

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 87

Program: 2.4 Air Transport
Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority
Topic: Foreign Airlines Operating into Australia
Proof Hansard Page: 138 (27 May 2015)

Senator Heffernan, Bill asked:

...

Mr Skidmore: I am not aware of the issues in relation to Japan. I will have to find more details. We have written to the Thai DCA to get more information.

CHAIR: It is not just Japan; it is China and a series of places have banned them.

Senator WILLIAMS: Why have they banned them?

CHAIR: Because they do not think they are maintaining their aircraft. Japan is not a backward country and I would have thought that if the European Union air safety mob have concerns, then all I am doing here tonight is alerting you to the fact that China, South Korea—and these people are on the game—have banned them because of safety issues.

Mr Skidmore: We take the information that is available to us to make an assessment and we do a risk based assessment in regards to the increase of surveillance, should we need to do that. In this case they have a foreign aircraft air operator's certificate.

Senator WILLIAMS: Do they have to forward their service records to you if you ask them, from Thai Airways?

Mr Skidmore: I would have to confirm.

CHAIR: I would have thought, Mr Skidmore, that may be—I am a broken down farmer but the first thing I would do is get on to China, Japan and Korea and say, 'What did you find?' I run into Thai Airways in the Boulevard Hotel in Sydney and I have to say they are all very polite, they look great and all the rest of it but if the plane is not maintained it does not matter how straight the tie is on the captain.

Mr Skidmore: I know we have written to the Thai DCA. I can find out further details in regard to who might have provided that or who we have asked for information from. I have not specifically written to Japan or any other country.

Dr Aleck: We actually visited Japan. Our international relations area, with a view to these issues, followed up on some of those events and what the authorities were doing. We met with the Japanese authorities. They were quite impressed with the processes that we use and indicated that they in fact did not. I do not want to speculate but I suspect that the banning is something that is done in the absence of information, as a precautionary measure.

CHAIR: I am raising it because it is obviously something about which you would say, 'Huh? What is that all about?' You can come back to me on that with some answers.

...

Answer:

On 20 March 2015 the International Civil Aviation Organization published a (single) significant safety concern against the Thailand Department of Civil Aviation (Thai DCA) relating to the consistency and structured approach to issuing of Air Operator Certificates (AOC) and authorisations for the transport of Dangerous Goods (DGs).

In response to this, CASA conducted a total of six ramp inspections on Thai Airways International (TAI) in Brisbane, Sydney, Melbourne and Perth. There have been no safety related findings from any of the inspections.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Additionally, in April 2015 CASA wrote to the Thai DCA and TAI requesting information. CASA received confirmation from DCA that the AOC issued to TAI, and special authorisations and approvals had not been suspended.

DCA provided CASA with the AOC Checklist, DG Report on TAI, en-route surveillance report, and line inspection report. TAI provided CASA with a range of documents including audits conducted by the DCA in 2014, ramp inspections conducted by foreign aviation safety authorities, a TAI internal audit report, and a copy of the 2014 International Air Transport Association IATA Operational Safety Audit report. CASA has reviewed the information provided and has not identified any areas of concern.

As a result of the information obtained, CASA has not placed any additional safety-related restrictions on TAI flights however, as a condition of its Foreign Aircraft Air Operators Certificate, TAI must apply to CASA for expansion, extension or other adjustments to operations, with any applications assessed on their merits.

Other regulators, including the European Aviation Safety Agency, Japan, Korea and China have not 'banned' flights from Thailand. CASA raised this matter with the Japan Civil Aviation Bureau (JCAB) in April 2015 and JCAB advised they have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Thai DCA to allow the current services to continue. It should be noted there is a significant difference in the risk profile for these regulators compared to Australia. Australia has only one established airline (TAI) currently operating here while countries such as Korea, China and Japan are served by a number of different, newly formed low cost carriers.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 88

Program: 2.4 Air Transport

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Key Performance Indicators and Number of Accidents

Proof Hansard Page: 141 (27 May 2015)

Senator Bullock, Joe asked:

Senator BULLOCK: I understand that you have adopted some KPIs with a view to ensuring that there is a reduction in the number of accidents per hours flown by each industry sector from 2015-16. Is that right?

