

AUTHORITY PRESCRIPTION OF AIRWORTHINESS STANDARDS PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

INTRODUCTION

1. The Defence Aviation Safety Authority (herein, ‘Authority’) has a delegated responsibility to implement a Defence Aviation Safety Program, which includes ‘establishing and certifying the initial safety requirements and standards for Defence Aviation organisations and aviation platforms/systems’¹. Inherent in this responsibility is the requirement to prescribe, revise and interpret the minimum requirements for the design of Defence aircraft, engines, propellers, and other aircraft-related equipment.

2. In the previous TAREG system, the then TAR (now the Authority) adopted the language of ‘prescribe, revise and interpret design standards’ to describe the activities undertaken by ‘Airworthiness Standards Representatives’ (ASR). ASR were essentially subject matter experts who had been approved by the TAR to prescribe, revise and interpret design standards for their specific design discipline. For those disciplines for which no ASR had been assigned, the TAR retained this function.

3. Under the Defence Aviation Safety Regulations (DASRs), a similar approach has been adopted in establishing ‘Delegates of the Safety Authority’ (DoSAs) for standards. DoSAs fulfil the function of prescribe², revise and interpret design standards for certain niche disciplines where the Authority does not hold in-house expertise. Responsibility for the remainder of disciplines has been retained by the Authority.

4. While the language of ‘prescribe, revise and interpret’ in relation to design standards for Defence aircraft is well known in Defence aviation, the actions undertaken by Authority staff (including DoSAs) for satisfying the Authority’s obligations to prescribe, revise and interpret design standards is not clearly defined or understood. Therefore, a clear understanding of each of these terms and a description of the methods a competent Airworthiness Authority (AA) would utilise in satisfying their obligations in this regard is required. Each term is defined³ as follows:

- a. prescribe – ‘to lay down, in writing or otherwise, as a rule or a course to be followed’
- b. revise – ‘to amend or alter’
- c. interpret – ‘to set forth the meaning of, explain or elucidate: to explain, construe, or understand in a particular way’.

5. These definitions are consistent with the activities of other National Airworthiness Authorities/ Military Airworthiness Authorities (N/MAA) when establishing Airworthiness Codes and supporting design requirements and standards, and publishing associated Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMC) or Guidance Material (GM). For example, the FAA:

- a. ‘prescribe’ airworthiness requirements through the FARs
- b. ‘revise’ these requirements as a result of trigger events or as a result of regular evaluations of the effectiveness of the requirements in achieving the desired level of safety⁴

¹ Joint Directive 24/2016 refers.

² Note that the ‘prescribe’ function of a DoSA does not include the approval of an Airworthiness Code to support initial certification, but rather to contribute to the Authority’s assessment of that Code.

³ Macquarie online dictionary, available at <https://www.macquariedictionary.com.au/>

⁴ The term ‘level of safety’, as used in this paper, should not be confused with Defence’s WHS obligations to eliminate or otherwise minimise risk SFARP. The Airworthiness Codes and supplementation prescribed by the Authority establish the ‘reputable standards’ for Defence aircraft design. Where compliance with the Codes and supplementation is confirmed, airworthiness safety risks in aircraft designs can be considered to have been eliminated or otherwise minimised SFARP provided the Defence context of application remains consistent with that intended/assumed in the standard. The prescription of these standards, however, does not eliminate an individual’s responsibility to exercise reasonable knowledge. See AAP7001.054 Section 1 Chapter 2 Annex A for additional detail on exercising reasonable knowledge in design.

c. 'interpret' the prescribed requirements through the issue of AMC and GM in the form of Airworthiness Circulars, Notices, Handbooks and Orders⁵.

6. The Authority's recognition of certain Airworthiness Codes prescribed by other N/MAA is a fundamental tenet of Authority prescription of airworthiness standards. Only Codes that have been evaluated by the Authority and confirmed to provide a complete and consistent suite of airworthiness requirements, which are suitable for application to Defence aircraft, have been recognised by the Authority. While recognition of these Codes does not strictly constitute a 'prescribe or revise airworthiness standards' function, the Authority effectively prescribes compliance with these Codes via their status as an acceptable Primary Certification Code for purposes of compliance with DASR 21.A.16A. The Authority's criteria for recognition of an Airworthiness Code are defined in AAP 7001.054, Section 1 Chapter 3, with all prescribed airworthiness standards and supplementation contained in Sections 2, 3 and 5.

