



Advisory Circular

Subject: Monitor Checks on Approved Check Pilots and Advanced Qualification Program Evaluators

Issuing Office:	Civil Aviation, Standards	Document No.:	AC 700-051
File Classification No.:	Z 5000-34	Issue No.:	01
RDIMS No.:	14063922-V17	Effective Date:	2019-01-02

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	3
1.1	Purpose	3
1.2	Applicability	3
1.3	Description of Changes	3
2.0	REFERENCES AND REQUIREMENTS.....	4
2.1	Reference Documents	4
2.2	Cancelled Documents	4
2.3	Definitions and Abbreviations.....	4
3.0	BACKGROUND.....	6
4.0	PROGRAM DETAILS.....	7
4.1	General.....	7
4.2	Eligibility Requirements - ACP (Type M) or AQPE (Type M) Authorization.....	7
4.3	Eligibility Requirements for a Sponsoring Air Operator	8
4.4	Implementation Plan	8
4.5	Application and Approval Process	9
4.6	Initial Training Requirements	9
4.7	Qualification / Recent Experience Requirements	9
4.8	Monitor Checks on Delegates with Type M Authority	10
4.9	Administration and Approvals for Monitor Checks	11
4.10	Conduct of a Monitor Check.....	11
4.11	Assessing a Monitor Check.....	11
4.12	Quality Assurance	11
4.13	Program Updates	12
5.0	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT.....	12
6.0	DOCUMENT HISTORY	12
7.0	CONTACT OFFICE	12
	APPENDIX A — MONITOR CHECK GUIDE	13

APPENDIX B - PERFORMANCE STANDARD 19
APPENDIX C – MONITOR CHECK GRADING MATRIX 23
APPENDIX D – SIMILAR AIRCRAFT TYPES..... 28

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- (1) This Advisory Circular (AC) is provided for information and guidance purposes. It describes an example of an acceptable means, but not the only means, of demonstrating compliance with regulations and standards. This AC on its own does not change, create, amend or permit deviations from regulatory requirements, nor does it establish minimum standards.

1.1 Purpose

- (1) The purpose of this document is to announce program changes with respect to the oversight of Approved Check Pilots (ACP) and Advanced Qualification Program Evaluators (AQPE).

1.2 Applicability

- (1) This document applies to all Transport Canada Civil Aviation (TCCA) employees and to individuals and organizations when they are exercising privileges granted to them under an External Ministerial Delegation of Authority. This information is also available to the aviation industry for information purposes.

1.3 Description of Changes

- (1) The Ministerial Delegation of Authority that allows a small segment of industry pilots to exercise ACP and AQPE privileges is expanding in scope. A select number of ACPs and AQPEs will receive additional privileges on their Delegation of Authority, which will allow them to assist TCCA with the monitoring of ACPs and AQPEs.
- (2) ACPs and AQPEs who receive these additional privileges will be authorized to conduct **recurrent** monitor checks on other industry ACPs and AQPEs in accordance with the criteria defined in this circular.
- (3) Civil Aviation Safety Inspectors (CASIs) will continue to be an integral part of the surveillance of ACPs and AQPEs by conducting all **initial** and **requalification** monitor checks, and some **recurrent** monitor checks, as defined in this circular.
- (4) Additional program changes have been made to improve the quality and effectiveness of monitor checks, which are as follows:
 - (a) A Monitor Check Guide has been developed and included in this circular to support the conduct of monitor checks;
 - (b) A mandatory course has been developed by TCCA to provide CASIs and industry delegates with instruction on the conduct of monitor checks;
 - (c) TCCA Staff Instruction (SI) 700-002 — *Approved Check Pilot Monitoring Procedures* has been re-named "*Flight Crew Checking and Monitoring*" and has been revised to remove any information that contradicts or duplicates the contents of this circular. (SI 700-002 is only applicable / available to CASIs); and
 - (d) CASIs will be expected to conduct monitor checks in accordance with this circular, SI 700-002 and the ACP / AQPE Manuals and associated Bulletins. Industry delegates will be expected to conduct monitor checks in accordance with this circular and the ACP / AQPE Manuals and associated Bulletins.