Mr Skidmore: I am currently reviewing all our KPIs to see how appropriate they are in regards to meeting the requirements of CASA going forward into the future. In regards to the actual KPIs on accident statistics, obviously we are looking for a reduction in any accident statistics.

Senator BULLOCK: You have not adopted that as a KPI?

Mr Skidmore: As indicated in the PBS, yes.

Senator BULLOCK: That is from 2015-16 on. If it was applying now, would you have met it? Is 2014-15 a year where the accidents per hours flown by the industry sector have gone down?

Mr Skidmore: I do not have that information directly to hand, but we can certainly gather that information and check on that.

Senator BULLOCK: Take that on notice, if you would not mind. Cockpit regulations—what are the rules currently around who is in the cockpit of a commercial aircraft in Australia?

Mr Skidmore: The regulations surrounding the type of people or the number of people?

Senator BULLOCK: Number and type.

Mr Skidmore: If you are alluding to the recent discussion that we have had with the operators in relation to the incident in Europe, that is being directed to the operators as an amendment to their operations manual—to incorporate an operating procedure such that they have two personnel inside the cockpit. It is not a regulation as such.

...

Answer:

Data required for the 2014-15 year is not yet available from the Australian Transport Safety Bureau or the Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics, so CASA is unable to determine the performance against the KPIs at this stage. Once it becomes available, information regarding performance against the KPIs can be provided to the Committee.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 89

Program: 2.4 Air Transport

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Consultation Process Regarding MCC Training Course

Proof Hansard Page: 143-144 (27 May 2015)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

Senator STERLE: I am going to move on to a completely different line of questioning and it is to do with an operator in Perth who has raised these questions with me and I think they are valid. There are a number of questions. I am going to try and get through as quickly as we can so we can move to Senator Xenophon but without cutting short. My questions will be directed to the multicrew cooperation training course. Can you outline the consultation process followed ahead of introduction of the mandatory MCC training course?

Mr Skidmore: I will ask my executive manager of standards to cover that.

Senator STERLE: Sure.

Mr Boyd: Your question is about—

Senator STERLE: Consultation.

Mr Boyd: The particular part you are referring to was part of the licensing regulations.

Senator STERLE: I am aware of this. Let's get straight to the point, Mr Boyd. What was your consultation?

Mr Boyd: They went through the normal consultation process.

Senator STERLE: Tell me what the normal consultation process is. Who did you meet with? Who did you talk to? When? How many times?

Mr Boyd: Look, in terms of that—

Senator STERLE: No, not look. I have asked you some questions, please.

Mr Boyd: I will have to take it on notice for that particular—

Senator STERLE: You do not know? You cannot tell me. You have just been called up because you are the man and you cannot tell me what the consultation process for—

Mr Skidmore: We have a process that we go through—

Senator STERLE: I will tell you what we will do.

Mr Skidmore: We can outline the process for you.

...

Answer:

The responses to these questions were provided during the following day's hearing on Thursday 28 May 2015.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 90

Program: 2.4 Air Transport

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: REPCON On Communications

Proof Hansard Page: 145-146 (27 May 2015)

Senator Xenophon, Nick asked:

Senator XENOPHON: I want to go to question on notice 174 of the last estimates, which relates to an incident that my aviation contacts have expressed a great degree of concern about—both pilots and those in air traffic control. This is the REPCON in relation to loss of separation or separation assurance. This was in terms of Melbourne Airport and Essendon Airport where there ought to have been some visual tracking. Are you familiar with that, Mr Farquharson?

Mr Farquharson: I am aware of the REPCON.

