The View from Washington

BY RIC PERI
VICE PRESIDENT, AEA GOVERNMENT & INDUSTRY AFFAIRS

Part 145 Repair Station Training Program Conflicts

For some readers this will be the last article before they should have their training programs completed and ready to submit to the FAA for approval. Some repair stations will have another year. But all repair stations must be aware there may be conflicts in getting your programs approved.

AEA just completed the first of four full-day Repair Station Training Program seminars we are offering before the first due date for RSTP submission. And after an entire day of discussion on the regulations, guidance materials and policies regarding the Repair Station Training Program, there were still the inevitable "Yeah, but what about my inspector?" questions.

We continually have inspector issues. And although we have worked very hard on standardization, we still fundamentally work with individuals and, as a result, always will have a certain level of personal views.

To minimize the variables in regulations and guidance, AEA works closely with the FAA and other government agencies in drafting regulations and guidance. The association participates on FAA advisory rulemaking committees to correct long-standing problems in existing rules. We also try to anticipate the problems in new rules and minimize them before the rule is ever published.

But even when we write the language into the regulations to minimize the impact of PIPP (Principle Inspectors Personal Preference), as we did in the repair station regulations, we have a few individual inspectors who just can't accept the "new" regulations. And in the extreme case, an inspector won't just disagree with the principle of the new rule even after being trained on the new rule, he'll choose to violate the rule and mandate items the law doesn't require.

Two recent issues I have worked on this month highlight this challenge.

In one case, a FSDO had adopted a "local" policy about the format of the repair station manual. Then, after an audit by FAA headquarters, the FSDO notified the repair stations in its district that "because of a change in headquarters' policy, every repair station within the district would have to change their repair station manual. Time, money and frustration were all caused by the FSDO's improper PIPP. The FSDO was wrong, but it was the industry that paid the price.

In another instance, I was talking to an ASI from a FSDO about the AEA's CD-based training programs the association distributes, and our discussion got onto AC 20-138A. The ASI proceeded to tell me about the regional PIPP, which was all GPS installations in the region were considered major, period! They were quite familiar with AC 20-138A. It was clear from our discussion that regardless of what administrator guidance says, the regional avionics manager was above the law, and no one within the FAA management was going to hold him accountable to the law. Again, time, money and frustration was the result of PIPP. Although there is clear guidance that states the GPS is now to be considered normal avionics, and it is the regional manager who is wrong, it will be the industry paying the price.

Not withstanding the best efforts of FAA headquarters to implement standardization through its adoption of ISO 9000, true standardization only will be achieved through the public's efforts to enact challenges to local non-standard mandates through the Customer Service Initiative. That is not to say, let's stop installing avionics until these issues are resolved. We should comply with the mandates of our inspectors (within reason, of course), but then file a challenge for the next installation.

There is a business to run and there is a government "of the people" that needs to be kept in check. When the business of aviation is completed, then it is time for the public to govern. When a public official chooses to disregard regulations, guidance and policy to act on his personal beliefs, his actions must be identified and corrected. In our industry that mechanism is the CSI.

These examples of PIPP are based on long-established regulations that have clear language and/or guidance. In the case of the Repair Station Training Program, there exists a potential conflict because of misleading policy.

To say each and every ASI will reasonably apply the intended logic of the authors of the RSTP — a logic that is only available buried in the preamble language of the NPRM or final rule published five years ago — would not be realistic.

Caution: Possible Conflicts Ahead

Webster's Dictionary defines con-

flict as a mental struggle resulting from incompatible or opposing needs, drives, wishes, or external or internal demands.

In regards to the Repair Station Training Program, this conflict originates in the group-writing approach the FAA used to deal with the RSTP in a timely manner.

Fortunately, the regulations (14 CFR 145.163) and advisory circular 145-10 were open to public comment and were amended based on substantial comments by the public. Unfortunately, the Administrator's policy (HBAW 05-03) was written to mirror the draft AC and has not been corrected; therefore, the policy does not align with public guidance.

AEA has promoted strict compliance with AC 145-10 in an effort to minimize the effect on its membership of the inspector's conflict. AC 145-10, by design and definition, is an acceptable means of compliance to 14 CFR 145.163. Any alternative means of compliance, such as developing your own or copying someone else's RSTP, means the Administrator's policy is used to evaluate your RSTP — a policy that is not in alignment with the regulation.

