not understand that non EU JAA countries are not acceptable after 28-9-2003. This is not in line with AMC M.A.501(a) 5.d</p>	<p>Non-EU JAA member States are considered as foreign organisations by the Basic Regulation. Any negotiations with these states will be handled by the European Commission.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<b>Cmt. 21 / ERA</b>	
<p>Can the Agency please explain the logic behind the dates of 28 September 2003 &amp; 2004 contained within these paragraphs? These paragraphs would appear to suggest that, from 28 September 2003, a JAA Form One issued by a JAA Full Member State would not be acceptable. Can the Agency please explain what steps will be taken to allow Non-EU member JAA States to continue to issue acceptable release documents for the component on which they have performed maintenance?</p>	<p>Non-EU JAA member States are considered as foreign organisations by the Basic Regulation. Any negotiations with these states will be handled by the European Commission.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>

Comment	Response
Paragraph (b)	
Cmt. 36 / Nayak Aircraft Service NL	
<p>According JAR-145.50(c) this paragraph was meant for (used) aircraft component release certificates prior to JAR-145.3 (a)(3) or (5). For a Line Maintenance Organization it is not possible to check the modification and AD status of aircraft components. Appropriate release document issued by the Aircraft component maintenance organization in combination with a JAR-OPS certified maintenance program should ensure the proper modification and AD status of each particular component. The Line Maintenance Organization should not be made responsible for the inspection of other (ECAR) approved organizations. Clarification and explanation of the term "...should satisfy?...appropriately released to service" is necessary. Where does the responsibility of the receiving organization stop?</p>	<p>This is existing JAA text (TGL 10) No text changed.</p>
Paragraph (c)	
Cmt. 36 / Nayak Aircraft Service NL	
<p>What is the purpose of this requirement? It shall bring components into the aircraft industry market where certification of said components shall lead to discussions.</p>	<p>This is existing JAA text (TGL 9) No text changed.</p>
Paragraph (c) 6.	
Cmt. 15 / Lufthansa Technik AG	
<p>"...the organisation cannot fabricate the part unless the TC/STC-holder or Part-21 design organisation gives an approved alternative." Add: Part-21 design organisation</p>	<p>Existing JAA Text (TGL 9) No text changed.</p>
Paragraph (c) para 4	
Cmt. 34 / ASA Sweden	
<p>seem to contain requirements.</p>	<p>Fabricating parts is optional. If this option is chosen certain criteria have to be respected. As this is optional the criteria have been placed in the AMC. No text changed.</p>
Paragraph (c) para 5	
Cmt. 34 / ASA Sweden	
<p>seem to contain requirements.</p>	<p>Fabricating parts is optional. If this option is chosen certain criteria have to be respected. As this is optional the criteria have been placed in the AMC. No text changed.</p>
Paragraph (c) para 7	
Cmt. 34 / ASA Sweden	
<p>The note to para 7 seems to contain a requirement.</p>	<p>Fabricating parts is optional. If this option is chosen certain criteria have to be respected. As this is optional the criteria have been placed in the AMC. No text changed.</p>

Comment	Response
Paragraph (c) para 8	
Cmt. 34 / ASA Sweden	
seem to contain requirements.	Fabricating parts is optional. If this option is chosen certain criteria have to be respected. As this is optional the criteria have been placed in the AMC.  No text changed.
Paragraph (c) paragraph 7	
Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK	
In the note: it should be .....acceptable to the 'competent authority' and not the 'member state'	Text changed.
Paragraph (d)	
Cmt. 10 / Contact Air Flugdienst Gmbh Co	
This point implies in general that any component not traceable back to manufacturer may not be accepted even if accompanied with an authorised release certificate. Second hand purchase would thus be impossible. We could only accept new parts from manufacturer ?	Traceability to the manufacturer being retrieved has never meant that second hand components cannot be sold.  No text changed.
Cmt. 15 / Lufthansa Technik AG	
Comment: The intention of this § is clearly understood and supported but for component being classified as unsalvageable there may be a repair developed at a later time or a life limit extension may be granted by the TC-holder at a later time, so the possibility to segregate but not necessarily mutilate these parts must be found.	This issue is covered by Part-M M.A.504(d).  No text changed.
Cmt. 16 / Lufthansa Technik	
Comment: The intention of this § is clearly understood and supported but for component being classified as unsalvageable there may be a repair developed at a later time or a life limit extension may be granted by the TC-holder at a later time, so the possibility to segregate but not necessarily mutilate these parts must be found.	This issue is covered by Part-M M.A.504(d).  No text changed.
Cmt. 18 / DGAC, France	
Delete AMC 145.A.42 (d) §2 and refer to MA 504 about the control of unserviceable components JUSTIFICATION:	Text necessary to control this situation.  No text changed.
Selling unsalvageable aircraft component is not a "common practice" in France. It is a "bad practice" and even a condemnable and condemned practice. This idea should not be even mentioned in such a document.	
Cmt. 21 / ERA	
This paragraph classifies as unsalvageable a certified life-limited part that has "missing or incomplete records". It has been the case for many years that, in such a case where an overhaul life is specified, the component can be overhauled and allowed to re-enter service. How would the Agency respond to this?	In the case of life limited parts it is not possible to zero time the parts whether or not they have complete records. Overhaul only applies to service life limited components with an overhaul life limit. In the case of life limited parts, no overhaul can verify the total life remaining of the Part.  No text changed.
Paragraph (e)	
Cmt. 15 / Lufthansa Technik AG	
Different from M.A.501 (a) 5. (e) in this § the reference to the existing bilaterals is missing	Text harmonised.

Comment	Response
<b>Cmt. 16 / Lufthansa Technik</b>	
Different from M.A.501 (a) 5. (e) in this § the reference to the existing bilaterals is miss	Text harmonised.
<b>Paragraph d</b>	
<b>Cmt. 5 / Monarch Aircraft Engineering Ltd</b>	
The reference procedure should address the need for a practical demonstration by the mechanic to the quality personnel of the proposed modified maintenance instruction. When satisfied the quality personnel should approve the modified maintenance instruction. In large aircraft maintenance organisations the Quality department will remain independent of technical decision-making and would therefore not directly approve modifications to maintenance instructions. This paragraph needs to be changed to reflect the technical interface.	This a comment to AMC 145.A.45(d). This is existing JAA text. (AMC to JAR 145). No text changed.

Comment	Response
145.A.45	
Paragraph [redacted]	
Cmt. 1 / <i>British Airways Engineering UK</i>	
<p>"The reference procedure should address the need for a practical demonstration by the mechanic to the quality personnel of the proposed modified maintenance instruction. When satisfied the quality personnel should approve the modified maintenance instruction"</p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>In large aircraft maintenance organisations the Quality department will remain independent of technical decision-making and would therefore not directly approve modifications to maintenance instructions. This paragraph needs to be changed to reflect the technical interface.</p>	<p>This is existing JAA text. (AMC to JAR 145).</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
Paragraph (b) 1	
Cmt. 21 / ERA	
<p>This paragraph makes reference to the EASA publication entitled "Part-145 Listed Organisations". It is gratifying to read that such a document is to be produced by the Agency. Can the Agency please advise us when this document will be made available?</p>	Text changed.
Paragraph (b) 2	
Cmt. 21 / ERA	
<p>This paragraph requires the approved organization to be in possession of the maintenance data necessary to accomplish maintenance to the required standards. This data includes number of manuals produced by the aircraft and equipment manufacturers, including the maintenance manual, repair manual, etc. It is our experience that it is very difficult for maintenance organization that does not, in itself, operate aircraft to obtain this data from the manufacturers. It is left to the operators to provide such data to the maintenance organisation. This adds burden and cost to all involved and has the potential for the maintenance organisation to be using out-of-date data due to possible time-delays in the distribution of revisions. Can the Agency please advise what steps it will take to ensure that the manufacturers provide the necessary data directly to the maintenance organisations?</p>	<p>Where the maintenance organisation can not get hold of the approved maintenance data they should approach the responsible customer. This is addressed in 145.A.45</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
Paragraph (d)	
Cmt. 8 / <i>KLM UK Engineering</i>	
<p>145.A.42 (d):</p> <p>The reference procedure should address the need for a practical demonstration by the mechanic to the quality personnel of the proposed modified maintenance instruction. When satisfied the quality personnel should approve the modified maintenance instruction"</p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>In large aircraft maintenance organisations the Quality department will remain independent of technical decision-making and would therefore not directly approve modifications to maintenance instructions. This paragraph needs to be changed to reflect the technical interface.</p>	<p>This is existing JAA text. (AMC to JAR 145).</p> <p>No text changed.</p>