2.0 REFERENCES AND REQUIREMENTS

2.1 Reference Documents

- (1) The following reference materials must be used in conjunction with this document:
 - (a) *Aeronautics Act* (R.S., 1985, c. A-2);
 - (b) Staff Instruction (SI) 700-002, Issue 02,— *Flight Crew Checking and Monitoring* - (not applicable to external delegates);
 - (c) Transport Canada Publication, TP 6533E, — *Approved Check Pilot Manual*;
 - (d) Transport Canada Publication, TP 14672, — *Advanced Qualification Program Evaluator Manual*; and
 - (e) Transport Canada form number 26-0844E — *Approved Check Pilot (ACP) and AQP Evaluator Monitor Report*.

2.2 Cancelled Documents

- (1) Not applicable.
- (2) By default, it is understood that the publication of a new issue of a document automatically renders any earlier issues of the same document null and void.

2.3 Definitions and Abbreviations

- (1) The following **definitions** are used in this document:
 - (a) **Active Operational Pilot** – In this circular, refers to a pilot that meets the minimum flight currency requirements specified by the air operator, or the qualification / recent experience requirements specified in the CARs / CASS for the applicable subpart, whichever is higher;
 - (b) **Advanced Qualification Program Evaluator (AQPE)** - A person holding an official authorization to conduct evaluations and/or validations on behalf of the Minister of Transport pursuant to Part 1, Section 4.3(1) of the *Aeronautics Act*, within a given air operator's approved Advanced Qualification Program (AQP). There are four types of AQPEs:
 - (i) **Type E** - An AQP Evaluator who is authorized to conduct Validations and Evaluations;
 - (ii) **Type V** - An AQP Evaluator who is authorized to conduct Validations;
 - (iii) **Type O** - An AQP Evaluator who is authorized to conduct Operational Evaluations only; and
 - (iv) **Type M** - An AQP Evaluator who is authorized to conduct monitor checks on Type E and Type V AQPEs and exercise the privileges applicable to Type E authority.
 - (c) **Air Operator** – In this circular, an air operator refers to the holder of a certificate under Part VII of the *Canadian Aviation Regulations* (CARs);
 - (d) **Approved Check Pilot (ACP)** – A person holding an official authorization to conduct any or all of the following activities on behalf of the Minister of Transport pursuant to Part 1, Section 4.3(1) of the *Aeronautics Act*: Pilot Proficiency Checks (PPCs), Line or Qualification Checks, and Monitor Checks. There are three types of ACPs:

- (i) **Type A** - An ACP who is authorized to conduct PPCs and Line or Qualification Checks, where the CARs require such a check to be conducted by an authorized person;
 - (ii) **Type B** - An ACP who is only authorized to conduct Line or Qualification Checks, where the CARs require such a check to be conducted by an authorized person; and
 - (iii) **Type M** - An ACP who is authorized to conduct monitor checks on ACPs (Type A), and exercise the privileges applicable to Type A authority.
- (e) **Civil Aviation Safety Inspector (CASI)** – In this circular, refers to a Transport Canada Inspector who is trained and authorized to conduct flight checks and ACP/AQPE initial, recurrent, and requalification monitors;
- (f) **Company Employee** - A person that is employed on a part-time basis, full-time basis or contract basis;
- (g) **Conduct** - To take an active role in all phases of a flight check, including pre-flight preparation and briefing, the control and pace of the various sequences, assessment of the candidate's performance, and the debriefing and completion of the required documents;
- (h) **Flight Check** - In this circular, refers to a PPC, Line Check, Qualification Check, Evaluation, or Validation flight check, in a simulator or an aircraft;
- (i) **Initial Monitor Check** – An initial assessment to confirm that an ACP or AQPE can conduct a flight check in accordance with the applicable performance standard. This assessment is conducted by a CASI;
- (j) **Issuing Authority** – In this circular, refers to the applicable TCCA manager, or his / her assigned delegate, that is responsible for issuing an accreditation to exercise a Ministerial Delegation;
- (k) **Letter of Accreditation** – An official authorization to exercise a Ministerial Delegation;
- (l) **National Operations** – The organization in TCCA Headquarters that is responsible for the oversight of a defined list of national air operators in Canada and the external delegates providing a service to these air operators;
- (m) **Professional Suitability** – In this circular, refers to a delegate that possesses the knowledge, competency, judgement, integrity and communication skills to represent the Minister in a favorable manner and who has demonstrated the willingness to work cooperatively with TCCA to promote aviation safety;
- (n) **Recurrent Monitor Check** – A frequency-based recurring assessment to confirm that an ACP or AQPE is maintaining the ability to conduct a flight check in accordance with the applicable performance standard. This check is normally scheduled on a fixed-interval schedule, occurring one year after an initial monitor check, and once every second year thereafter (intervals can vary, depending on risk-based circumstances). A monitor check conducted for the purposes of **revising** authorizations on a Letter of Accreditation is also considered a **recurrent** monitor check;
- (o) **Requalification Monitor Check** – An assessment that is conducted by a CASI on an ACP or AQPE when the validity period of their last monitor check has expired;