7. This paper describes the implementing principles for satisfying the responsibilities of the Authority in prescribing, revising and interpreting airworthiness standards.

AIM

8. The aim of this principles paper is to define guiding principles for the prescription, revision and interpretation of Airworthiness Codes, design requirements, and design standards under the DASRs. This paper forms the basis upon which Authority instructions that describe the manner in which these functions will be conducted, will be developed.

IMPLEMENTATION PRINCIPLES

Prescribe Airworthiness Codes and Standards

Principle 1. The Authority will evaluate Airworthiness Codes published by Authority recognised N/MAAs to establish whether the Codes provide a suitable basis for Defence aircraft type certification.

9. To provide assurance that safe flight is achieved through aircraft design, many N/MAAs prescribe airworthiness design requirements, which are usually documented in an 'Airworthiness Code' (DASR 21.A.16A refers). An Airworthiness Code is a complete and consistent suite of design requirements that define those attributes of aircraft systems or equipment that underpin safe flight. As the development and maintenance of an Airworthiness Code is a substantial undertaking, rather than define and publish its own Code Defence has elected to recognise Airworthiness Codes prescribed by other N/MAAs where they meet the requirements of AAP 7001.054, Section 1 Chapter 3.

10. For the Authority to recognise an Airworthiness Code, as a minimum, the Code must:

- a. be prescribed by a recognised N/MAA
- b. have demonstrated a sound safety record
- c. prescribe a complete and consistent suite of airworthiness design requirements
- d. be supported by associated guidance on how to achieve compliance with the airworthiness design requirements
- e. be accessible, ie published by the N/MAA in a consolidated and easily accessed format.

⁵ While the FAA generally does not 'prescribe' applicable design standards for the requirements prescribed in the Codes, the FAA AMC (such as ACs) do include references to accepted standards where appropriate. In essence, these standards become 'de-facto' prescribed airworthiness standards.

Principle 2. The Authority will determine whether supplementation to airworthiness requirements prescribed within recognised Airworthiness Codes is required.

11. Authority recognised Airworthiness Codes should substantially meet the level of safety expected by Defence. However, in order to eliminate or otherwise minimise risk so far as is reasonably practicable (SFARP), recognised Codes will inevitably require supplementation by the Authority, to account for:

- a. Defence's unique Configuration, Role and/or operating Environment
- b. deficiencies in the level of safety provided by the airworthiness design requirements prescribed within the Code, identified as a result of local research and experience
- c. intentional ambiguities within the airworthiness standards adopted by the relevant N/MAA, where it is assumed that tailoring will be required to meet the needs of the specific application in order to demonstrate compliance with the standard.

12. To identify whether supplementation of an Airworthiness Code is required as a result of Defence unique CRE, the Authority will evaluate the CRE assumed by the Code's authors and confirm that it is consistent with that which would normally be encountered during Defence aircraft operations. The Authority will also prescribe supplementation to recognised Codes to account for deficiencies identified through Defence experience (either through accident/incident investigations or design deficiencies identified during aircraft acquisition or modification programs).

13. The Authority recognised Airworthiness Codes and associated supplementation are published in AAP 7001.054. Compliance with a recognised Code and relevant supplementation forms the basis of Defence aircraft type certification programs. However, the expectation is that the supplementation will be applied in a practical and pragmatic manner. To support pragmatic implementation, the Authority has classified each airworthiness design requirement as either 'essential' or 'recommended', using the following criteria:

- a. Essential – represents requirements which, if not met, would adversely impact any claims that risks associated with a design have been eliminated or otherwise minimised SFARP through compliance with reputable standards (ie they are integral to the establishment of the 'reputable standards' for Defence aircraft design).
- b. Recommended – represents emerging aviation industry 'good practice' that is not yet widely accepted/implemented, or presents an opportunity to increase the level of safety afforded by the design (usually above that provided in Airworthiness Codes) (see paragraph 15 for further clarification).

14. The Authority's general prerequisite for Type Certification is that all Essential design requirements are met. However, there are certain circumstances, explored in Principles 4 and 5, where Type Certification may still be achieved despite an Essential design requirement not being met.

15. Given the nature of recommended design requirements, their adoption is not mandated by the Authority. Nevertheless, the recommended requirements may assist duty holders to satisfy obligations under WHS legislation for eliminating or otherwise minimising risk SFARP. Consequently, the designer, in conjunction with other⁶ shared duty holders, should determine if adoption of a recommended requirement is reasonably practicable by assessing the improvement in the level of safety afforded by the recommended requirement against the likely cost(s) of implementation.