Comment	Response
<p><b>Cmt.</b> 27 / FAA USA</p> <p>AMC 145. A. 45 (d) allows the AMO to modify maintenance data without obtaining NAA approval, based solely on the approval of the AMO QC system. Suggest changing paragraph to provide for NAA to accept a procedure in the MOE for minor changes to maintenance data. The NAA should also be required to review the data changes when performing inspections.</p> <p>FAA position: This IR and AMC would require additional review during any BASA/MIP discussions. This represents a potential special condition.</p>	<p>Part-145 145.A.45(d) specifies the need for a procedure in the maintenance organisation exposition.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<p><b>Paragraph</b> (e)</p>	
<p><b>Cmt.</b> 29 / CAA-UK</p> <p>As part of the rule was deleted paragraph 1,3 and 4 of the AMC should be deleted as well and paragraph 2 should become part of the AMC for 145.A.65 (b)</p>	<p>Text changed.</p>
<p><b>Paragraph</b> ©</p>	
<p><b>Cmt.</b> 29 / CAA-UK</p> <p>JAR145 AMC145.45 (c) is missing and needs reinstating as it was part of JAR145 amendment 5.</p>	<p>Text changed.</p>

Comment	Response
145.A.47	
Paragraph (a)	
Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK	
The wording from JAR145 IEM 145.47(b) has been placed at the bottom of AMC.A.145.47(a) (last paragraph) as this was IEM it should now be GM145.47(b)	Text changed but not as requested.
Paragraph (a) para 2	
Cmt. 34 / ASA Sweden	
Delete the word "includes" in the first sentence of the paragraph and insert the words "should include" in its place in order to clarify the non-mandatory status of the AMC.	This is an explanation and does not contain a requirement. Text not changed.
Paragraph (b)	
Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK	
AMC145.A.47(b) should be AMC145.A.47©	Text changed.

Comment	Response
<b>Appendix 1</b>	
<b>Paragraph</b>	
<b>Cmt. 18 / DGAC, France</b>	
<p>AMCertification of maintenance</p> <p>1. Suitable release certificate means a certificate of release to service which complies with DGAC comment n° 59 to 145.A.50 on Appendix VII.</p> <p>2. Compliance with all other Part-145 and operator requirements means making an appropriate entry in the aircraft technical log, checking for compliance with type design standards, modifications, repairs, airworthiness directives, life limitations and condition of the aircraft component plus information on where, when and why the aircraft was grounded. See DGAC comment n° 59 to 145.A.50 on Appendix VII.</p> <p>If DGAC comment n° 59 to 145.A.50 on Appendix VII is not inserted in the rule, the following Aircraft CRS has to be inserted in this AMC.</p> <p>Certification of maintenance</p> <p>1. Suitable release certificate means a certificate of release to service which complies with DGAC comment n° 59 to 145.A.50 on Appendix VII.</p> <p>2. Compliance with all other Part-145 and operator requirements means making an appropriate entry in the aircraft technical log, checking for compliance with type design standards, modifications, repairs, airworthiness directives, life limitations and condition of the aircraft component plus information on where, when and why the aircraft was grounded.</p> <p>4.JUSTIFICATION: See DGAC comment n° 59 to 145.A.50 on Appendix VII. If DGAC comment n° 59 to 145.A.50 on Appendix VII is not inserted in the rule, the following Aircraft CRS has to be inserted in this AMC.</p>	<p>This DGAC comment n° 59 would require a change to the intent of the existing JA 145 Amendment 5 text.</p> <p>Text not changed.</p>
<b>Paragraph (a)</b>	
<b>Cmt. 1 / British Airways Engineering UK</b>	
<p>The text in paragraph 2 implies that all components require an EASA Form 1 to be issued. Should it not reflect acceptance of existing JAA Form Ones, until such time as an EASA Form One is required as part of the component's life cycle?</p>	<p>This is a comment to AMC 145.A.50(a). The acceptance of a component on a JAA Form One is still allowed until 28 September 2004 refer to AMC 145.A.42(a).</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<b>Cmt. 8 / KLM UK Engineering</b>	
<p>145.A.50 (a): Issue: The text in paragraph 2 implies that all components require an EASA Form 1 to be issued. Should it not reflect acceptance of existing JAA Form Ones, until such time as an EASA Form One is required as part of the component's life cycle?</p>	<p>This is a comment to AMC 145.A.50(a). The acceptance of a component on a JAA Form One is still allowed until 28 September 2004 refer to AMC 145.A.42(a).</p> <p>No text changed.</p>

Comment	Response
<p><b>Paragraph</b> (a)2.6.1 b</p> <p><b>Cmt.</b> 21 / ERA</p>	<p>This is a comment to AMC 145.A.50(a). Text changed in AMC 145.A.50(a) to be line with existing JAA text (TGL 10)</p> <p>Text changed.</p>
<p><b>Paragraph</b> 2.5</p> <p><b>Cmt.</b> 16 / Lufthansa Technik</p>	<p>This paragraph allows a component in storage without an EASA Form 1 to be issued with the EASA Form 1. AMC 145.A.42(a) still allows any component with a JAA Form One to be acceptable until 28 September 2004.</p> <p>Text changed.</p>
<p><b>Paragraph</b> 2.5.1</p> <p><b>Cmt.</b> 16 / Lufthansa Technik</p>	<p>This paragraph is only applicable to unused parts in storage without an EASA form so the use of "or equivalent" is therefore superflous.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<p><b>Paragraph</b> 2.6.1. b.</p> <p><b>Cmt.</b> 16 / Lufthansa Technik</p>	<p>This is a comment to AMC 145.A.50(a). Text changed in AMC 145.A.50(a) to be line with existing JAA text (TGL 10)</p> <p>Text changed.</p>
<p><b>Paragraph</b> 2.6.2</p> <p><b>Cmt.</b> 16 / Lufthansa Technik</p>	<p>Non-EU JAA member States are considered as foreign organisations by the Basic Regulation. Any negotiations with these states will be handled by the European Commission.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<p><b>Paragraph</b> Item 2.5</p> <p><b>Cmt.</b> 15 / Lufthansa Technik AG</p>	<p>This paragraph allows a component in storage without an EASA Form 1 to be issued with the EASA Form 1. AMC 145.A.42(a) still allows any component with a JAA Form One to be acceptable until 28 September 2004.</p> <p>Text changed.</p>

Comment	Response
<b>Paragraph</b> <i>Item 2.5.1</i>	
<b>Cmt.</b> 15 / <i>Lufthansa Technik AG</i>	
"... components in storage without an EASA Form One or equivalent up to the ...." add: or equivalent	This paragraph is only applicable to unused parts in storage without an EASA form so the use of "or equivalent" is therefore superflous.  No text changed.
<b>Paragraph</b> <i>Item 2.6.1. b.</i>	
<b>Cmt.</b> 15 / <i>Lufthansa Technik AG</i>	
"... servicabel if the last flights with..." Comment: last flights is unprecise.	This is a comment to AMC 145.A.50(a). Text changed in AMC 145.A.50(a) to be line with existing JAA text (TGL 10)  Text changed.
<b>Paragraph</b> <i>Item 2.6.2</i>	
<b>Cmt.</b> 15 / <i>Lufthansa Technik AG</i>	
It is unclear what rules are applicable for parts coming from a JAR-145 Maintenance Organisation with JAA Form One from a country not being an EU Member State. It would be an undue burden for the industry, if these parts would have to be treated in a separate manner than those from the EU Member States	Non-EU JAA member States are considered as foreign organisations by the Basic Regulation. Any negotiations with these states will be handled by the European Commission.  No text changed.