Senator XENOPHON: You are aware of it. You may want to take this on notice. In CASA's answer to question on notice 174 it said, 'CASA relied upon the advice of Airservices.' Given that the ATSB apparently used WebTrack—you are familiar with WebTrack, Mr Farquharson?

Mr Farquharson: Vaguely.

Senator XENOPHON: Yes, it is something where a 12-year-old goes on online and it tells you where the aircraft are, literally. There are all these caveats on it saying, 'It's not to be used for safety or other purposes.' There are all sorts of disclaimers on the WebTrack site. It says there is a liability and a disclaimer. It says WebTrack:

... should not be relied on for personal, medical, legal or financial decisions. ...

It adds that there are no assurances as to accuracy. That is what the ATSB relied on—WebTrack. I am going to ask them about that tomorrow. Given that the ATSB used WebTrack to investigate the REPCON, and Airservices continued LAHSO operations whilst being prohibited by CASA, which dismissed their safety case, is it not pertinent that advice provided by Airservices regarding safety management be re-examined? These are serious issues of safety. We are talking about aircraft that could potentially intersect at Melbourne and Essendon airports because of the runways. They are supposed to have visual contact. The question on notice asked:

At the time CASA reviewed Airservices Cirrus report—

That was the initial report—

was it aware that approximately 3 hours had elapsed between the time the reported breakdown of communication occurred and the time it was detected and corrected?

You were not aware of that—not critical, because that was the information that was provided to you. You subsequently became aware of the three hour period when the REPCON was escalated, because somebody was so concerned at what had occurred. You relied on advice from Airservices, and Airservices in turn got some cover from the ATSB. I have pilots and those in air traffic control who are worried sick about what occurred. There appears to have been some systemic failures. Will you be looking beyond what you looked at in the answer to question on notice 174?

Mr Farquharson: This is not an area that I am particularly familiar with. Mr Cromarty would probably be able to help.

...

Senator XENOPHON: But it also relates to Melbourne Airport. That was what the REPCON was about. It was about aircraft taking off at Melbourne Airport on one particular runway and at Essendon another runway. Is that correct? How can you just think it is about Essendon, when we are talking about aircraft that are—

Mr Cromarty: It was about a breakdown in communication.

Senator XENOPHON: Between Melbourne and Essendon?

Mr Cromarty: Yes.

Senator XENOPHON: Right. It is a three-hour period. Presumably in that three-hour period there would have been aircraft taking off at Melbourne Airport. Is that correct?

Mr Skidmore: Can I take that one, and we will get a more of a forensic investigation into—

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Senator XENOPHON: How can your colleagues say that it is just about Essendon. That is completely disingenuous.

Mr Cromarty: I did not say that.

Senator XENOPHON: You said it is about Essendon. It also involves Melbourne, obviously.

Mr Cromarty: The REPCON was about communications between Essendon and Melbourne.

Senator XENOPHON: Right. And aircraft are taking off at the same time—

Mr Skidmore: I do not know the full details of it, but they might be taking off in different directions.

Senator XENOPHON: No, they were not. They were taking off where they could have intersected about five or eight kilometres out.

Mr Skidmore: I am prepared to take it on and have a look at it for you.

Senator XENOPHON: Will I know by tomorrow morning?

Mr Skidmore: Regarding?

Senator XENOPHON: These matters. Or will it take longer than that?

Mr Skidmore: I will do my best to find out for you.

Senator XENOPHON: I would be very grateful...

Answer:

Yes, CASA will be looking beyond what was looked at in the response to Question on Notice 174 from the Additional Estimates 2014-15, regarding Cirrus Report #ATS-0125061.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 91

Program: 2.4 Air Transport

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: REPCON and CASA actions

Proof Hansard Page: 4-6 (28 May 2015)

Senator Xenophon, Nick asked:

...