The Administrator's policy, HBAW 05-03 states that:

"Training programs submitted to the FAA for approval, and are found to be in conflict with regulatory requirements or are inadequate, must be appropriately modified by the repair station in accordance with established procedures of the repair station manual. When appropriate, job aids have been developed to assist inspectors in the approval process."

The first half of this statement is right on. The RSTP must comply with the regulations. Unfortunately, the second part of the paragraph has the potential to over-regulate repair stations. When you evaluate the job aids, you find many of them imply a standard the regulation no longer supports.

The following is another example of possible conflicts created by the Administrator's policy. HBAW 05-03 states that:

(1) A Repair Station Training Program must meet the requirements of HCFR 145.163.

(2) A repair station's training sources, training methods, curriculum, training courses, etc. are not subject to FAA approval.

(3) The PI only determines that the elements of a Repair Station Training Program are met, which ensure the repair station trains to meet its capabilities and customer specific requirements.

(4) The training program content will be evaluated for compliance of the rule.

(5) The repair station shoulders the responsibility that its training program sources, methods, curriculum, and courses meet the requirements of the rule and its customers.

This is correct and in line with the preamble language of the regulation and the follow-on guidance in AC 145-10.

However, immediately following the above information, the Administrator's policy directs them that:

• The PI should monitor training conducted under program approval. Whenever possible, the first session of training conducted should be monitored by the PI or a qualified inspector.

• An FAA inspector does not need to observe every training session. A sufficient sampling of the training sessions, however, should be observed as a basis for a realistic evaluation.

• During the evaluation, the repair station must demonstrate the ability to effectively train their personnel. Any deficiency identified during the evaluation of the training program must be discussed with the repair station.

• Direct observation of testing and checking is an effective method for determining whether learning has occurred. Examining the results of tests, such as oral or written tests, or OJT, provides a quantifiable method for measuring training effectiveness.

• The PI must examine and determine the causal factors of significant failure trends.

In one statement, the FAA makes it clear that the repair station "shoulders the responsibility" for course content, but the next statement implies it is the inspector's responsibility to evaluate each course for content.

With regards to instructors, the Administrator's policy states:

"Instructor Selection. The Repair Stations Training Program should include criteria for instructors and a description of how instructors are selected. In cases where the sources of training are external to the repair station, it may not be possible to select instructors, but the quality of instruction should be monitored to ensure the quality of training employees receive is adequate.

Whereas the AC states:

• Instructors shall be qualified based upon subject matter knowledge and teaching ability.

• Subject matter expertise may be established by experience, demonstrated knowledge and/or certification.

• The ability to impart information can be determined by observation, demonstration or experience.

• The evaluation of in-house instructors shall be documented in the course description.

To amplify the repair station's role in selecting instructors, Section 3 of the RSTP templates contained in the AC addresses the accountable manager's role in defining the instructor's qualifications.

The accountable manager will outline training requirements for the company and/or for the individual, based on the results of a training needs assessment. While defining the course or lesson, the

Continued on following page

Frequently Asked Questions

The following information is from the Federal Register/Vol. 66, No. 151/Monday, Aug. 6, 2001, 14 CFR Part 145 Repair Stations Final Rule.

TOPIC:

Repair Station Training Program Recordkeeping

QUESTION: AC 145.163, paragraph 407, Training Documentation states, "The repair station must document the required individual employee training in a format acceptable to the FAA."
What does the administrator consider "in a format acceptable to the FAA?"

ANSWER: The answer is contained in the preamble to the final repair station regulations published Aug. 6, 2001.

A commenter had raised the issue of record keeping during the public comment period.

The FAA responded to the comments with the following answer: "With regard to commenter's concerns regarding the content of the training records, the FAA notes that the language 'in a format acceptable to the FAA' refers to the media by which the records will be submitted, for example electronically. When submitting its training program for approval, a repair station should delineate the items it intends to include in the records."

So, with regards to the Repair Station Training Program, the format the FAA refers to is the media by which the repair station chooses to keep its records. That is, either paper media or electronic media. Which records the repair station keeps and the layout of the records is left to the repair station to decide.

Note: AEA offers these Frequently Asked Questions in order to foster greater understanding of the Federal Aviation Regulations and the rules that govern our industry. AEA strives to make them as accurate as possible at the time they are written, but rules change so you should verify any information you receive from an AEA FAQ before you rely on it. AEA DISCLAIMS ANY WARRANTY FOR THE ACCURACY OF THE INFORMATION PROVIDED. This information is NOT meant to serve as legal advice. If you have particular legal questions, they should be directed to an attorney.