Comment	Response
145.A.55	
Paragraph (a)	
<b>Cmt. 1 / British Airways Engineering UK</b>	
<p>"The organisation shall record all details of maintenance work carried out in a form and manner acceptable to the competent authority."</p> <p>Issue: The method adopted for the retention of record details is defined by the organisation, but is accepted by the competent authority.</p>	<p>This is a comment to Part-145. There is no AMC to 145.A.55. Part-145 has been changed to reflect this comment.</p> <p>Text changed.</p>
<b>Cmt. 8 / KLM UK Engineering</b>	
<p>145.A.55 (a): The organisation shall record all details of maintenance work carried out in a form and manner acceptable to the competent authority.</p> <p>Issue: The method adopted for the retention of record details is defined by the organisation, but is accepted by the competent authority.</p>	<p>This is a comment to Part-145. There is no AMC to 145.A.55. Part-145 has been changed to reflect this comment.</p> <p>Text changed.</p>

Comment	Response
145.A.60	
Paragraph [redacted]	
Cmt. 1 / <i>British Airways Engineering UK</i>	
<p>"In the event of an unforeseen urgent operational circumstance or due to operational needs, the Member state may grant an extension to the compliance with ECAR-145 for limited duration, subject to the following conditions</p> <p>Issue: Under JAR-145.95 Equivalent Safety Case, the NAA was able to exempt an organisation from a requirement within JAR-145 provided that an equivalent safety case could be established. This flexibility is no longer available and exemption is restricted to urgent operational circumstances or needs, but only on a temporary basis. In addition, the latest version of the proposed draft Part 145 Section A, makes no mention of the requirement, as stated above</p>	<p>In the EU environment, this provision can no longer apply. This possibility is covered by Article 10 to the Basic Regulation although the scope is more limited.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
Paragraph (c)	
Cmt. 8 / <i>KLM UK Engineering</i>	
<p>The organisation shall make such reports in a form and manner acceptable to the Agency but reportable to the competent authority, and ensure that they contain all pertinent information about the condition and evaluation results known to the organisation.</p> <p>Issue: This current paragraph implies that all occurrence reports must be submitted on a standard form to EASA (the Agency). It is unclear as to whether the Agency is sufficiently resourced to carry out this function.</p>	<p>It is not required to report to the Agency.</p> <p>Text not changed.</p>
Paragraph @	
Cmt. 1 / <i>British Airways Engineering UK</i>	
<p>Reports must be made in a manner acceptable to the Agency and contain all pertinent information about the condition and evaluation results known to the ECAR-145 approved maintenance organisation.</p> <p>Issue: What report format is acceptable to EASA? Is it envisaged that a common report format will be available for use in all ECAR-145 approved organisations? Or is it proposed that reporting should be through the Member state (EASA regional office)?</p>	<p>The format of the form has not been defined. The Agency will develop a format in due course.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
Cmt. 1 / <i>British Airways Engineering UK</i>	
<p>"The organisation shall make such reports in a form and manner acceptable to the Agency but reportable to the competent authority, and ensure that they contain all pertinent information about the condition and evaluation results known to the organisation."</p> <p>Issue: This current paragraph implies that all occurrence reports must be submitted on a standard form to EASA (the Agency). It is unclear as to whether the Agency is sufficiently resourced to carry out this function.</p>	<p>It is not required to report to the Agency.</p> <p>Text not changed.</p>
Cmt. 29 / <i>CAA UK</i>	
<p>'In a manner established by the competent authority' should be changed to 'in a manner established by the Agency' to be consistent with the rule. If there is meant to be an EAMOR Form this should be included in the GM.</p>	<p>Text changed in Part-145.</p>

Comment

Response

Paragraph c

**Cmt. 8 / KLM UK Engineering**

ECAR-145.60 (c):  
Reports must be made in a manner acceptable to the Agency and contain all pertinent information about the condition and evaluation results known to the ECAR-145 approved maintenance organisation.

Issue:

What report format is acceptable to EASA? Is it envisaged that a common report format will be available for use in all ECAR-145 approved organisations? Or is it proposed that reporting should be through the Member state (EASA regional office)?

The format of the form has not been defined. The Agency will develop a format in due course.

No text changed.

**Comment**

**Response**

145.A.65

**Paragraph** (a)

**Cmt.** 29 / CAA-UK

For further information etc refers to the Occurrence report GAI and should be a note for AMC145.60(b) and is not part of this AMC

Text changed.

Comment

Response

Paragraph (b) (3)

Comment	Response
<p><b>Cmt. 30 / KLM E&amp;M</b></p>	
<p>ECAR 145.65(b)(3) is supposedly the paragraph which introduces the concept of 'critical tasks', eventhough the term is used nowhere in the regulations, nor in the AMC. Unfortunately, the consequence is that a clear defintion is lacking, making the ruling sensitive to interpretation and extremely difficult to implement.</p> <p>In addition we would like to comment as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We object to the implementation of new maintenance concepts through the AMC or GM 'backdoor'. Any fundamental policy change should be subject to the comment procedure</li> <li>- it is very strange that the nomination of critical tasks is left to the 145 repair station, while for other types of safety tasks (such as ETOPS tasks, duplicate- or independent inspections, etc.) the responsibility lies with the operator.</li> <li>- as result of the two previous items, all 145 repair stations will develop different approaches, resulting in unequal treatment of an aircraft when maintained by different repair stations.</li> </ul> <p>KLM suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- to make the control and selection of critical tasks a formal responsibility of the operator</li> <li>- to produce a clear definition of a 'critical task' and have this go through the normal comment procedure, as an industry wide discussion on this item is required.</li> <li>- to withdraw the regulation until both above issues have been clarified.</li> </ul> <p>Painfull as this scenario may seem, it is to be preferred above the issue of inadequate regulations.</p> <p>Note:</p> <p>The definition of critical tasks should at least provide the following clues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. is the concept applicable to routine tasks, non-routine tasks, modification work, etc.?</li> <li>2. the extent of a critical task should be limited to that part of the procedure, which (in case of a multiple error), may be the direct cause of a potentially catastrophic event.</li> </ol> <p>For example: if wrong or no installation of an engine gearbox access cover can cause fatal oil loss, than only the installatation of the cover will be considered as a critical task and not the entire boroscope inspection procedure, for which the removal of the cover was required.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. During a maintenance visit, intrusive tasks in parallel aircraft systems do not qualify critical tasks, when they involve different components.</li> <li>4. When only a single potentially critical task is performed during a maintenance check, critical task procedures need to be followed, only the normal procedures for that task.</li> <li>5. To prevent undue burden to the maintenance organisation, activities do not have to be considered as critical tasks, if it can be ascertained that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the effect of the related maintenance error will be immediately (before taxi out) evident to the flight crew (through indications or otherwise) and (M)MEL procedures prohibit departure of the aircraft under those conditions.</li> </ul> </li> <li>6. The limited experience there is, indicates that critical tasks are typically related to errors, developing into potentially catastrophic events within the course of one flight.</li> <li>7. Flight control tasks are specifically excluded from critical tasks, because on flight control systems a single error and subsequent failure may already be catastrophic, for which reason intrusive tasks on these systems are covered by special inspection procedures.</li> </ol>	<p>This is existing JAA text.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>