- (p) **Staff Instruction** – A document that provides TCCA employees with specific information and procedures to standardize the delivery of the Civil Aviation Program;
 - (q) **Surveillance / Oversight on ACPs and AQPEs** – Refers to the conduct of monitor checks on these delegates and the periodic administrative review of their performance and records on file with TCCA; and
 - (r) **Transitional Safety Management System** – In this circular, refers to the implementation of a safety management system that does not have all the components to be recognized as a complete safety management system.
- (2) The following **abbreviations** are used in this document:
- (a) **ACP:** Approved Check Pilot;
 - (b) **AQP:** Advanced Qualification Program;
 - (c) **AQPE:** Advanced Qualification Program Evaluator;
 - (d) **CARs:** Canadian Aviation Regulations;
 - (e) **CASI:** Civil Aviation Safety Inspector;
 - (f) **CASS:** Commercial Air Services Standard;
 - (g) **FTR:** Flight Test Report;
 - (h) **LOE:** Line Operational Evaluation;
 - (i) **MV:** Manoeuvres Validation;
 - (j) **POI:** Principal Operations Inspector;
 - (k) **PPC:** Pilot Proficiency Check;
 - (l) **PVI:** Program Validation Inspection;
 - (m) **SI:** Staff Instruction;
 - (n) **SMS:** Safety Management System;
 - (o) **SOP:** Standard Operating Procedure;
 - (p) **TATC:** Transportation Appeal Tribunal of Canada;
 - (q) **TCCA:** Transport Canada Civil Aviation; and
 - (r) **HQ:** Headquarters.

3.0 BACKGROUND

- (1) ACPs and AQPEs have consistently demonstrated the ability to conduct flight checks in a competent and professional manner. This is reinforced by the historically high pass rate that ACPs and AQPEs have achieved during monitor checks conducted by TCCA.
- (2) Surveillance of most ACPs / AQPEs is a low-risk activity within TCCA's broad scope of aviation oversight and warrants better use of risk-based surveillance practices. Creating a shared arrangement between TCCA and industry to conduct recurrent monitor checks provides a balanced approach to risk management. In turn, this enables the efficient use of TCCA resources and allows TCCA to leverage valuable industry experience to enhance the overall quality and effectiveness of the ACP and AQPE programs.

- (3) TCCA collaborated with industry to jointly assess the risks and merits of sharing the responsibility for surveillance of ACPs and AQPEs. The results of this effort have been used to construct the framework and policies associated with this initiative as defined in this circular.