VIEW FROM WASHINGTON

Continued from page 19

following information should be documented, as appropriate:

• Instructor qualifications — define the knowledge or skill level of the in-house instructor or the qualifications of the instructor that provided the information (if known).

This is yet another example of possible conflicts.

The tools provided to the ASI for evaluating the overall RSTP also may create problems.

The following are some of the questions included in HBAW 05-03, which are to be used prior to approval of a Repair Station's Training Program.

Training Program Content Analysis

Interview Employees

(12) Does the training program improve the ability of the employee to perform his/her job?

(13) Are there elements of employee job or specific tasks where they are not trained, but feel that training is needed?

(14) Are training settings appropriate for the material covered? (Classroom training covers required knowledge, application training addresses skills, and on-the-job training strengthens abilities to perform tasks.)

(15) Has training been sequenced properly?

What does the ASI do if the employee uses the interview as a tool to manipulate the system to justify more training? Does the ASI use a safety analysis to evaluate the employee's remarks?

The opportunity for conflict clearly exists in the development and approval of the Repair Station Training Program.

Follow AC 145-10

The best method to minimize conflict is to use AC 145-10. The templates contained in the AC provide a minimal content of what the repair station's training program will contain. It does not present "how" the repair station will implement its program, only that they will comply with the regulation. By regulation, the specific procedures for implementation of the RSTP were not to be FAA-approved.

If the RSTP is not designed in accordance with AC 145-10, then the application must be evaluated against HBAW 05-03, which will require a description of "how" many of these RSTP elements will be implemented. To follow this path will be one of extreme cost, bureaucracy and micromanagement by your local inspector.

Will PIPP be a factor in acquiring FAA approval of your RSTP? Of course. Can it be minimized by utilizing the information tools provided by AEA and the guidance published by the FAA? Absolutely.

Regulatory Update

United States

High-Intensity Radiated Fields (HIRF) Protection for Aircraft Electrical and Electronic Systems

The FAA has issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking proposing to add certification standards to protect aircraft electrical and electronic systems from high-intensity radiated fields (HIRF). The FAA argues this action is necessary due to the vulnerability of aircraft electrical and electronic systems and the increasing use of high-power radio frequency transmitters. The intended effect of this action is to create a safer operating environment for civil aviation by protecting aircraft and their systems from the adverse effects of HIRF.

The electromagnetic HIRF environment results from the transmission of electromagnetic energy from radar, radio, television and other ground-based, shipborne or airborne radio frequency transmitters. This environment has the capability of adversely affecting the operation of aircraft electrical and electronic systems.

Although the HIRF environment did not pose a significant threat to earlier generations of aircraft, in the late 1970s designs for civil aircraft were first proposed that included flight-critical electronic controls, electronic displays and electronic engine controls, such as those used in military aircraft. These systems are more susceptible to the adverse effects of operation in the HIRF environment. Accidents and incidents on civil aircraft with flight-critical electrical and electronic systems also have brought attention to the need to protect these critical systems from high-intensity radiated fields.

The proposed HIRF certification requirements would apply to an applicant for a new type certificate and to an applicant for a change to an existing type certificate when the certification basis for the aircraft includes the proposed requirements. The applicability of the proposed requirements to an applicant for a change to an existing type certificate would be governed by the provisions contained in current AC 21.101.

Comments must be submitted before May 2, 2006. Your comments can be submitted to the DOT Docket website at: http://dms.dot.gov.

You can get an electronic copy of this NPRM on the FAA's regulations and policies webpage at www.faa.gov/regulations_policies/.

Proposed Technical Standard Order (TSO)-C166a, Extended Squitter Automatic Dependent Surveillance — Broadcast (ADS-B) and Traffic Information Service —Broadcast (TIS-B) Equipment

On Dec. 28, 2005, the Federal Aviation Administration published a notice of availability of a proposed Technical Standard Order, TSO-C166a, Extended Squitter Automatic Dependent Surveillance—Broadcast (ADS-B) and Traffic Information Service—Broadcast (TIS-B) Equipment.