Comment	Response
<p>such as duplicate (independent) inspections. Additionally, differently performed intrusive tasks on these systems may actually cause potentially catastrophic event such as flight control asymmetry.</p> <p>8. It is recognised that as result of the proven quality of maintenance programs current in use, which are based on MSG-3 and which are supplemented by CMR's (Certification Maintenance Requirements) based on OEM System Safety Assessments, the number of critical tasks is inherently expected to be limited.</p> <p>9. Items designated as servicing do not have to be considered for nomination as a critical task.</p> <p>10. Guidance should be given about how to handle any possible overlap between critical tasks and e.g. ETOPS tasks. Example: If an intrusive task is considered as an ETOPS task according to instructions the operator and is also performed more than once during a maintenance visit, which could make it a critical task for the 145 AMO, which procedure should then take preference? In our opinion, such a conflict indicates that it is preferable that all special maintenance requirements originate from the operator and critical tasks should therefore be nominated by the operator.</p> <p>11. A provision should be created that under certain conditions a critical task may be performed more than once by the same person, provided this is covered by an independent inspection. Example: Oil servicing is typically performed by a single person servicing all engines. In case of a 4 engined aircraft, this would mean strictly speaking that this aircraft requires 4 men to service it, which is an unacceptable burden. For instance, an independent inspection would in this case be a more efficient solution.</p> <p>12. Guidance should be given about whether flight crew performing (pre-flight) maintenance should be required to be aware of critical tasks and if so, how to handle them.</p>	

Paragraph (b) Paragraph 1

Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK

<p>2 full stops after 1. Incorrect cross reference should be 145.A.65(c) (1) Table for audit plan is not current with JAR145 amendment 5 or Part145 and formatting needs reviewing. Note 2 for table has incorrect cross reference AMC145.A.65(b) should be AMC145.A.65 (c) (1)</p>	<p>This is a comment to GM145.A.65(b). Text changed in AMC 145.A.65(b) but not requested. GM145.A.65(b) text changed.</p>
---	---

Comment

Response

Paragraph

(b) (3)

Comment	Response
<p><b>Cmt.</b> 19 / KLM</p>	
<p>ECAR 145.65(b)(3) is supposedly the paragraph which introduces the concept of 'critical tasks', eventhough the term is used nowhere in the regulations, nor in the AMC. Unfortunately, the consequence is that a clear defintion is lacking, making the ruling sensitive to interpretation and extremely difficult to implement.</p> <p>In addition we would like to comment as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We object to the implementation of new maintenance concepts through the AMC or GM 'backdoor'. Any fundamental policy change should be subject to the comment procedure</li> <li>- it is very strange that the nomination of critical tasks is left to the 145 repair station, while for other types of safety tasks (such as ETOPS tasks, duplicate- or independent inspections, etc.) the responsibility lies with the operator.</li> <li>- as result of the two previous items, all 145 repair stations will develop different approaches, resulting in unequal treatment of an aircraft when maintained by different repair stations.</li> </ul> <p>KLM suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- to make the control and selection of critical tasks a formal responsibility of the operator</li> <li>- to produce a clear definition of a 'critical task' and have this go through the normal comment procedure, as an industry wide discussion on this item is required.</li> <li>- to withdraw the regulation until both above issues have been clarified.</li> </ul> <p>Painfull as this scenario may seem, it is to be preferred above the issue of inadequate regulations.</p> <p>Note:</p> <p>The definition of critical tasks should at least provide the following clues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. is the concept applicable to routine tasks, non-routine tasks, modification work, etc.?</li> <li>2. the extent of a critical task should be limited to that part of the procedure, which (in case of a multiple error), may be the direct cause of a potentially catastrophic event.</li> </ol> <p>For example: if wrong or no installation of an engine gearbox access cover can cause fatal oil loss, than only the installation of the cover will be considered as a critical task and not the entire boroscope inspection procedure, for which the removal of the cover was required.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. During a maintenance visit, intrusive tasks in parallel aircraft systems do not qualify critical tasks, when they involve different components.</li> <li>4. When only a single potentially critical task is performed during a maintenance check, critical task procedures need to be followed, only the normal procedures for that task.</li> <li>5. To prevent undue burden to the maintenance organisation, activities do not have to be considered as critical tasks, if it can be ascertained that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the effect of the related maintenance error will be immediately (before taxi out) evident to the flight crew (through indications or otherwise) and (M)MEL procedures prohibit departure of the aircraft under those conditions.</li> </ul> </li> <li>6. The limited experience there is, indicates that critical tasks are typically related to errors, developing into potentially catastrophic events within the course of one flight.</li> <li>7. Flight control tasks are specifically excluded from critical tasks, because on flight control systems a single error and subsequent failure may already be catastrophic, for which reason intrusive tasks on these systems are covered by special inspection procedures, such as duplicate (independent) inspections. Additionally, differently performed intrusive tasks on these systems may actually cause</li> </ol>	<p>This is existing JAA text.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>

Comment	Response
<p>potentially catastrophic event such as flight control asymmetry.</p> <p>8. It is recognised that as result of the proven quality of maintenance programs current in use, which are based on MSG-3 and which are supplemented by CMR's (Certification Maintenance Requirements) based on OEM System Safety Assessments, the number of critical tasks is inherently expected to be limited.</p> <p>9. Items designated as servicing do not have to be considered for nomination as a critical task</p>	
<p><b>Cmt.</b> 31 / <i>Martinair Holland NV</i></p>	
<p>Independent Inspection:  This is a new item and it will take more time to analyse the content of this AMC and its implications on the organisation than the comment period currently allows.  This is an additional maintenance practice (equal to critical task requirement as laid down in AMC145.A.65(b)(3)) which should not be described here, but in Part 145 and if applicable to M.A. Subpart F organisations in the Subpart F.  It takes time to implement such a new maintenance practice at all organisations performing maintenance. This time should be given to the organisations.</p>	<p>This is existing JAA text.</p>
	<p>No text changed.</p>
<p><b>Paragraph</b> (c) (1) <i>Paragraph 5</i></p>	
<p><b>Cmt.</b> 29 / <i>CAA-UK</i></p>	
<p>Last paragraph has a typo an maintenance organisation should be a maintenance organization.</p>	<p>Text changed.</p>
<p><b>Paragraph</b> (c) (2) <i>Paragraph 2</i></p>	
<p><b>Cmt.</b> 29 / <i>CAA-UK</i></p>	
<p>ECAR145 should be replaced by Part 145</p>	<p>Text changed.</p>

Comment	Response
145.A.70	
<b>Paragraph (a)</b>	
<b>Cmt. 20 / CAA Netherlands</b>	
CAA-NL suggests to include AMC M.A.704 7.on EDP here.	Text changed.
<b>Cmt. 21 / ERA</b>	
This paragraph, and several others within this AMC, makes reference to EU OPS. As th document is still in draft format, is this reference correct?	Text changed.
<b>Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK</b>	
Part 145.A.147 requires a production planning system to be in place, however there is n an allocated section in the MOE for any procedures that form part of the production planning system. Propose a section 2.28 titled 'Production Planning procedures' is adde to MOE layout.	Text changed.
<b>Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK</b>	
MOE layout section 3.4 and 3.5 for Certifying Staff should be titled to include Base Maintenance B1 and B2 qualified support staff.	Text changed.
<b>Paragraph (a) para 6 and 8</b>	
<b>Cmt. 34 / ASA Sweden</b>	
The indicated paragraphs seem to contain requirements. Delete the paragraph and insert the requirements in Part 145 or change the wording to clarify the nonmandatory status of the GM.4.	This a comment to GM 145.A.70(a). Text changed in the GM 145.A.70(a).

