



WORKING PAPER

ASSEMBLY — 41ST SESSION

TECHNICAL COMMISSION

Agenda Item 31: Aviation Safety and Air Navigation Standardization

**MEASURES TO STRENGTHEN AIRCRAFT TYPE TRAINING
STANDARDS/SPECIFICATION**

(Presented by China)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper, based on the practices of Member States in the management of type-specific qualifications, proposes a process for strengthening the standards/specification for aircraft type training (including pilot training and maintenance personnel training), taking into consideration relevant provisions in Annexes 1, 6 and 8.

There is a need to clarify the role of Type Certificates Holder (TCH) as the source of aircraft type training standards/specification, and establish appropriate management systems

Action: The Assembly is invited to:

- a) instruct the Air Navigation Commission to amend Annex 1 to clearly define the standards/specification for type rating training, and strengthen the requirement for TCH to serve as the source of such standards; and
- b) instruct the Air Navigation Commission to amend Annex 8, to clarify the responsibilities of TCH to develop and provide proposals for the standards/specification for aircraft type training (including pilot training and maintenance personnel training).

<i>Strategic Objectives:</i>	This working paper relates to the Safety Strategic Objective.
<i>Financial implications:</i>	The activities referred to in this paper will be undertaken with resources available in the 2022-2025 Regular Programme Budget
<i>References:</i>	Annex 8 — <i>Airworthiness of Aircraft</i> Annex 6 — <i>Operation of Aircraft</i> Annex 1 — <i>Personnel Licensing</i>

¹ English and Chinese versions provided by China.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 In international practice, an approach generally used by some Member States is to develop pilot type rating requirements and training specification for specific aircraft types jointly with TCH, as is the case with the process of Flight Standardization Board (FSB) adopted by Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and Civil Aviation Administration of China (CAAC), the process of Operational Suitability Data - Flight Crew Data (OSD-FCD) by European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA), and the process of Operational Evaluation Board (OEB) by Transport Canada Civil Aviation (TCCA) and National Civil Aviation Agency of Brazil (ANAC). These processes, however, are not mentioned within the framework of ICAO's documents (only partially mentioned in Doc 9379 in paragraphs addressing cross-crew qualifications).

1.2 Chapter 2, 2.1 of Annex 1 sets out general rules for pilot licences and ratings, which although include a requirement to establish type ratings for certain aircraft, do not specify requirements for type rating training standards/specification. Instead, it is in Annex 6 that the requirements for type rating training and proficiency checks for flight crews are provided. As a result, although Member States generally issue type ratings by endorsing the ratings on licences, the standards/specification for type rating training are not harmonized. Even the above FSB, OSD and OEB processes are not entirely consistent in terms of output.

1.3 In terms of the impact on flight safety, the category and ratings of pilot licences are the basis for ensuring that pilots are competent to fly safely, but type rating in particular can reflect pilots' competency in a more direct way. Especially for complex aircraft, competency-based training needs to be specific to aircraft type, but differences among Member States in type rating requirements and standards should be a concern.

1.4 Similar problems can be found in maintenance personnel licensing. Only a few Member States have established, jointly with TCH, the requirements for endorsement of type ratings and training specification, such as EASA's Operational Suitability Data - Maintenance Crew Data (OSD - MCD) process, and the Maintenance Review Board (MRB) process adopted by CAAC...

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 The key to addressing the above issues is to strengthen the requirement for TCH to serve as the source of standards for aircraft type training (including pilot training and maintenance personnel training). The reason is that TCH are best placed and have the duty to develop proposals for the training standards of the aircraft types they made, as is the case with instructions for continued airworthiness (ICAs) required by Annex 8 and Airworthiness Manual (Doc 9760).

2.2 The proposals provided by TCH, once adopted by national civil aviation authorities following the FSB, OSD or OEB review process as aircraft type training standards and specification for use by aircraft operators, could also serve as a solution to the inconsistency in the outputs of the processes adopted by the civil aviation authorities of different States.

2.3 To strengthen the requirement for TCH to serve as the source of standards for aircraft type training, requires the TCH to establish a team of specialists, clarify their responsibilities and set out a process to cooperate with the development and research personnel. This is also a weak link for many TCH/manufacturers, in the context of frequent design changes and its accumulating impacts, especially

without new variant, which have resulted in heightened risks to operational safety due to the inadequacy of training. This is a problem that should not be overlooked.

2.4 CAAC's policy documents have specified the relevant requirements, which have been implemented among domestic aircraft TCHs/manufacturers. The same approach will also be used to the imported aircraft, especially requiring the TCHs/manufacturers to establish appropriate management systems.

3. **SUGGESTION**

3.1 Only if all member states can be strengthening the responsibility for TCH to serve as the source of standards for aircraft type training, the mutual and standardized type training specification could be presented.

— END —