This notice announces the availability of the proposed revision to TSO-C166, Extended Squitter ADS-B and TIS-B equipment operating on the radio frequency of 1090 MHz, issued Sept. 20, 2004. The resulting changes to this proposed revised TSO tells individuals seeking a TSO authorization or letter of design approval what minimum performance standards their Extended Squitter ADS-B and TIS-B equipment must meet to be identified with the applicable TSO marking.

A copy of the proposed revised TSO-C166 can be obtained from the FAA website at www.faa.gov/aircraft/draft_docs/.

Copies of all RTCA documents can be purchased from RTCA Inc., 1828 L Street, NW, Suite 815, Washington, DC 20036. Copies also can be obtained through the RTCA website at www.rtca.org/.

For more information, contact Robert H. Duffer, AIR-130, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20591; telephone: (425) 227-2722; fax: (425) 227-1181.

Service difficulty reports

On Dec. 29, 2005, the FAA published in the Federal Register a final rule and withdrawal of delayed final rule regarding service difficulty reports.

The FAA is withdrawing a delayed final rule published Sept. 15, 2000. That final rule would have amended the reporting requirements for certificate holders concerning failures, malfunctions and defects of aircraft, aircraft engines, systems and components. They are withdrawing this rule to allow the FAA time to re-examine the SDR program and consider the comments received since the delayed final rule was published.

In this action, they also adopted several amendments that improve the functioning of the SDR program.

The following is the change to Part 145–Repair Stations:

Sec. 145.221 Service difficulty reports.

9. Amend Sec. 145.221 to revise the heading as set forth above and to revise paragraph (d) introductory text to read as follows: (d) A certificated repair station may submit a service difficulty report for the following.

For more information, contact Emilio Estrada, Flight Standards Service, Aircraft Maintenance

Division (AFS-300), Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20591; telephone: (202) 267-5571; e-mail: emilio.estrada@faa.gov.

Thermal/acoustic insulation installed on transport category airplanes

On Dec. 30, 2005, the FAA published in the Federal Register a final rule affecting thermal/acoustic insulation installed on transport category airplanes. This is a change to the thermal/acoustic insulation final rule as reported during the AEA regional meetings in 2005. This information is critical for the maintenance of transport category aircraft interiors and should be passed along to your director of quality/chief inspector.

This action modifies the requirements for improved flammability characteristics of thermal/acoustic insulation used as replacements on airplanes manufactured before Sept. 2, 2005. The FAA has provided information to the Aircraft Electronics Association, General Aviation Manufacturers Association and other general aviation associations that the rule as originally published would apply to a much broader range of components in currently operating airplanes than was originally intended by the FAA.

In addition, since publishing a final rule on July 31, 2003, the FAA has learned that some requirements for improved flammability covered materials do not have a significant effect on airplane fire safety. Further, in many cases, compliant replacements are not readily available.

This rule change focuses the requirements on replacement materials that have a greater effect on safety and are readily available, and is necessary to avoid grounding of airplanes. It also significantly reduces the burden for compliance on in-service aircraft.

The following is the "new" language for Part 91. There are similar rule changes for Parts 121 and 135.

Sec. 91.613 Materials for compartment interiors.

(b) Thermal/acoustic insulation materials. For transport category airplanes type certificated after January 1, 1958:

(1) For airplanes manufactured before September 2, 2005, when thermal/acoustic insulation is installed in the fuselage as replacements after September 2, 2005, the insulation must meet the flame propagation requirements of Sec. 25.856 of this chapter, effective September 2, 2003, if it is: (i) Of a blanket construction or (ii) Installed around air ducting.

Maintenance recording requirements

The FAA has published a final rule affecting maintenance recording requirements on aircraft operated under 14 CFR Parts 121 and 135.

This final rule amends FAA regulations dealing with recording of maintenance data for large, transport category, propeller-driven aircraft. It changes the requirement for recording engine and propeller "total time in service" for certain aircraft operated under Part 121. These relieving changes are necessary to correct an oversight in the rule when it was originally drafted in 1996. The amendment removes the requirement to record total time in service for engines and propellers installed on certain aircraft certificated for cargo operations. The FAA also is amending sections of Parts 21 and 135 to correct several outdated references to sections previously deleted in Parts 121 and 135.

Sec. 135.419 Approved aircraft inspection program.

(a) Whenever the Administrator finds that the aircraft inspections required or allowed under Part 91 of this chapter are not adequate to meet this part, or upon application by a certificate holder, the Administrator may amend the certificate holder's operations specifications under Sec. 119.51, to require or allow an approved aircraft inspection program for any make and model aircraft of which the certificate holder has the exclusive use of at least one aircraft (as defined in Sec. 135.25(b)).