My understanding is that it has been seven months since the initial complaint was made and Airservices has still not provided any explanation for its behaviour to this committee. I live in hope that it will do so this morning. Irrespective of why Airservices behaved in the way it did, by its own admission it compromises the safety of the public, the aircraft crews and the national airspace system for two years. I am advised that due to the density of traffic in the Melbourne area and the time lapse that thousands of people likely were exposed to this unmitigated risk. What explanation, if any, has Airservices provided to CASA regarding its conduct? I am happy for you to take it on notice. These are issues where I am very happy to get a considered response from you.

Mr Skidmore: Thank you. In regards to the information provided, I do not have that immediately to hand. My Executive Manager, Airspace and Aerodrome Regulation, Mr Peter Cromarty, may have that. In regards to the activities undertaken by Airservices, we do audits and surveil the activities of Airservices. We look forward to the information from them to ensure the safety of our airspace. I will pass to my executive manager to see if he has any further information regarding the LAHSO activities; otherwise we will take it on notice and provide you with a separate brief.

Senator XENOPHON: Sure. I am happy to do that. These are genuine concerns, I believe, that have been put to me. If I could just continue on, because of time constraints. Has CASA in the past cancelled, suspended or varied air operator certificates for operators who have ignored CASA requirements?

Mr Skidmore: Are you talking about air operator certificates specifically in regards to Australian operations?

Senator XENOPHON: Yes.

Mr Skidmore: I would have to ask my executive manager of operations.

Senator XENOPHON: Sure. I am happy for that to be taken on notice. I just want to put these on the record and get a considered response. As I indicated to you before estimates, I will seek to have a meeting with you about this because of the concerns that have been expressed to me. Has CASA in the past cancelled, suspended or varied the licences of pilots who have ignored CASA requirements? I think that the answer is yes, but if you could take that on notice about the extent of that.

Mr Skidmore: Certainly.

Senator XENOPHON: Is or has CASA taken action to cancel, suspend or otherwise vary Airservices's operating certificates as a result of Airservices ignoring CASA's requirements regarding the conduct of land and hold short operations? The question that has been put to me by air traffic controllers and pilots is: if not, why not? Perhaps you could take that on notice.

Mr Skidmore: Certainly.

Senator XENOPHON: Is or has CASA taken action to cancel, suspend or otherwise vary licences of air traffic controllers and their managers who new or reasonably ought to have known that conducting land and hold short operations beyond the published wind limits have been rejected by CASA? No. If not, why not? Again, you can take that on notice. If CASA has taken no action, what message should other CASA approved operators, CASA licence holders, our aviation industry and the broader international community understand about the robustness of the regulatory environment? What I have been told this morning is that if these matters are not investigated properly, why would we bother to go to the regulator? That is not a criticism of CASA; it is just that the way that the ATSB and Airservices dealt with it, they feel like giving up. It really worries me if there is that culture. My other question to you is, given the combination of the rejection of its land and hold short safety case by its regulator was not seen by Airservices Melbourne as an impediment to its conduct and that the Airservices Cirrus report 0125061 in late 2003 of a breakdown in coordination at the very busy Melbourne airspace—and I think, Mr Cromarty we discussed that briefly last night—omitted to mention that the breakdown was not detected for fully three hours. The first that CASA and the ATSB knew about the extraordinarily long time in the breakdown

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016

Infrastructure and Regional Development

of the coordination was via the industry confidential safety reporting system, the REPCON AR201300090. That also suggests that losses of separation, separation assurance, may have occurred as a consequence of that breakdown of coordination between Essendon tower, Melbourne terminal area control and Melbourne tower. What has been put to me is that the failure to report an unknown loss of separation is an offence. Is that the case?

Mr Skidmore: They have recorded that though, Senator, in regards to the REPCON. I applaud Airservices for having a reporting system that actually identified that.

Senator XENOPHON: My understanding was this: there was an initial report—the Cirrus. It was not investigated, there was a frustration and there was a confidential report by an air traffic controller, or someone in the sector, who said that this is quite serious, and it was escalated at that level. Could you at least look at the sequence of events as to what occurred?