Comment	Response
145.A.75	
Paragraph	
Cmt. 32 / <i>The Royal Aeronautical Society</i>	
Paragraph AMC 145.A.75 makes reference to ECAR-145 where this should be Part-14	Text changed.
Paragraph (b) 4.7	
Cmt. 20 / <i>CAA Netherlands</i>	
Typo: it still reads ECAR-145	Text changed.
Paragraph (b) Paragraph 1	
Cmt. 29 / <i>CAA-UK</i>	
Cross reference to AMC145.A.65(b) is no longer valid. The paragraph in the JAR145 was not transferred. Propose text to read : To be appropriately approved to subcontract the organisation should have a procedure for the control of such subcontractors as state in this AMC.	Text changed.

**Comment**

**Response**

145.A.85

**Paragraph** (b)

**Cmt.** 29 / CAA-UK

This GM is duplicated with AMC145.A.85 (b) and should be deleted

Text changed.

Comment	Response
145.B.10	
Paragraph [redacted]	
Cmt. 20 / CAA Netherlands	
CAA-NL suggests to include information from AMC M.B.102(a), AMC M.B.102(c), AMC M.B.102 (d) AMC M.B.104(a) here.	Text changed.
Paragraph © [redacted]	
Cmt. 1 / British Airways Engineering UK	
<p>"An organization which is registered and located outside the Member States will only be granted approval in respect of any such location outside the Member States when in compliance with this ECAR-145 if EASA is satisfied that there is a need for such approval to maintain aircraft/aircraft components at that location and when in compliance with this ECAR-145."</p>	<p>Non-EU JAA member States are considered as foreign organisations by the Basic Regulation. Any negotiations with these states will be handled by the European Commission.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<p>Issue: JAR-145 allowed for the recognition of another NAA's approval (outside of Member states). It appears that all maintenance organisations outside of Member states will not require full EASA approval.</p>	
<p>Scenario: An EU Member state-based airline requiring maintenance in the United States, will now have to ensure that the proposed maintenance organisation has full EASA 145 approval prior to commencement of contract. ECAR-145.15 (c) states that EASA "shall assume responsibilities, function and tasks normally discharged by the Member state", however it is unclear when the Agency will be suitably resourced to do so. In addition, the latest version of the proposed draft Part 145 Section A, makes no mention of the requirement, as stated above.</p>	
Paragraph 10 3)	
Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK	
The 3rd bullet point Part145 Training etc is duplicated with the Rule and should be deleted	Text changed.
Paragraph 2	
Cmt. 1 / British Airways Engineering UK	
Where maintenance facilities are located in more than one Member state the investigation and continued oversight of the approval must be carried out in conjunction with the Member states in whose territory the other maintenance facilities are located	<p>This is addressed in AMC 145.B.25 1.</p> <p>Text not changed.</p>
<p>Issue: From the information provided at present, it is unclear how EASA intend to manage cross state approvals.</p>	

**Comment**

**Response**

**Paragraph** 3

**Cmt.** 27 / FAA USA

AMC 145. B. 10, 3) out lines the NAA auditing staff training requirements.  
The competent authority being the NAA, it appears that EASA is putting the burden of training the NAA inspectors on the NAA.  
In the interest of standardization EASA should be responsible for train all NAA staff to same standards.  
The JAA trained all NAA in JAR requirements in order to facilitate standardization in each authority. If each authority is responsible to train their staff, the FAA feels this would not promote a good working relation between the NAA/EASA and FAA.  
FAA Position: The FAA would need to be satisfied that all NAA auditing/inspection staff adequately trained to EASA standards before a BASA/MIP could be discussed in detail. The FAA feels that EASA as the regulating body should be responsible to train NAA inspectors on any special conditions that would be in a MIP with EASA.

Training is the responsibility of the competent authority. EASA is responsible for standardisation to ensure the requirements are applied consistently.  
Text not changed.

Comment	Response
145.B.20	
Paragraph 1	
Cmt. 18 / DGAC, France	
Propose to delete paragraph. JUSTIFICATION: See DGAC comment n° 67 to 145.B.20 (1).	This is existing JAR-145 procedures text. No text changed.
Paragraph 1) paragraph 1	
Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK	
add a space between 'authority' and 'in'	Text changed.

Comment	Response
145.B.25	
Paragraph 1	
Cmt. 18 / DGAC, France	
<p>Propose to delete paragraph.  JUSTIFICATION:  See DGAC comment n°37 on M.B.601  According 145.1 there is only one competent authority : the authority designated by the Member State where that organisation's principle place of business is located.  However co-operation and exchange of information could be encouraged, for example the approving authority could :  - contract the local authority for making audits,  - invite the local authority for joint audits, or  - send copies of the audits it does itself to the local authority</p>	<p>This is already existing JAA text.  No text changed.</p>
Paragraph 2	
Cmt. 18 / DGAC, France	
<p>Propose to delete paragraph.  JUSTIFICATION:  See DGAC comment n°23 on M.A.618 for limited approvals</p>	<p>The issue of limited or unlimited approvals has been addressed in the Regulation for continuing airworthiness. A transition period of 2 years has been decided where Member States may continue to issue time limited approvals. At the end of this transition period a final European-wide decision will be taken.  No text changed.</p>
Paragraph 2)	
Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK	
2 full stops at the end of sentence, one should be deleted	Text changed.

Comment	Response
145.B.30	
Paragraph (4)	
Cmt. 1 / <i>British Airways Engineering UK</i>	
The competent authority can recommend continued Part 145 approval when confirmed Level 1 findings are closed	The reference paragraph does not exist in the document published for consultation No text changed.
Paragraph (5)	
Cmt. 1 / <i>British Airways Engineering UK</i>	
All confirmed Level 1 findings must be closed by the organisation to the satisfaction of Member state before continued ECAR-145 approval can be recommended.	The reference paragraph does not exist in the document published for consultation No text changed.
Inflexible approach. Under JAR-145, the approved maintenance organisation was previously granted 30 days to provide an adequate response to, and rectification of, the findings, other than those Level 1 findings that constituted an immediate safety risk.	
Cmt. 1 / <i>British Airways Engineering UK</i>	
"The competent authority can recommend continued Part 145 approval when all confirmed Level 2 findings closure actions have been accepted."	The reference paragraph does not exist in the document published for consultation No text changed.
Issue: Inflexible approach. Under JAR-145, the approved maintenance organisation was previously granted an adequate period of time in order to provide an appropriate response to the findings, without punitive action. As written, 145.B.30 (5) implies that the organisation's Part 145 approval is suspended until such time that the Level 2 findings closure actions have been accepted by the competent authority.	
Paragraph 1	
Cmt. 18 / <i>DGAC, France</i>	
Delete the fourth dash of this paragraph : - the specific item audit being granted a back credit should be audited not later than 24 months after the last audit of the item.	Existing JAA text (Chapter 8). No text changed.
4.JUSTIFICATION:	
This objective of "back credit time related" management is too complex to deal with. The main point is to state that the situation of a single surveillance audit conducted over a period of two years is unacceptable. It is even in contradiction with OACI directives which impose a minimum of one audit per year.	
Paragraph 4	
Cmt. 5 / <i>Monarch Aircraft Engineering Ltd</i>	
The competent authority can recommend continued Part 145 approval when confirmed Level 1 findings are closed. This is considered a restrictive and inflexible approach. Under JAR-145 an adequate period of time in order to provide an appropriate response to, and rectification of, the findings was granted, other than those Level 1 findings that constituted an immediate safety risk	The reference paragraph does not exist in the document published for consultation No text changed.

Comment	Response
---------	----------

**Paragraph** 5

**Cmt.** 7 / *KLM UK Engineering Ltd*

The competent authority can recommend continued Part 145 approval when all confirmed Level 2 findings closure actions have been accepted.

