

## RA 1016 – Military Continuing Airworthiness Management

### Rationale

*Maintaining the Airworthiness of an Air System is a complex undertaking that requires clear procedures and competent personnel to accomplish. Failures in the management of the Continuing Airworthiness (CAw) of an Air System could invalidate Risk to Life assessments conducted as part of the Air System Safety Case<sup>1</sup>. ► This RA ◀ outlines the requirement for a MAA approved Military Continuing Airworthiness Management Organization (Mil CAMO) to manage all CAw tasks, in order to ensure that military registered Air Systems within their Area of Responsibility (AoR)<sup>2</sup> are operated safely and with a valid Military Airworthiness Review Certificate (MARC).*

### Contents

**1016(1): Withdrawn – Not deemed a regulatory requirement**  
**1016(2): Establishment of a Military Continuing Airworthiness Management Organization**  
**1016(3): Requirement for a valid Military Airworthiness Review Certificate**

### Regulation 1016(1)

#### Accountable Manager (Continuing Airworthiness)

1016(1) Withdrawn – Not deemed a regulatory requirement.

### Acceptable Means of Compliance 1016(1)

#### Accountable Manager (Continuing Airworthiness)

1. Withdrawn – Not deemed a regulatory requirement.

### Guidance Material 1016(1)

#### Accountable Manager (Continuing Airworthiness)

2. Withdrawn – Not deemed a regulatory requirement.

### Regulation 1016(2)

#### Establishment of a Military Continuing Airworthiness Management Organization

1016(2) Delivery Duty Holders (DDH) and Accountable Managers (Military Flying) (AM(MF)) **shall** ensure that the tasks associated with CAw of the military registered Air Systems in their AoR<sup>2</sup> are managed by an approved<sup>3</sup> Mil CAMO.

### Acceptable Means of Compliance 1016(2)

#### Establishment of a Military Continuing Airworthiness Management Organization

3. Each DDH / AM(MF) **should** appoint a Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person (SQEP)<sup>4</sup> as the Military Continuing Airworthiness Manager (Mil CAM)<sup>5</sup> to manage and control all CAw activity for the military registered Air System(s) for which they have CAw responsibility<sup>2,6</sup> ◀.

4. The Mil CAM and Deputy Mil CAM (DCAM) **should** meet the SQEP criteria detailed in RA 4945<sup>4</sup>. Operating Duty Holders' CAE may authorize non-compliance on a case-by-case basis, informing the MAA. ► ◀

<sup>1</sup> Refer to RA 1205 – Air System Safety Cases.

<sup>2</sup> AoR includes all active Air Systems ► ◀ on the UK Military Aircraft Register (MAR) identified in their Continuing Airworthiness Management Exposition (CAME), inclusive of Air Systems held in storage or within sustainment fleets. Where there is more than one Mil CAM, against a given Air System, they are to come to agreement as to who is responsible for each Air System.

<sup>3</sup> Refer to RA 4941 – Application – MRP Part M Sub Part G.

<sup>4</sup> Refer to RA 4945 – Personnel Requirements – MRP Part M Sub Part G.

<sup>5</sup> Refer to RA 1011 – Military Continuing Airworthiness Manager Responsibilities.

<sup>6</sup> ► In derogation to the above Regulation, for Organizations with Remotely Piloted Air Systems (RPAS) categorized as Specific S2, a DDH Chief Air Engineer (CAE) may manage CAw. Refer to RA 1605 – Remotely Piloted Air Systems Specific S2 sub-category. ◀

## Acceptable Means of Compliance 1016(2)

5. ► The Mil CAM **should** ensure all staff, managing CAw tasks, are trained, assessed as competent and authorized<sup>7</sup>. ◀
6. The Mil CAMO and Mil CAM **should** work in support of the DDH / AM(MF) and either:
  - a. Be co-located with the DDH / AM(MF) or;
  - b. If geographically separated from the DDH / AM(MF), employ rigorous and demonstrable standards of communication, which **should** be detailed in the CAME<sup>8</sup>.
7. Where the Mil CAMO supports more than one DDH / AM(MF), then a written agreement **should** be established between the DDH and AM(MF) to manage and control all CAw activity for the military registered Air System(s) that ► the DDH / AM(MF) ◀ operate.