Mr Skidmore: Certainly. We can look at the sequence of events and provide you with the information.

Senator XENOPHON: CASA was reliant on Airservices assurances that nothing untoward had occurred. Can I ask that you look at these matters, because of the concerns that have been expressed to me directly by people who are worried about raising this publicly for their careers. They say that that three hour period was very problematic. ATSB relied on WebTrak, which is something that a journalist told me this morning they rely on to track the PM's plane. It is not exactly a forensic tool. It is not the same as a radar tape. Would CASA be looking at the radar tapes as to whether the information provided to CASA from Airservices was robust and adequate enough? If you could take that on notice as well.

Mr Skidmore: Certainly.

Answer:

CASA was satisfied with the information provided by Airservices at the time in relation to the REPCON on the incident, and as no Loss of Separation (LOS) or Loss of Separation Assurance (LOSA) was reported by Airservices or through the Cirris database, CASA did not require further explanation.

CASA's Annual Reports provide the number of cancelled, suspended or varied pilots and air operator certificates.

CASA has not cancelled, suspended or varied Airservices' operating certificate in relation to CASA requirements regarding the conduct of Land and Hold Short Operations (LAHSO). CASA's oversight of LAHSO has revealed no breaches of the Part 172 regulations.

CASA has not cancelled, suspended or varied the licences of air traffic controllers and their managers regarding land and hold short operations beyond the published wind limits. While there was some ambiguity in the procedures relating to runway selection and wind criteria, this has now been rectified by Airservices.

It is not an offence to fail to report an unknown loss of separation.

CASA would be unable to review the radar tapes due to the time elapsed since the incident.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 92

Program: 2.4 Air Transport

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: MCC Course Providers

Proof Hansard Page: 7 (28 May 2015)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

...

Senator STERLE: Can you list the providers of these courses and outline how a company becomes accredited to deliver these courses? If that is a long, lengthy question, I am happy to take the long lengthy ones on notice. But as I say, I would much rather have an answer so it does not create all this extra paper trail for you guys.

Mr Skidmore: I think the process would best be addressed by taking that one on notice and providing you with that detail.

Senator STERLE: That is fine. So that is on notice...

Answer:

Pilots completing human factors and crew resource management training (HF/CRM training) that is conducted by operators under their training and checking system are taken to have completed Multi Crew Cooperation (MCC) training. HF/CRM training is part of pilot induction training for air transport operations. Recognition can be given to operators who conduct equivalent training.

The current course provider conducting MCC training is CAE Oxford Aviation Academy, Melbourne.

CASA is aware of six other operators considering seeking approval from CASA to conduct MCC training. These operators are based in Brisbane, Adelaide and Melbourne.

The process for becoming accredited to deliver MCC courses involves the following steps:

- If the provider has an approved HF/CRM training course (mentioned above), they can continue conducting those courses during the transition period.
- If the provider is already approved to conduct pilot training for multi-pilot operations (such as an aircraft type rating for a multi-crew aircraft – typically a heavy aircraft operator), they need to submit their training course for approval. This would be managed as a variation to their training approvals.
- If the provider is not approved to conduct pilot training, they need to submit an application for a Civil Aviation Safety Regulations Part 142 certificate. The application needs to address the organisational processes for conducting training, managing their instructors and the training resources they plan to use, as well as their reporting and record keeping systems in addition to their proposed MCC course.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 93

Program: 2.4 Air Transport

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Part 61 Post-Implementation Review

Proof Hansard Page: 8 (28 May 2015)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

...

Senator STERLE: Good. Can you tell us who will be conducting the review?

Mr Crosthwaite: The post-implementation review is organised by CASA. We consult with the same group—the standards consultative committee and the FCL subcommittee—on the issues that are raised for review. We go through, step by step, each of those issues, consult them and look at solutions to either change the regulations or introduce an instrument to deal with a particular problem that has arisen.