Issue:

Inflexible approach. Under JAR-145, the approved maintenance organisation was previously granted an adequate period of time in order to provide an appropriate response to the findings, without punitive action. As written, 145.B.30 (5) implies that the organisation's Part 145 approval is suspended until such time that the Level 2 findings closure actions have been accepted by the competent authority.

The reference paragraph does not exist in the document published for consultation

No text changed.

**Cmt.** 8 / *KLM UK Engineering*

ECAR-145 Part 2.30.5:  
All confirmed Level 1 findings must be closed by the organisation to the satisfaction of the Member state before continued ECAR-145 approval can be recommended.

Issue:

Inflexible approach. Under JAR-145, the approved maintenance organisation was previously granted 30 days to provide an adequate response to, and rectification of, the findings, other than those Level 1 findings that constituted an immediate safety risk.

The reference paragraph does not exist in the document published for consultation

No text changed.

Comment	Response
145.B.35	
Paragraph	
<b>Cmt.</b> 29 / CAA-UK	
The wording could be improved by making the following changes: The competent authority should have adequate control over any changes to the management personnel specified in 145.A.30(a) and (b) and such changes in personnel will require an amendment to the exposition	Text changed.
<b>Cmt.</b> 29 / CAA-UK	
Use of 'variations' in this AMC is not consistent with rule	Text changed.

Comment	Response
145.B.40	
Paragraph (4) 1	
Cmt. 18 / DGAC, France	
Delete §1 4.JUSTIFICATION: See DGAC comment n° 69 to 145.B.40.	Existing JAA text (chapter 8).  No text changed.
Paragraph 2	
Cmt. 1 / British Airways Engineering UK	
<p>"Member state action for Level 1 finding. The maintenance approval must be suspended whole or in part depending upon the extent of the Level 1 finding, until successful corrective action has been taken."</p> <p>Inflexible approach. Under JAR-145, the approved maintenance organisation was previously granted 30 days to provide an adequate response to, and rectification of, the findings, other than those Level 1 findings that constituted an immediate safety risk.</p>	<p>The rule as commented states that immediate action must be taken to limit, suspend or revoke, in whole or in part the approval. This allows for different levels of administrative action and for the existence of an appeal process.</p> <p>Nonetheless, a Level 1 finding leads to action on the certificate as it lowers the safety standard and hazards the aircraft.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
Cmt. 8 / KLM UK Engineering	
<p>ECAR-145 Part 2.40.2: Member state action for Level 1 finding. The maintenance approval must be suspended whole or in part depending upon the extent of the Level 1 finding, until successful corrective action has been taken.</p> <p>Issue: Inflexible approach. Under JAR-145, the approved maintenance organisation was previously granted 30 days to provide an adequate response to, and rectification of, the findings, other than those Level 1 findings that constituted an immediate safety risk.</p>	<p>The rule as commented states that immediate action must be taken to limit, suspend or revoke, in whole or in part the approval. This allows for different levels of administrative action and for the existence of an appeal process.</p> <p>Nonetheless, a Level 1 finding leads to action on the certificate as it lowers the safety standard and hazards the aircraft.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>

Comment	Response
<b>Appendix 1</b>	
<b>Paragraph</b>	
<b>Cmt. 11 / Foca Switzerland</b>	
EASA Form 4 shall be formatted such that it can be used under all Parts that require acceptance of Management Personnel by the Competent Authority, i.e. Part 145, Part 1 Part 21/SubpartG, Part M/Subpart F.	Text changed.
<b>Cmt. 11 / Foca Switzerland</b>	
Expressions in the scope of Part 145 and PartM/Subpart F Approvals (page 2 of EASA Form 2) shall be harmonised with expressions of ratings in the Part 66 Aircraft Maintenance Licence. This is especially important in case of series.	This is the existing JAA rating system for maintenance organisations. No text changed.
<b>Paragraph EASA form two page 1 of 2</b>	
<b>Cmt. 20 / CAA Netherlands</b>	
Typo: Still reveres is made to Renewal.	Text changed.

Comment	Response
<b>Appendix 2</b>	
<b>Paragraph</b>	
<b>Cmt.</b> 29 / CAA-UK	
<p>The following changes are needed for the Form 6:  The formatting on Part 2 between 145.40 and 42 needs fixing  Part 2 paragraphs should be 145.A.25 etc and not 145.25  Part 145.90 title should be 'Continued validity'  Part 3 Part1 1.19 should be 1.10 'Member state' should be replaced by 'Competent Authority' (2.18 also)  Part 5 Applicable Part145 amendment status should be deleted as this is superfluous  Part 5 heading includes 'renewal' (no longer used) and 'variation' which is not consistent with rule wording</p>	Text changed.
<b>Paragraph</b> <b>AMC &amp; GM to part 145 appendix EASA Form 6</b>	
<b>Cmt.</b> 34 / ASA Sweden	
<p>The last two pages of Appendix 2 contain "EASA Form Two". They have been given the heading "Appendix 1". If these two pages form part of Appendix 2, this should be clearly indicated and the two pages should not have the heading Appendix 1. If appendix 2 shall have the subtitle "EASA Form 6", it might be confusing that the appendix also contains "EASA Form Two".  The number in the titles of the forms (6 and Two respectively) should have the same structure, i.e. use letters or numbers.</p>	Text changed.

Comment	Response
<i>Other</i>	
<b>Paragraph</b>	
<b>Cmt. 1 / British Airways Engineering UK</b>	
<p>"From the effective date of ECAR-145 any JAR-145 approvals issued by JAA full Member states that are also EU Member states shall be recognised as equivalent to ECAR-145 approvals until 27th March 2007 unless the approval is surrendered, suspended, revoked, expired or superseded by the grant of and ECAR-145 approval."</p> <p>Issue: There is no mention made of the recognition of existing JAR-145 approvals. In particular those issued to non-Member state maintenance organisations through NAA sponsorship JAR/FAR-145 accepted organisations.</p> <p>Scenario: The continued validity of non-Member state maintenance organisations' JAR-145 approval could be called into question with the implementation of ECAR-145, which an EU Member state-based airline relies on to provide maintenance at foreign locations, e.g. Qantas, South African Airways, Delta, American Airlines. In addition, the latest version of the proposed draft Part 145 Section A, makes no mention of the requirement, as stated above.</p>	<p>Non-EU member States are considered as foreign organisations by the Basic Regulation. Any negotiations with these states will be handled by the European Commission. Otherwise, the approval of foreign organisations is the responsibility of EASA.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<b>Cmt. 8 / KLM UK Engineering</b>	
<p>ECAR-145 Part 2.60: In the event of an unforeseen urgent operational circumstance or due to operational needs, the Member state may grant an extension to the compliance with ECAR-145 for limited duration, subject to the following conditions</p> <p>Issue: Under JAR-145.95 Equivalent Safety Case, the NAA was able to exempt an organisation from a requirement within JAR-145 provided that an equivalent safety case could be established. This flexibility is no longer available and exemption is restricted to urgent operational circumstances or needs, but only on a temporary basis. In addition, the latest version of the proposed draft Part 145 Section A, makes no mention of the requirement, as stated above.</p>	<p>In the EU environment, this provision can no longer apply. This possibility is covered by Article 10 to the Basic Regulation although the scope is more limited.</p> <p>Paragraph 145.B.60 has been reintroduced.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>