⁶ In this context, other shared duty holders are those individual responsible for allocating and controlling resources necessary to support implementation of the recommended requirement (eg associated project manager, MAO, CAMO and so on).

16. Some standards cannot be employed without tailoring to suit the specific aircraft type or application. The Authority may include tailoring in the design requirements prescribed in AAP 7001.054, including permissible tailoring that will not degrade the level of safety. However, the tailoring in AAP 7001.054 is by no means comprehensive and, with few exceptions⁷, any additional proposed tailoring of airworthiness design requirements prescribed in an aircraft's TCB will require approval from the Authority. All tailoring will be recorded in an Authority approved Military Certification Review Item (MCRI).

Principle 3. The Authority may prescribe bespoke airworthiness standards for use where an aircraft does not conform to an Authority recognised Airworthiness Code.

17. Defence may acquire aircraft that do not meet the requirements for certification under an Authority recognised Airworthiness Code. These circumstances include:

- a. **Acquisition of aircraft that have been certified to an Airworthiness Code that is not yet recognised by the Authority.** In these cases, the Authority will assess the Airworthiness Code adopted in the aircraft's TCB against the criteria for recognition as per AAP 7001.054, Section 1 Chapter 3, and prescribe supplementation where required.
- b. **Acquisition of aircraft that have been designed to a bespoke suite of airworthiness design requirements.** These requirements may be prescribed by recognised N/MAAs, however, do not constitute a suite of requirements that satisfy all AAP 7001.054 criteria for recognition as an Airworthiness Code. As such, the Authority will assess the set of design requirements as a basis for providing an acceptable foundation for safe design of a Defence aircraft, and prescribe additional supplementation where required.

Principle 4. The Authority may approve a proposed alternative airworthiness standard if it presents an equivalent level of safety.

18. The Authority may approve alternative design standards that achieve an equivalent level of safety to Essential design standards prescribed by the Authority. The Authority will only approve an alternative standard as having achieved an equivalent level of safety where analysis:

- a. confirms the alternative standard achieves an equivalent level of safety
- b. demonstrates that the alternative standard, supplemented by engineering or maintenance actions, should achieve an equivalent level of safety, or
- c. demonstrates that the alternative standard, supplemented by operational risk controls agreed for implementation by the MAO, should achieve an equivalent level of safety.

19. Approvals based on paragraphs 18b or 18c would normally require close consultation with the relevant capability manager (or delegate), since the complementary operational, engineering and/or maintenance controls may impose a burden for the remaining life-of-type of the aircraft.

20. Approvals based on paragraph 19a may result in a one-off approval (where the context of acceptability of the alternative standard is unique to a particular Defence aircraft CRE), or an amendment to AAP 7001.054 (in which case the alternate standard would provide an enduring means of satisfying an Essential design requirement).

⁷ See paragraph 19 and 20 of 'Aviation Design Requirements Promulgation and Management – Principles for Implementation' (DGTA-ADF U7298233).

Principle 5. The Authority may approve an alternative airworthiness requirement that does not afford an equivalent level of safety to that inherent in an Authority prescribed standard.

21. The Essential design requirements in AAP 7001.054 necessarily assume a generic military aircraft that is employed in a generic military role and operating environment. It is therefore possible that an Essential design requirement may drive a marked negative effect on a candidate aircraft's capability or cost, and the capability manager (or delegate) may contend that mandating compliance with the design requirement is not in Defence's best interests. The capability manager could propose an alternative design requirement that does not afford an equivalent level of safety to an Authority prescribed requirement, but would still satisfy their statutory obligation to eliminate or otherwise minimise risks SFARP, when contextualised for the military role and operating environment of the aircraft.

22. Like other MAAs, the Authority accepts that tailoring of design requirements may be necessary to achieve essential military capability⁸. Provided the Authority concludes the proposed tailoring is judicious (ie that the tailoring represents good judgement or sense) in the ADF operational context, the Authority may approve tailoring to the proposed TCB. Type Certification against the tailored TCB would then be pursued by the applicant.