Senator STERLE: What we have found out is that since the initial working group was put together, the RAAA joined in November. Are there any other groups that have now joined as part of the working group?

Mr Crosthwaite: The response from industry on post-implementation has been very strong and very healthy. We have had particular engagement with the helicopter sector, which is pleasing. So the RAAA is more involved. There is the AHIA and other helicopter people and we have been in contact with mustering people as well. We have the Aero club movement. So there is quite a good number of extra people now involved in that post implementation review process.

Senator STERLE: Tremendous. If you can take that on notice and let us know who actually is on the working group. We do not have to go through them all if there are any additional ones. Thank you...

Answer:

The Flight Crew Licensing subcommittee of the Standards Consultative Committee (FCL subcommittee) includes representatives from the following organisations:

- Aerial Agriculture Association of Australia (AAAA);
- Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association of Australia (AOPA);
- Airways Aviation (pilot training and operator)**;
- Australian Association of Flight Instructors (AAFI);
- Australian Defence Force;
- Australian Federation of Air Pilots (AFAP);
- Australian Helicopter Industry Association (AHIA)**;
- Australian and International Pilots Association (AIPA);
- Australian Wings Academy (pilot training)**;
- Becker Helicopters (pilot training)**;
- Cobham Aviation Services (operator);
- Craig Crumblin (representing aerial mustering operators)**;
- Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development;
- Flying Training Adelaide (FTA) (pilot training);
- Honourable Company of Air Pilots Australia Inc.;
- International Aviation Training and Education Organisation (pilot training)**;
- Kestrel Aviation**;
- North Queensland Aero Club (pilot training and operator)**;
- Qantas Airways;
- Qantas Link;
- Queensland Government Air Wing (operator);

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016

Infrastructure and Regional Development

- Recreational Aviation Australia (self-administration organisation);
- Regional Aviation Association Australia (RAAA);
- Royal Federation of Aero Clubs of Australia (RFAC);
- Royal Flying Doctor Service (operator);
- Sports Aircraft Association of Australia; and
- Virgin Australia.

*Those marked with ** have joined the subcommittee since the new regulations commenced.*

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 94

Program: 2.4 Air Transport
Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority
Topic: Cost of MCC Training Course
Proof Hansard Page: 10 (28 May 2015)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

...

Senator STERLE: I understand that. Do you have any idea of the basis of the cost? I remember when we got a few dollars from the Howard government, which was greatly appreciated in the trucking industry. The whole idea of delivering money for training was spot on—that is, to recognise the skills of our truckies and forkies. The only problem is when you lease it outside; it is a licence to print money for some unscrupulous training providers. I just want to make sure that it is all kosher—I am proud to use the word 'kosher'—and that there is not a big heap of fleecing going on. You have no idea of the cost structure?

Mr Skidmore: I am certainly happy to have a look and see if we can get that information for you.

Senator STERLE: Thank you...

...

Senator STERLE: What I'm leading to there, so that I am not sneaking up on you, is whether there is, for example, a cost for simulator hire?

Mr Crosthwaite: My understanding is that the course that we have been talking about includes simulator training.

Senator STERLE: That is in the nine and a half thousand dollars?

Mr Crosthwaite: That is my understanding.

Mr Skidmore: When we are saying nine and a half thousand dollars, we would have to get a specific number for you to ensure that we do understand—

Senator STERLE: That is fine. But at this stage we think that the cost of hiring the simulator is in that. You can come back to me; that is okay...

Answer:

A Multi Crew Cooperation (MCC) course includes theory and practical training. A typical course would include approximately 20 hours of classroom lessons, which could be managed using computer-based training lessons, and 20 to 30 hours of practical training in a flight simulation training device (FSTD). Prior learning, experience and qualifications can be recognised for the purposes of MCC training. While the training provider sets the costs of the course (including the coverage of simulator hire fees if applicable), CASA understands the cost structure of a course would depend on the sophistication of the FSTD and how the training provider chooses to manage the training. Normally, two trainees would participate as a training team for the practical training so the hourly rate for the FSTD would be shared.