Comment	Response
<p><b>Cmt. 8 / KLM UK Engineering</b></p> <p>ECAR-145.12: From the effective date of ECAR-145 any JAR-145 approvals issued by JAA full Member states that are also EU Member states shall be recognised as equivalent to ECAR-145 approvals until 27th March 2007 unless the approval is surrendered, suspended, revoked, expired or superseded by the grant of and ECAR-145 approval.</p> <p>Issue: There is no mention made of the recognition of existing JAR-145 approvals. In particular those issued to non-Member state maintenance organisations through NAA sponsorship JAR/FAR-145 accepted organisations.</p> <p>Scenario: The continued validity of non-Member state maintenance organisations' JAR-145 approval could be called into question with the implementation of ECAR-145, which an EU Member state-based airline relies on to provide maintenance at foreign locations, e.g. Qantas, South African Airways, Delta, American Airlines. In addition, the latest version of the proposed draft Part 145 Section A, makes no mention of the requirement, as stated above.</p>	<p>Non-EU member States are considered as foreign organisations by the Basic Regulation. Any negotiations with these states will be handled by the European Commission. Otherwise, the approval of foreign organisations is the responsibility of EASA.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<p><b>Cmt. 11 / Foca Switzerland</b></p> <p>For the sake of standardisation,</p> <p>the AMC paragraphs of the various Parts relating to the same systemic procedures shall be written in consistent manner (same wording), i.e. for the initial certification of organisations, for the conduct of audits, for the processing of findings, for the limitation/suspension/revocation of approvals etc., be it i.a.w. Part 145, Part M/Subpart Part 147, Part 21/Subpart G.</p> <p>Forms containing the same kind of information shall have a consistent format throughout all Parts they are used for, i.e. page 1 of application form (EASA Form 2), EASA Form 4 (acceptance of management personnel), page 1 of approval certificates, page 1 of approval recommendation reports (EASA Form 6/6F)</p> <p>AMC &amp; GM paragraphs on organisation expositions/manuals (MOE, MOM, MTOE, POE) shall be written in consistent manner (same wording), i.e. guidance to structure, amendment and approval procedures etc. This is especially important in case an organisation, applying for several approvals, establishes joint management chapters of expositions/manuals.</p> <p>Options for the unlimited/limited issue of certificates shall be consistent for all kinds of organisation approvals.</p>	<p>Continuing airworthiness Parts and AMCs have been harmonised.</p>

Comment	Response
<b>Cmt. 13 / Finnair</b>	
<p>For the purpose of this Part an acceptable maintenance organisation may be:</p> <p>1) a maintenance organisation approval issued by a Member State before the entry into force of this Regulation shall be deemed to have been issued in accordance with this Regulation. For this purpose, by derogation to the provisions of 145.B.40.4 under Annex II, level 2 findings associated with the differences between JAR 145 and Annex II may be closed within one year;</p> <p>2) for aircraft line and base maintenance until 28 September 2005 a maintenance organisation approved by a JAA full member authority within the JAA mutual recognition system.</p> <p>Reason: To avoid sudden change of rules when an operator/maintenance organisation has contracted maintenance to a JAR-145 maintenance organisation approved by a non-EU JAA Full Member Authority. (For instance Norway, Switzerland) Should also be included in the regulation Article 4.</p>	<p>Non-EU member States are considered as foreign organisations by the Basic Regulation. Any negotiations with these states will be handled by the European Commission.</p> <p>Otherwise, the approval of foreign organisations is the responsibility of EASA.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<b>Cmt. 20 / CAA Netherlands</b>	
<p>CAA-NL is using digital systems to generate several forms required by the JAA. CAA-NL has the intention to use similar digital systems to create the forms required by EASA. However, the proposed design of the forms makes it difficult to generate them by using computerized systems. Most of the proposed forms are designed by using boxes, frames and lines. Especially forms with a dynamic quantity of text to be put in a box or a frame are requiring a lot of programming in order to get an acceptable result.</p> <p>CAA-NL proposes the following:</p> <p>Make a general design for all forms to be used by the Member States/ Competent Authorities in order to make them easily recognizable as EASA forms.</p> <p>The use of boxes and lines should be limited to the headers and footers only.</p> <p>The layout of the body of the forms should be simple text or one simple table.</p> <p>The comment is applicable for at least the following forms; EASA Form 6, EASA Form 6, EASA Form 13, EASA Form 56 and EASA Form 58.</p>	<p>These forms are AMC. Therefore, the forms issued by the competent authority need not be identical.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<b>Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK</b>	
<p>Appendix 3</p> <p>The Form 2 is titled appendix 1 but the Form 4 is also appendix 1</p> <p>Form 2 includes 'renewal' and 'variation' renewals are no longer used and the word variation is not consistent with the rule.</p> <p>The Form 2 should include a space for Company Registration Number as this would be expected of an applicant as part of the legal entity investigation.</p> <p>Page 2 of Form 2 Rating D1 limitation section should have 'Quote particular NDT method to be consistent with Appendix 2 to the rule</p>	
<b>Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK</b>	
Should be referenced AMC145.65 (b)	Text changed
<b>Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK</b>	
<p>AMC145.A.50 (a)</p> <p>Para 2.4.5 should be combined with 2.4.3 as they are connected :</p> <p>2.4.3. A list of all airworthiness directives, repairs and modifications known to have been incorporated. If no airworthiness directives or repairs or modifications are known to be incorporated then this should be so stated.</p>	Text changed.

Comment	Response
<b>Cmt.</b> 29 / CAA-UK	
AMC145.A.50 (d) Paragraphs 2 to 6 should be part of the AMC.A.50 (a) as it relates to every CRS and not just the EASA Form 1 which 50(d) relates to.	Text changed.
<b>Cmt.</b> 29 / CAA-UK	
AMC145.A.50(a) paragraph 2 Needs to be expanded to include the normal robbery situation and should be amended to read "from an active aircraft or an aircraft which has been withdrawn from service.	Text changed.
<b>Paragraph</b> (a) paragraph 1(a)	
<b>Cmt.</b> 29 / CAA-UK	
AMC145.A. 50(a) needs to clarify the Base Maintenance environment as there is a single Certificate of Release to Service by adding the following sentence to the end of the paragraph..... "In the case of base maintenance a separate task sign off is required for the maintenance and installation tasks."	Text changed.
<b>Paragraph</b> (a) Paragraph 2.4.6	
<b>Cmt.</b> 29 / CAA-UK	
AMC 145.A.50(a) Typo in last sentence acceptance text report should be acceptance test report	Text changed.
<b>Paragraph</b> (a) paragraph 3	
<b>Cmt.</b> 29 / CAA-UK	
This paragraph should be AMC.145.A.50 (a) paragraph 1(c) as this will raise the profile of this paragraph rather than the current location at the very end of the AMC.	Text changed.
<b>Paragraph</b> (f) paragraph 1	
<b>Cmt.</b> 29 / CAA-UK	
AMC145.A.50 The use of 'competent authority' here does not reflect the competent authority as listed Part145.1 General. This could be confusing using this terminology.	Text changed.
<b>Paragraph</b> 15.2	
<b>Cmt.</b> 8 / KLM UK Engineering Ltd	
ECAR-145 Part 2.15.2 Where maintenance facilities are located in more than one Member state the investigation and continued oversight of the approval must be carried out in conjunction with the Member states in whose territory the other maintenance facilities are located.  Issue: From the information provided at present, it is unclear how EASA intend to manage cross state approvals.	This is addressed in AMC 145.B.25 1.  Text not changed.