23. Judicious tailoring of the TCB will be evident when:

- a. the capability manager has a clear (well-defined) and documented capability imperative for the proposed tailoring
- b. the applicant has confirmed that compliance with a requirement of the Code or prescribed supplementation impedes that capability imperative
- c. the applicant has defined the delta between the requirement of the Code or prescribed supplementation, and the tailored TCB requirement
- d. the applicant, with the assistance of the capability manager (or delegate), has clearly characterised the risk due to this delta
- e. the capability manager (or delegate) and the applicant has *ensured* that all reasonably practicable measures to eliminate or otherwise minimise the risk have been implemented
- f. the capability manager (or delegate) has formally concluded that the tailored TCB presents a suitable and defensible level of safety for that Defence aircraft, contextualised for ADF operations.

24. The Authority may have two separate roles in the above process. First, as the repository of standards and certification expertise, the Authority may advise the capability manager and applicant on how to wisely complete each step. Secondly, and most importantly, the Authority would need to gain sufficient confidence in the conduct of the process to *assure* the Defence AA that the tailoring was indeed judicious. If this second role cannot be achieved, the tailoring of the TCB cannot be approved and consequently Type Certification would be precluded.

25. Importantly, Authority approval of proposed tailoring *does not* constitute endorsement/agreement of the determination that risk has been eliminated or otherwise minimised SFARP. Rather, this must remain a decision for the capability manager (or delegate), as does the enduring management of the residual risk due to the tailoring/alternative standard.

⁸ For example, the European Military Airworthiness Certification Criteria (EMACC) guidebook states that its purpose is to "...enable a systematic, disciplined analysis of certification criteria in order to tailor a TCB for a specific air system". MIL-HDBK-516C, Airworthiness Certification Criteria, similarly acknowledges that tailoring of certification criteria may be required.

Principle 6. The Authority may delegate responsibility for prescribing supplementation, and/or additional airworthiness standards, for specified design disciplines to Defence subject matter experts.

26. The Authority may delegate responsibility to prescribe supplementation and/or additional airworthiness design standards for certain niche disciplines in which the Authority does not hold in house expertise to suitably qualified and experienced subject matter experts, who will be known as ‘Standards DoSAs’. Standards DoSAs will not approve a recognised Airworthiness Code for application to a Defence aircraft to support initial certification, but may contribute to the Authority’s assessment of a Code. Any prescribed supplementation is published in AAP 7001.054.

27. The Authority will assign Standards DoSAs for niche disciplines as the need arises. As at December 2017, the disciplines assigned a DoSA are:

- a. aircraft stores clearance
- b. cargo aerial delivery systems and loads⁹
- c. aircraft life support equipment.

Principle 7. The Authority does not prescribe supplementation to account for all WHS legislation responsibilities of designers, importers and suppliers.

28. Airworthiness Codes consider injury to aircrew during aircraft operations, and indirectly include some requirements that protect passengers from injury. The Codes do not consider potential longer term health impacts due to design related hazards (eg chemical, biological, ergonomic, and so on). Further, potential hazards posed to aircraft maintenance personnel and persons in close proximity to a non-operating aircraft are not considered within the scope of airworthiness and therefore may not be covered within the prescribed Codes and supplementation. Consequently, designers, importers and suppliers will need to prescribe additional design requirements that specifically address these issues. Further detail on potential WHS legislation compliance issues in aircraft design is contained in AAP 7001.054 Section 1 Chapter 2.

Principle 8. The Authority does not prescribe supplementation to account for Defence interoperability or capability requirements.

29. Airworthiness Codes, by their nature, are not intended to prescribe requirements for interoperability and capability considerations. While there may be some interoperability and capability outcomes achieved through the adoption of recognised Codes, the capability manager (or delegate) should identify additional requirements and communicate these requirements to designers. While some interoperability and capability requirements *may* be published in AAP 7001.054¹⁰, these requirements are not prescribed by the Authority and are not considered part of the certified design.

Revise Airworthiness Codes and Standards

Principle 9. The Authority will evaluate amendments to Airworthiness Codes and standards and prescribe updated standards or issue revised supplementation where warranted.

30. Authority recognised N/MAAs may promulgate amendments to Airworthiness Codes and design standards as a result of trigger events or following regular evaluations of the effectiveness of the Codes in achieving safe flight, or to provide enhancements to the level of safety afforded by the Code. The Authority monitors proposed amendments, evaluates the changes, and prescribes updated standards or updates associated supplementation where required. Periodically, the Authority will evaluate:

⁹ At the time of release, the cargo aerial delivery systems and loads DoSA is yet to be assigned.

¹⁰ Publication of selected capability and interoperability requirements in AAP 7001.054 is an interim measure, pending identification of a suitable repository for this information.