Simulator instructors need to be qualified instructors who hold a multi-crew cooperation training endorsement. In some schools, these instructors will be experienced airline pilots. An MCC course can also be incorporated into an airline's induction training programme and that is how many pilots would complete their MCC training.

Simulator hire costs vary according to the complexity of the device. A minimum level MCC device hourly price is understood to be in the vicinity of \$500 per hour depending on the cost structure of the operator.

Some training providers are choosing to use high-end airline simulators which typically rent for more than \$1000 per hour, depending on the pricing arrangement.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 95

Program: 2.4 Air Transport

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Pilot Operating Standards and MCC Training

Proof Hansard Page: 11 (28 May 2015)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

...

Senator STERLE: Were there any instances involving pilots in this situation not operating at the required standard? Was there an issue?

Mr Skidmore: I do not have that information available.

Senator STERLE: All right. Have a think and come back on that. Gentlemen, thank you very much for your concise answers.

Answer:

Data input errors is one of the nine broad safety concerns identified by the ATSB. The ATSB cites the Emirates A340 incident at Melbourne Airport in 2009 as an example.

The skill of optimising crew cooperation is accepted worldwide as a critical piloting competency. Actions such as systematic cross-checking of settings, confirming instructions and procedures, and cooperatively sharing workloads and processes enhance crew safety-performance.

Prior to 1 September 2014, Multi-Crew Cooperation (MCC) training was achieved in the air transport sector through mandatory human factors and crew resource management training. Part 61 licensing regulations extend MCC training to all multi-crew operations. The application of MCC competencies is consistent with the transition to a competency-based training and qualification framework.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 96

Program: 2.4 Air Transport

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Regulation of RPAS

Proof Hansard Page: 12 (28 May 2015)

Senator Gallacher, Alex asked:

Senator GALLACHER: I will put this question on notice, but I want it in the public arena. There is an increasing area of safety concerns in respect to unmanned platforms—recreational, commercial and military. I would like you to forward to this committee your policy document in respect to that. That is to give us an idea about what you are doing about these recreational UAVs, commercial operations of UAVs and the military operations of UAVs. What is CASA's policy thinking in respect to this emerging area of increasing probable safety concern?

Mr Skidmore: If I understand the question correctly, I can provide you with the information in regards to what we are doing. Looking at regulation 101 and potentially looking at a new regulation, 102, depending on how we want to—

Senator GALLACHER: I would just like to see what your organisation has in terms of policy or regulation in respect to this area.

Mr Skidmore: Certainly.

Answer:

CASA's regulations on unmanned aerial vehicles (or RPAS) are located in Part 101 of the Civil Aviation Safety Regulations (CASR).

The regulations and associated advisory circulars can be viewed at http://www.casa.gov.au/newrules/topic.asp?session=1393041714&pc=PC_91070&topic=uas.

CASA, in consultation with the public and industry, is currently reviewing the regulations.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 97

Program: 2.4 Air Transport
Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority
Topic: Flying Hours for Pilot Licence
Proof Hansard Page: 12 (28 May 2015)

Senator Heffernan, Bill asked:

CHAIR: I have a lot of stuff on Bankstown. There are still people out there who think there is some seriously dodgy business going on—the amount of earth that has been moved, the effect of a possible flood. They have already had a flood there, but not a one in 100 year event, which is supposed to be the point where houses are seriously flooded because of the build-up of the floodplain. There are a range of other issues. Some of the tenants think they have been duded with their leases because there was an agreement with the Commonwealth before it was sold off. I think the best way to do deal with this is that this committee needs a private briefing, along with Senator Fawcett, because I am getting sick of hearing from one side and then getting bureaucratic push back from the other. We need to sort out what is going on out there. Does Bankstown airport still do pilot training? Can you start with no hours? Is it 30 hours to get a restricted licence still? How many hours is it to get a restricted licence?