4.0 PROGRAM DETAILS

4.1 General

- (1) Industry delegates who are approved to conduct ACP and AQPE monitor checks will receive an additional authority on their Letter of Accreditation, titled: ACP Type M, and / or AQPE Type M, where the “M” represents ‘Monitor’. An industry delegate with Type M authority is representing ‘The Minister’ during the conduct of a monitor check.
- (2) ACPs and AQPEs who meet the eligibility criteria in this circular **and** are employed and sponsored by an eligible air operator can apply for Type M authority. Delegates that receive Type M authority will be authorized to conduct **recurrent** monitor checks on ACPs / AQPEs only within their organization. Delegates with Type M authority **will not** be authorized to conduct the following monitor checks – (these checks must be conducted by a CASI):
- (a) Initial or requalification monitor checks;
 - (b) Monitor checks conducted for the purposes of revising the authorities on a Letter of Authorization (if a monitor check is required, as determined by the Issuing Authority);
 - (c) Monitor checks on ACPs / AQPEs who have Type M authority;
 - (d) Monitor checks on ACPs / AQPEs who are not employed by the same air operator as the Type M delegate; and
 - (e) Recurrent monitor checks on ACPs or AQPEs where there are performance or risk-related concerns, as determined by TCCA.
- (3) In addition to the monitor checks listed in the above paragraph, the Issuing Authority has the discretion to carry out a **recurrent** monitor check on any ACP or AQPE for sampling purposes.
- (4) Eligible air operators are not obligated to sponsor ACPs / AQPEs for the Type M authorization. However, it is anticipated that eligible air operators will choose to participate in this initiative to add flexibility to the scheduling of monitor checks and contribute to the quality and effectiveness of the ACP / AQPE programs.

4.2 Eligibility Requirements - ACP (Type M) or AQPE (Type M) Authorization

- (1) ACPs and AQPEs must meet all the following requirements to be considered for a Type M authorization and must continue to meet these requirements to retain Type M authority:
- (a) A valid ACP (Type A) or AQPE (Type E) authorization on their Letter of Accreditation;
 - (b) A valid medical certificate or temporary loss of medical for 90 days or less;
 - (c) A minimum of four years of experience as an ACP (Type A) or AQPE (Type E) and actively employed as an ACP or AQPE for a minimum of 24-months immediately preceding the Type M application;
 - (d) No grade below three (3) on any item during their previous monitor check;
 - (e) A minimum of 32 PPCs conducted as an ACP or a combination of 32 MVs and LOEs conducted as an AQPE (of which no more than 50% were MVs);
 - (f) Employed as an active operational pilot with the sponsoring air operator (see section 2.3 for the definition of “active operational pilot”);

- (g) Professional suitability (as defined in section 2.3), as determined by the Issuing Authority; and
- (h) Nominated by the sponsoring air operator and approved by the Issuing Authority.

4.3 Eligibility Requirements for a Sponsoring Air Operator

- (1) Air operators must be operating under Part VII of the CARs and meet the following requirements to be eligible for TCCA consideration to sponsor ACPs / AQPEs for a Type M authorization:
 - (a) Must have an SMS or transitional SMS in place or a quality assurance program with the following components:
 - (i) Internal reporting program;
 - (ii) Reactive event analysis process; and
 - (iii) Open communication and reporting to a company executive or an appropriate representative.
 - (b) No uncorrected or repetitive findings related to pilot training in surveillance results that the Issuing Authority deems to be significant enough to prevent the sponsorship of a delegate for Type M authority;
 - (c) Employ sufficient ACPs (Type A) or AQPEs (Type E), such that each person holding an ACP / AQPE (Type M) authority within the air operator will be conducting monitor checks on no less than four ACPs or AQPEs; and
 - (d) Have the support and approval of the Issuing Authority.

4.4 Implementation Plan

- (1) The Type M authority will be gradually phased-in to account for the broad spectrum of operations and risk profiles that exist in the Canadian aviation industry. Implementation will occur in two phases, as described below:
 - (a) Phase One:
 - (i) **Scope** – The following air operators will be eligible to participate in phase one:
 - (A) All air operators that operate under subpart 705 can apply to sponsor ACPs and AQPEs for Type M authority; and
 - (B) A total of four (4) air operators that operate under subparts 702, 703, and 704 will be invited by TCCA to sponsor ACPs for Type M authority. Two fixed-wing and two rotary-wing air operators will be invited to participate in this initiative, based on a desire to sample a broad spectrum of operations.
 - (ii) **Purpose** – The purpose of this phase is to monitor the initial implementation of this program change and make policy or procedural adjustments, if necessary, before considering the expansion of this initiative to other eligible air operators; and
 - (iii) **Duration** – A sufficient period of no less than 18-months to properly assess the shortcomings, merits, and overall results of this initiative.
 - (b) Phase Two:
 - (i) **Scope** – To be confirmed based on lessons learned during phase one. However, the intent is to extend the availability of this initiative to other eligible air operators, as appropriate;