Antidrug and alcohol misuse prevention programs for personnel engaged in specified aviation activities

The FAA published in the Federal Register on Jan. 10, 2006, a final rule that may have significant impact on repair station contracts.

This final rule amends the FAA regulations governing drug and alcohol testing to clarify that each person who performs a safety-sensitive function for a regulated employer by contract, including by subcontract at any tier, is subject to testing. These amendments are necessary because in the 1990s, the FAA issued conflicting guidance about which contractors were subject to drug and alcohol testing. This action also rescinds all prior guidance on the subject of testing contractors.

Maintenance activity is considered "a safety-sensitive function;" therefore, this "clarification" affects any contracted maintenance at any tier of the sub-contracting activity.

An electronic copy of this rule is available by visiting the FAA's Office of Rulemaking's webpage at www.faa.gov/regulations_policies/.

Advisory Circular 23-26, Synthetic Vision and Pathway Depictions on the Primary Flight Display

The FAA has issued a notice of issuance of advisory circular.

This AC sets forth an acceptable

Continued on page 46

Continued from page 23

means, but not the only means, of showing compliance with Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) Part 23 for two new concepts in small airplanes. The two concepts are: Synthetic Vision and pathway depictions displaying the navigation course on the primary flight display. This AC addresses the two concepts in a head-down display format only. This AC covers airplanes in the normal, utility, acrobatic and commuter categories approved to fly under IFR.

A copy of AC 23-22 is available at www.airweb.faa.gov/ac.

Draft Advisory Circulars, Proposed Technical Standard Orders and other policy documents

The FAA has announced that the Aircraft Certification Service of the FAA maintains the "Aircraft Certification Draft Documents Open for Comment" website at www.faa.gov/aircraft/draft_docs/.

The Aircraft Certification Service will make available on this website draft ACs, proposed TSOs and other policy documents open for comment. The Aircraft Certification Service will no longer publish an individual Federal Register Notice for each draft AC, proposed TSO or other policy documents made available for public comment. There is no requirement to publish these documents or notices in the Federal Register. Comments on the documents published on the website must be received on or before the due date specified on the website for each document.

The FAA will publish in the Federal Register a recurring generic Notice of Availability and Request for Comments announcement reminding the public to check the "Aircraft Certification Draft Documents Open for Comments" website at www.faa.gov/aircraft/draft_docs/.

Policy Statement Number PS-ACE100-2005-50001

This notice announces an FAA-proposed policy on applying AC 20-152 to complex airborne electronic hardware (CEH) installed in Part 23 aircraft or in airships. The specific issues addressed concern selecting and applying hardware design assurance levels to CEH. This notice advises the public, especially manufacturers of normal, utility and acrobatic category airplanes, and commuter category airplanes and their suppliers, that the FAA intends to adopt this policy.

Although the comment period ended Feb. 27, 2006, comments can be submitted after the closing date but should be submitted as early as possible.

Send all comments on the proposed policy statement to Robin Sova, Federal Aviation Administration, Small Airplane Directorate, Regulations & Policy, ACE-114, 901 Locust St., Room 301, Kansas City, MO 64106; telephone: (816) 329-4133; fax: 816-329-4090; e-mail: robin.sova@faa.gov.

Proposed Technical Standard Order C176, Aircraft Image Recorder Systems

The FAA has published a notice of availability and request for comments on a proposed TSO C176, Aircraft Image Recorder Systems. This proposed TSO tells individuals seeking a TSO authorization or letter of design approval what minimum performance standards their aircraft image recorder system must meet.

Although the comment period ended Feb. 27, 2006, comments can be submitted after the closing date but should be submitted as early as possible.

A copy of the proposed TSO is available from the website at www.faa.gov/aircraft/draft_docs/. See section titled "FOR."

For more information or to send comments on the proposed technical standard order, contact Veronica Gardner, Federal Aviation Administration, Aircraft Certification Service, Aircraft Engineering Division, Avionic Systems Branch, AIR-130, 470 L'Enfant Plaza, SW, Suite 4102, Washington, DC 20024; e-mail: veronica.gardner@faa.gov.