Mr Skidmore: I am not sure of the exact numbers.

CHAIR: It will take three or four hours to sort this shit out.

Mr Skidmore: I would have to confirm whether there is a flying training school at Bankstown still.

Mr Crosthwaite: The hours requirement for private pilots is the same as it was in the previous regulations, which is 40 hours.

CHAIR: It was 30 when I got mine. What is the minimum for unrestricted?

Mr Crosthwaite: Unrestricted is 40 hours.

CHAIR: No, I am talking about restricted.

Mr Crosthwaite: The new recreational pilot licence—

CHAIR: No, I am talking about before you qualify to go solo and do your cross country. How many hours is that?

Mr Crosthwaite: I will double check, but it is in the order of 20 hours.

Mr Skidmore: We will confirm the number for you.

CHAIR: Can you do that at Bankstown Airport?

Mr Crosthwaite: Yes.

...

Answer:

Pilots are able to undertake pilot licence training at Bankstown airport including from initial stages through to advanced pilot training. There are 11 (8 aeroplane and 3 helicopter) flying training schools located at Bankstown airport.

The minimum number of hours to obtain a Recreational Pilot Licence (RPL) is 25 hours. This is the equivalent of the Restricted Private Pilot Licence that was available prior to 1988.

Pilots are able to conduct training for the RPL at Bankstown.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 98

Program: 2.4 Air Transport

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Cockpit Safety Regulations

Proof Hansard Page: Written

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

1. What regulations exist to regulate who is in the cockpit of commercial aircraft in Australia?
2. Have there been any attempts to prescribe this in regulations in the past ten years?
3. If yes, what was proposed, when, and what was the outcome?

Answer:

1. From a safety regulatory perspective, Regulation 227 of the Civil Aviation Regulations 1988 covers the Admission to the crew compartment. On 30 March 2015 Australia's major international, domestic and regional airlines committed to update their own standard operating procedures to require two members of the operating crew or authorised persons on the flight deck at all times.
2. N/A.
3. N/A.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 99

Program: 2.4 Air Transport

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Investigations in relation to Scribe Line Inspections

Proof Hansard Page: Written

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

In relation to the two investigations carried out at ST Aerospace in relation to Scribe Line inspections, can CASA provide the details to the committee of the purpose of the investigations, the findings and proposed actions resulting from those investigations (including any evidence that CASA relied on to make their findings)?

Answer:

The purpose of the investigations was to determine if ST Aerospace had used an unserviceable laser device for scribe line inspections.

CASA was satisfied with the information provided by ST Aerospace so there were no findings or proposed actions required.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates 2015 - 2016

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Question no.: 100

Program: 2.4 Air Transport

Division/Agency: Civil Aviation Safety Authority

Topic: Melbourne Aeronautical Study and Flight Training

Proof Hansard Page: Written

Senator Rice, Janet asked:

These questions relate to the *Aeronautical study of Melbourne 2011*, recommendation no. 1:

1. Did the flying schools in the Melbourne area meet with CASA to discuss options for increasing access to the Melbourne CTA and CTR by student pilots and VFR aircraft?
2. Was an outcome of this meeting to change or rearrange the airspace classification to increase access to Melbourne CTA and CTR to VFR aircraft?
3. If change or reclassification occurred, what evidence and cost/benefit was this change to achieve? And what date did the change become effective?
4. Was advice sought for any proposed or actual change or reclassification from the Minister for Environment Protection, Heritage and the Arts?
5. What consultation was held with the broader community and residents' groups that were likely to be impacted at that time?
How were concerns accommodated?
If no discussions were held, why not?

Answer:

1. No.
2. N/A.
3. N/A.
4. No.
5. No request to change airspace in the vicinity of Melbourne was received by CASA, therefore no consultation was held with the broader community and residents' groups.