## Guidance Material 1016(2)

### Establishment of a Military Continuing Airworthiness Management Organization

8. The terms Mil CAMO and Mil CAM are intended to provide clarity in differentiating between those organizations approved in accordance with (iaw) MRP Part M and those that are approved iaw European ► Union ◀ Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) Regulations. It applies equally to those organizations headed by a Crown Servant Mil CAM, and those organizations supporting an AM(MF) where the Mil CAM may not be a Crown Servant.
9. CAw Management Regulations are detailed in MRP Part M Regulation<sup>9</sup>.
10. In respect of Mil CAMOs supporting DDHs, ordinarily the CAE<sup>10</sup> to that DDH will be the Mil CAM. If both roles are filled by the same person, the Mil CAM is to have a clear understanding of their CAw responsibilities<sup>5</sup>.
11. Where a particular support strategy includes a contracting arrangement with an EASA approved Part M Sub Part G organization with a civilian CAw Manager, this in no way obviates the requirement for a Mil CAM, who will retain overarching responsibility for CAw. In such cases, the Mil CAM may utilize the contracted arrangements, but is to be able to demonstrate adequate control of the activity.
12. Where Mil CAMO activity is undertaken on the Mil CAMO's behalf by another MOD organization, eg a Delivery Team, and that organization carries out assurance activities, then this may provide the Mil CAMO with the necessary assurance without the need for duplication. This does not remove the requirement for the Mil CAM to be satisfied that the scope of the assurance activity is adequate.
13. In pursuance of managing and controlling the CAw of Air Systems within their AoR<sup>2</sup>, Mil CAMs, whether Crown Servants or civilians, do not need to be directly subordinate to the Air Systems' DDH / AM(MF). This is particularly relevant for those Mil CAMs who support Defence Contractor Flying Organizations; in such cases they may be part of a different organization working under a contract or bespoke agreement. It is also acceptable for the Mil CAM to have duties other than direct support to a specified DDH / AM(MF), if they have the capacity to do so. In all cases, the accountability for compliance with this Regulation remains with the relevant DDH / AM(MF) directing the flying activity and if they are not satisfied with their Mil CAMO arrangement(s), then they are to consider an alternative solution to meet the Regulatory requirements.
14. Where a military registered Air System is operated as an activity for a period less than 6 months then a Mil CAMO may not be required. In such a case the DDH / AM(MF) is to make an application by way of a Waiver<sup>11</sup>, detailing the arrangements in place for ensuring the CAw of their military registered Air Systems.

<sup>7</sup> ► Refer to RA 4945(3): Personnel Competence and MRP Part M Authorization. ◀

<sup>8</sup> Refer to RA 4943 – Continuing Airworthiness Management Exposition – MRP Part M Sub Part G.

<sup>9</sup> Refer to the RA 4900 series: Continuing Airworthiness Management Organization (CAMO) Regulation.

<sup>10</sup> Refer to RA 1023 – Chief Air Engineers – Air Safety Responsibilities.

<sup>11</sup> Refer to MAA03: MAA Regulatory Processes.

**Regulation  
1016(3)**

**Requirement for a valid Military Airworthiness Review Certificate**

1016(3) For military registered Air Systems, the accountable DDH / AM(MF) **shall** ensure that the Air System is not flown without a valid MARC.

**Acceptable  
Means of  
Compliance  
1016(3)**

**Requirement for a valid Military Airworthiness Review Certificate**

15. The DDH / AM(MF) **should** be able to adequately demonstrate how they control flying to ensure that the Air System has a valid MARC before the Air System is released for flight ►<sup>12</sup>◄.

**Guidance  
Material  
1016(3)**

**Requirement for a valid Military Airworthiness Review Certificate**

16. The Regulation, AMC and GM for MARCs is located in the MRP Part M Sub Part I<sup>13</sup>.

17. In derogation to the above Regulation, Air Systems flown under a Military Permit to Fly (MPTF)<sup>14</sup> may be flown without a valid MARC, if permitted by the Type Airworthiness Authority.

18. The Military Airworthiness Review (Mil AR)<sup>15</sup> is deemed the best possible process for establishing an Air System's Airworthiness and current configuration, therefore, every effort is to be made by Air System operators to utilize the Mil AR and the subsequent issuance of a MARC.

<sup>12</sup> ► In derogation to the above Regulation, Organizations with RPAS categorized as Specific S2 and lower may implement a sample audit of the Airworthiness of individual platforms in lieu of a MARC. Refer to RA 1605 - Remotely Piloted Air Systems Specific S2 sub-category. ◄

<sup>13</sup> Refer to the RA 4970 series - Airworthiness Review.

<sup>14</sup> Refer to ► RA 1305 – Military Permit to Fly (In-Service), (Special Case Flying) and (Single Task) and to RA 5880 – Military Permit to Fly (development) - MRP Part 21 Subpart P. ◄

<sup>15</sup> Refer to RA 4971 – Military Airworthiness Review and Certification - MRP Part M Sub Part I.

Intentionally Blank for Print Pagination