Advisory Circular 25.856-2, Installation of Thermal/Acoustic Insulation for Burnthrough Protection

This FAA notice announces the issuance of AC 25.856-2, Installation of Thermal/Acoustic Insulation for Burnthrough Protection. The AC provides information and guidance regarding an acceptable means, but not the only means, of compliance with the portions of the airworthiness standards for transport category airplanes that deal with the installation of thermal/acoustic insulation.

A copy of AC 25.856-2 can be downloaded from www.airweb.faa.gov/rgl.

For more information, contact Kenna Sinclair, FAA Standardization Branch, ANM-113, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Ave., SW, Renton, Wa. 98055-4056; telephone: (425) 227-1556; e-mail: kenna.sinclair@faa.gov.

Australia

Advisory Circular 91.U-02 — Required Navigation Performance 10 Operational Authorization

Civil Aviation Advisory Publication RNP-10 — Required Navigation Performance 10 operational approval has been cancelled and replaced by AC 91.U-02 — Required Navigation Performance 10 Operational Authorization (www.casa.gov.au/rules/1998casr/091/091Uc02.pdf).

This AC provides Australian aircraft owners and operators with comprehensive information on a means of gaining

an authorization to undertake "RNP 10 Operations," i.e. obtain an RNP 10 Operational Authorization.

Canada

Transport Canada Recreational Aircraft Review Committee

At a CARAC Part V maintenance and manufacturing meeting in January, TCCA proposed a Recreational Aircraft Review Committee be formed to review operational and certification requirements for recreational aircraft.

Barry Aylward has been accepted as AEA Canada's representative on this committee. AEA's focus will be with respect to avionics equipage and maintenance requirements driven by airspace operational requirements. This is planned to be a Fast-Trak committee with a life expectancy of less than two years.

Transport Canada to revise altimeter and transponder calibration requirements

At the January CARAC meeting, NPA 2005-093 (CAR 625 App. C) was accepted with consensus and will expand the requirement for 24-month altimeter calibration from "IFR and VFR in Class B Airspace" to "IFR and VFR in Class B and C, or Class C and D Airspace that is designated as Transponder Airspace." This applies to all aircraft in the airspace, regardless of certification basis or category.

Also, NPA 2005-094 (CAR 571 App F) was accepted and will formalize the requirement for a full integration transponder/encoder system test every 24 months. Of specific interest are the notes at the end of the NPA, which state:

2) Whenever an error is reported in the Altitude Reporting Data, or when maintenance is performed on the system that could introduce correlation errors, the integration test must be performed.

3) Subject to the above note, when the maintenance performed consists of the installation of a Line-Replaceable Unit (LRU) and the installed LRU is a known airworthy part, the integration test need not be accomplished as long as an operational test is carried out prior to flight.

The proposed regulations and related guidance material will formally acknowledge that a correlation error is the calibration relationship between the pilot's altimeter and the Mode C encoder, and that replacement of a transponder cannot introduce a correlation error. It could cause a complete failure or gross and variable errors in a scenario in which the interface is compromised, but never a correlation error.

Transport Canada will accept UK and EASA advisory documents for modification approvals.

NPA 2005-095 (Ref 571.06) was accepted at the January CARAC meeting. This NPA is intended to allow advisory materials from the UK and EASA similar to that of FAA AC43.13 to be used as "specified data" references in documenting and certifying modifications.

Transport Canada Delegates Conference

The 2006 Transport Canada Delegates Conference will take place from June 27-29 in Ottawa. TCCA delegates have received notice of this conference; however, other individuals from the aircraft certification/modification industry persons can attend. A number of sessions will deal with modification issues, such as Major/Minor mod classification; ICAs; certification of integrated systems in GA aircraft; aircraft interiors compliance; and updates on policy affecting modification certification, including the outstanding policy items from the 2004 TCCA/AEA Avionics Modification Workshop.

For more information about the conference, visit www.tc.gc.ca/CivilAviaton/certification/delegations/2006DelegatesConference.htm.

Europe

JAA

A new training course program provided by JAA is available on the JAA website at www.jaa.nl.

TGL 40—Operational considerations for the use of initial services for air-ground data-link communications in European airspace: A new temporary guidance leaflet was issued. It is complementary to and should be used in conjunction with EASA AMC 20-11. The operational guidance material was issued in response to the Eurocontrol Link 200+ initiative.

JAA welcomed Bosnia and Herzegovina as a new candidate member in December 2005. With the addition of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the JAA now has 40 members of which 33 are full members and seven are candidate members. ❑