Comment	Response
<p><b>Paragraph</b> <b>AMC 145 B 60</b></p> <p><b>Cmt.</b> <b>31 / Martinair Holland NV</b></p>	<p>The JAR 145.95 Equivalent Safety Case is not incorporated into Part 145 or AMC to 145.60. The explanatory note does not clear up if JAR 145.95 is replaced by Part 145.B.60.</p> <p>In the EU environment, this provision can no longer apply. This possibility is covered by Article 10 to the Basic Regulation although the scope is more limited.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<p><b>Paragraph</b> <b>AMC 145A 1</b></p> <p><b>Cmt.</b> <b>27 / FAA USA</b></p>	<p>Recommend information in AMC to define designated authority, Agency, third Country. The word competent authority is used through out IR and AMC 145 and not defined. We recognize that it is defined in the EU regulation. We recommend that these issues be defined in AMC 145.A.10 to get a full understanding of the terms as they relate to the regulations without causing the reader to visit several documents to gain a full understanding.</p> <p>competent authority is defined in Part-145, 145.1</p>
<p><b>Paragraph</b> <b>GM 145.A.60(a)</b></p> <p><b>Cmt.</b> <b>20 / CAA Netherlands</b></p>	<p>CAA-NL strongly suggests to change this para in :A manner acceptable to the CO. Each report should contain i) ii) .</p> <p>Text changed but not as requested.</p>
<p><b>Paragraph</b> <b>i</b></p> <p><b>Cmt.</b> <b>8 / KLM UK Engineering</b></p>	<p>ECAR-145.30 (i): Component Certifying staff must comply with ECAR-66.</p> <p>Issue: At this time, it appears that there is no specified scope for the implementation of ECAR for Component certifying staff, i.e. licence structure; qualification requirements; protection rights; implementation date and transition period, etc. From the information currently available, it is unclear when the Agency will be suitably resourced to do so.</p> <p>Part-66 refers to national requirements at this time.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>
<p><b>Paragraph</b> <b>Leaflet 10-11</b></p> <p><b>Cmt.</b> <b>31 / Martinair Holland NV</b></p>	<p>AMC 145.A.50 does not mention the equivalent certificates (FAA/TCCA-forms) as agreed by bilateral agreements as this is mentioned in AMC M.A.501(a)5(e). We also advise to mention the applicable release documents used (i.e. FAA-Form 8130 name as done previously in the JAR.</p> <p>This is covered by:</p> <p>" (a) a release document issued by an organisation under the terms of a bilateral agreement signed by the European Community; (b) a release document issued by an organisation approved under the terms of a JAA maintenance bilateral agreement until superseded by the corresponding agreement signed by the European Community;"</p> <p>in AMC 145.A.42(a).</p> <p>No text changed.</p>

Comment

Response

Paragraph *paragraph 2.7*

Cmt. 29 / CAA-UK

AMC 145.A.50(a)  
Typo: ...by an maintenance organisation should be a maintenance organisation

Text changed.

Comment	Response
<b>General Comments</b>	
<b>Paragraph</b>	
<b>Cmt. 18 / DGAC, France</b>	
As AMCs are not mandatory, the terms "must", "shall" and perhaps "should", should be removed from the text. The use of the expression "may" would prevent any confusion introduced by ambiguous terms.	Text reviewed and changed where applicable.
<b>Cmt. 27 / FAA USA</b>	
<p>AMC 145. B. 10 3) out lines the NAA auditing staff training requirements.</p> <p>The competent authority being the NAA, it appears that EASA is putting the burden of training the NAA inspectors on the NAA.</p> <p>In the interest of standardization EASA should train all NAA staff to the same standard. The JAA trained all NAA inspectors in JAR requirements in order to facilitate standardization in each authority. If each authority is responsible to train their staff the FAA feels this would not promote a good working relation between the NAA/EASA and FAA.</p> <p>FAA Position: The FAA would need to be satisfied that all NAA auditing/inspection staff adequately trained to EASA standards before a BASA/MIP could be discussed in detail. The FAA feels that EASA would be responsible to train NAA inspectors on any special conditions that would be in a MIP with EASA.</p>	<p>Training is the responsibility of the competent authority. EASA is responsible for standardisation to ensure the requirements are applied consistently.</p> <p>Text not changed.</p>
<b>Cmt. 31 / Martinair Holland NV</b>	
<p>According to the Explanatory Note some Leaflets are not incorporated into AMC or GM. In AMC 145 we recommend to incorporate the following leaflets into AMC or GM to Part 145:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Leaflet 12: JAR 145 Release to Service after incomplete maintenance</li> <li>-Leaflet 13: JAR 145 Release to Service-Single/Multiple Signature</li> <li>-Leaflet 16: JAR 145 Release to Service &amp; The JAR OPS Tech Log.</li> <li>-Leaflet 18: JAR-145 Approval of Expositions with extensive procedures</li> <li>-Leaflet 21: Combined JAA Form One and FAR Part 43 Return to Service for JAA/FAA customer</li> <li>-Leaflet 22: JAA Acceptance of USA Repair Stations</li> <li>-Leaflet 23: JAA Acceptance of Canadian Approved Maintenance Organisations</li> </ul>	<p>The content of the subject TGLs has been fully reviewed, the applicable paragraphs have been transferred, the rest has been left for further Agency analysis.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>

Comment	Response
<p><b>Cmt.</b> 34 / <i>LUFTFARTSVERKET, Aviation Safety Authority (ASA)</i></p> <p>Regulation (EC) No 1592/2002 article 56.2 reads: "During an additional transition period of 42 months from the date referred to in paragraph 1, Member States may continue to issue certificates and approvals by way of derogation from the provisions of Articles 5, 6, 9 and 15 under the conditions specified by the Commission in the implementing rules adopted for their application....."</p> <p>The time aspect is a general problem that has to be addressed. The time given for consultation have been too short considering that the material is extensive and that acceptable means of compliance (AMC) and guidance material (GM), as well as the proposed implementing rules need more review before they can be considered ready for adoption.</p> <p>The entry into force dates in general does not allow neither authorities nor the market enough time to adjust. This can have serious effects on the industry and certain activities may have to shut down. We cannot accept this to happen because enough time is not allowed and this could definitely not have been the purpose.</p> <p>We therefore recommend that the 42 month transition period is used to give everyone involved reasonable time to adjust and prepare.</p>	<p>The transitional aspects are addressed in the Commission Regulation. Once it is published, the associated AMC supporting it also need to be published. The AMC Agency documents and can therefore be amended through a process deferring for the EU decision making process.</p> <p>No text changed.</p>

Comment	Response
<b>Cmt. 34 / ASA Sweden</b>	
<p>Documents in general need an editorial review in regard of language and consistency, for example:</p> <p>The titles of the drafted material should have the same structure. There is total inconsistency in whether the titles of the drafted material (in this case both the Implementation Rules and the Acceptable Means of Compliance and Guidance Material) shall be written with or without the "-" between the word "Part" and the specific letter or number of each part, i.e. M, 66, 145 or 147.</p> <p>All AMC or GM paragraph numbers should have the same structure. At present they are different in different Parts. GMs to Part 145 are called "GM (a paragraph)", see for example GM 145.A.70 (a), whereas GMs to Part 147 are called "Guidance to (a paragraph)", see for example Guidance to 147.A.1.</p> <p>All AMC and GM headings should be the same as those of the requirements that they are referring to. In the drafted material, there are AMCs and GMs with a different heading than the requirement that they refer to. For example, some AMCs contain headings that have been shortened (see AMC M.A. 606).</p> <p>Regarding appendices, the following should apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Appendices should be avoided. Forms and such should be inserted under an AMC or a GM.</li> <li>- If it is necessary to use appendices, there should be a reference in an AMC or a GM to an appendix that can be found in the material. Frequently, there are appendices attached to the material where no reference can be found in the AMCs or GMs.</li> <li>- In the heading of all appendices, and preferably on all pages included in an appendix, it should be clearly indicated that the appendix or page forms part of an AMC (see for example both appendices, Appendix 1 and Appendix 2, to AMC and GM to Part 145, where nothing indicates that their provisions contain acceptable means of compliance).</li> </ul> <p>Comment nr. COMMENT FORM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In order to provide acceptable means of compliance or guidance material that is easy to recognise for all users, all forms should retain their original numbers.</li> <li>- It is also preferable that all relevant forms which have been developed by JAA are inserted in the AMC/GM-material. Thus, "Form 12" for the application of a 147-organisation approval, should be inserted in the AMC material for Part 147.</li> </ul>	<p>This review will be carried out by the agency as soon as a consolidated text is available for adoption.</p>