- a. currently recognised Airworthiness Codes and confirm that they continue to provide a complete and consistent suite of airworthiness requirements and satisfy the Authority's requirements for Code Recognition
- b. any changes to the Codes that reduce the level of safety previously afforded, and determine whether additional supplementation to re-establish the level of safety is required
- c. the actions of the relevant N/MAA to resolve potential safety issues, if any, associated with the requirements in their Code.

Principle 10. The Authority will evaluate safety improvements introduced within an amended Airworthiness Code or standard and direct retrospective incorporation for in-service Defence aircraft if warranted.

31. The Authority will determine whether proposed or implemented changes to recognised Airworthiness Codes present material improvements to the level of safety afforded by the Code for the Defence aviation context. Where the Authority determines that changes to recognised Airworthiness Codes afford safety improvements that warrant retrospective application to Defence in-service aircraft, separate direction will be issued by the Authority (usually in the form of an Airworthiness Directive) to effect this change. Promulgated changes may not be restricted to aircraft certified to the updated Code. That is, where changes to a Code offer an increase in the level of safety which has not been reflected in other Codes, the Authority will assess whether the changes are to be applied irrespective of the individual platform's original certification Code.

32. Where the Authority determines that direction to implement changed standards retrospectively is not warranted, the Authority may advise relevant MTCHs and MAOs of the changes to assist in ongoing evaluation of effectiveness of hazard controls and determinations that risks have been eliminated or otherwise minimised SFARP.

Principle 11. The Authority will evaluate accident/incident investigation outcomes and recommendations to confirm whether recognised Airworthiness Codes, supplementation and standards continue to afford the required level of safety.

33. Accident/incident investigations and their outcomes are integral to informing engineers of risks in aircraft design and potential ways of eliminating or controlling those risks. N/MAAs and national accident investigation authorities conduct investigations, make recommendations for safety improvements, and (usually) make their findings of causal factors and proposed remediation actions public. Defence also conducts independent investigations into accidents/incidents on Defence aircraft and publishes the outcomes.

34. The Authority will evaluate outcomes from accident/incident investigations (Australian and major foreign civil and military) to confirm that recognised Airworthiness Codes, supplementation and standards continue to afford the required level of safety.

35. Regardless of the actions of the Authority in evaluating accident/incident investigations, design organisations remain responsible for exercising reasonable knowledge in design. Consequently, design organisations should be aware of accident/incident investigation outcomes applicable to the specific aircraft for which they have responsibility when confirming their design has eliminated or otherwise minimised risks SFARP.

Principle 12. The Authority will evaluate advances in aircraft design disciplines/technologies to confirm whether recognised Airworthiness Codes, supplementation and standards continue to represent reputable standards for Defence aircraft design.

36. Advances in design disciplines/technologies may emerge, which afford safety improvements that are being implemented broadly within aviation as commonly accepted 'good practice'. Such advances may impact Authority decisions that currently recognised Airworthiness Codes and Authority prescribed

supplementation represent reputable standards for Defence aircraft design. The Authority will monitor changes in technology which may necessitate a revision of a recognised Airworthiness Code, supplementation and/or standards and issue amendments to supplementation where required.

37. Regardless of the actions of the Authority in monitoring advances in design disciplines/technologies, design organisations remain responsible for exercising reasonable knowledge in design. Consequently, design organisations should be aware of technology advances applicable to the design being undertaken, and consider the implications of not adopting these advances when confirming their design has eliminated or otherwise minimised risks SFARP.

Interpret Airworthiness Codes and Standards

Principle 13. The Authority will maintain expertise in selected design disciplines sufficient to confirm the adequacy of proposed Type Certification Bases and compliance demonstration activities.

38. The level and scope of expertise maintained by the Authority is dependent on the degree to which expertise¹¹ in a particular design discipline contributes to the Authority's ability to fulfil its assurance oversight functions, including:

- a. Authority evaluation and approval of a proposed TCB
- b. conducting inspection of compliance demonstration evidence
- c. educating design organisations and project staff on requirements for compliance demonstration.

39. **Authority evaluation and approval of a proposed TCB.** Defence is unlikely to conduct a bespoke or ab initio type certification program, with type certification programs relying heavily on Authority recognised N/MAA programs as a basis for Australian military type certification. Consequently, applications for type certification of Defence aircraft will be supported by a TCB already approved by a N/MAA. Nevertheless, additional airworthiness requirements and standards may be imposed by the Authority to account for the ADF's CRE, and these will be included in the TCB. Under these circumstances, the Authority requires sufficient expertise in design disciplines associated with these supplementary requirements and standards to confirm that the proposed TCB comprehensively accounts for the ADF's CRE.

40. **Inspection of compliance demonstration evidence.** The Authority conducts inspection of compliance demonstration evidence to assure the validity of compliance demonstration outcomes. This function requires Authority personnel to maintain expertise sufficient to provide assurance that:

- a. inappropriate assumptions have not been made during the design process
- b. compliance demonstration evidence is of adequate coverage and quality
- c. novel or unusual features of the design have been robustly evaluated
- d. critical elements of the design have been subjected to appropriate engineering rigour.

41. **Education.** Educating design organisations in approaches to undertaking compliance demonstration is not a core Authority function. However, the Authority provides education and training in certain niche disciplines (eg E3, crash protection, system safety and software) to design organisations and project offices to enhance their ability to undertake compliance demonstrations. The Authority requires sufficient expertise to scope and/or deliver the education program.

Principle 14. Where no organic expertise exists in Defence, the Authority may engage external experts to support Authority determinations on interpretation of prescribed Airworthiness Codes and standards.

¹¹ This expertise may be internal to the Authority, or provided by Standards DoSAs.

42. For some niche disciplines it is not practical for the Authority to maintain organic expertise (either within the Authority or via delegation to a Standards DoSA). The requirement for expertise in these disciplines typically arises as a result of novel or emerging technologies utilised on a singular/small number of platforms, or where the cost of maintaining expertise in the discipline is disproportionate to the frequency the Authority requires the expertise. In these circumstances, the Authority retains responsibility for interpretation of prescribed Airworthiness Codes and standards, however, will engage external subject matter experts to provide assistance in prescribing and interpreting requirements.

CONCLUSION

43. This paper examines the principles underpinning prescription, revision and interpretation of Airworthiness Codes and design requirements under the DASRs. Adoption of these principles, in conjunction with the principles underpinning the application of Airworthiness Codes, enables the Authority to appropriately manage design requirements underpinning safe aircraft operations in Defence.

44. The following implementation principles are proposed:

Prescribe Airworthiness Codes and Standards

Principle 1. The Authority will evaluate Airworthiness Codes published by Authority recognised N/MAAs to establish whether the Codes provide a suitable basis for Defence aircraft type certification.

Principle 2. The Authority will determine whether supplementation to airworthiness requirements prescribed within recognised Airworthiness Codes is required.

Principle 3. The Authority may prescribe bespoke airworthiness standards for use where an aircraft does not conform to an Authority recognised Airworthiness Code.

Principle 4. The Authority may approve a proposed alternative airworthiness standard if it presents an equivalent level of safety.

Principle 5. The Authority may approve an alternative airworthiness requirement that does not afford an equivalent level of safety to that inherent in an Authority prescribed standard.

Principle 6. The Authority may delegate responsibility for prescribing supplementation, and/or additional airworthiness standards, for specified design disciplines to Defence subject matter experts.

Principle 7. The Authority does not prescribe supplementation to account for all WHS legislation responsibilities of designers, importers and suppliers.

Principle 8. The Authority does not prescribe supplementation to account for Defence interoperability or capability requirements.

Revise Airworthiness Codes and Standards

Principle 9. The Authority will evaluate amendments to Airworthiness Codes and standards and prescribe updated standards or issue revised supplementation where warranted.

Principle 10. The Authority will evaluate safety improvements introduced within an amended Airworthiness Code or standard and direct retrospective incorporation for in-service Defence aircraft if warranted.

Principle 11. The Authority will evaluate accident/incident investigation outcomes and recommendations to confirm whether recognised Airworthiness Codes, supplementation and standards continue to afford the required level of safety.

Principle 12. The Authority will evaluate advances in aircraft design disciplines/technologies to confirm whether recognised Airworthiness Codes, supplementation and standards continue to represent reputable standards for Defence aircraft design.

Interpret Airworthiness Codes and Standards

Principle 13. The Authority will maintain expertise in selected design disciplines sufficient to confirm the adequacy of proposed Type Certification Bases and compliance demonstration activities.

Principle 14. Where no organic expertise exists in Defence, the Authority may engage external experts to support Authority determinations on interpretation of prescribed Airworthiness Codes and standards.

Drafted by:

Approved by:

Original signed

Original signed

S Donaldson
DD ASSI

M Wade
DAVCERT

20 Dec 17

20 Dec 17