- (ii) **Purpose** – To complete the full implementation of this program change; and
 - (iii) **Duration** –There is no defined timeline for completion.
- (2) Timings and updates on the above phases will be announced through the issuance of ACP / AQPE Bulletins. Following the completion of the trial phase, this AC will be amended as required and include the removal of section 4.4.

4.5 Application and Approval Process

- (1) Eligible air operators who wish to participate in this initiative are responsible for developing a process to attract and identify the best internal candidates for a Type M authorization based on organizational needs.
- (2) The ratio of Type M authorizations versus the number of ACPs / AQPEs that exist within an air operator should reflect the applicable logistical considerations and availability of Type M delegate(s). As a minimum, the air operator must employ sufficient ACPs (Type A) or AQPEs (Type E), such that each person holding an ACP / AQPE (Type M) authority within the air operator will be conducting monitor checks on no less than four ACPs or AQPEs. The primary objective is to ensure that Type M authorizations are kept to the minimum required to meet operational needs, which will assist with quality control and increase the likelihood that Type M authorizations are only issued to ACPs and AQPEs who have demonstrated the best attributes for the role.
- (3) Air operators are required to liaise with their TCCA POI to determine operational needs and discuss potential candidates for the Type M authorization. After the air operator and POI agree on a tentative plan, the air operator must provide the applicable regional TCCA office with a completed ACP Application Form (26-0837) or AQPE Application Form (26-0843) and resume for each candidate. The application forms are available on-line in the TCCA Forms Catalogue. The resume must clearly indicate how the applicant meets the required qualification and experience requirements specified in this circular.
- (4) The Issuing Authority will assess the application(s) and issue a conditional letter of Type M approval to each approved applicant, as applicable, and coordinate attendance on the Monitor Check Course. The approval is “conditional” on the successful completion of the Monitor Check Course. Upon successful completion of the Monitor Check Course, the delegate’s Letter of Accreditation will be revised to include Type M authorization.

4.6 Initial Training Requirements

- (1) Before an industry delegate can exercise the privileges of Type M authorization, the TCCA ACP / AQPE Monitor Check Course must be completed. This new course is mandatory for any person who conducts monitor checks, including CASIs.
- (2) The Monitor Check Course is two days in duration, which requires in-person attendance.

4.7 Qualification / Recent Experience Requirements

- (1) ACPs / AQPEs (Type M) must continue to meet the following qualification and recent experience requirements in order to exercise the Type M authority:
- (a) Qualification Requirements:
 - (i) Completed the TCCA ACP / AQPE Monitor Check Course;
 - (ii) Type rated on the aircraft (blanket or individual) that the monitor check is being conducted on, or type rated on a similar aircraft type, as per the approved list in Appendix D;

- (iii) Valid PPC on one of the aircraft types on the ACP / AQPE's Letter of Accreditation;
 - (iv) Knowledge of special authorizations, capabilities, or qualifications, such as RNP and/or RNP AR, RVR 1200/600/300 Cat II/III operations, offshore instrument approaches, heads up display, and enhanced vision systems, as applicable to the check;
 - (v) Knowledge of company operations manual(s), standard operating procedures, special authorization(s), Aircraft Flight Manuals (AFMs), Minimum Equipment Lists (MELs), Safety Management System (SMS) and any other pertinent operational publications that are applicable to the check;
 - (vi) If acting as a flight crew member during the monitor check, the ACP must be qualified and current on type in accordance with the CARs and company requirements;
 - (vii) Must attend a 'workshop' conducted by TCCA every three years, or on an interval that may be otherwise specified by TCCA; and
 - (viii) No performance or risk-related matters that renders the ACP or AQPE unsuitable for a Type M authorization, as determined by TCCA.
- (b) Recent Experience Requirements:
- (i) Must conduct no less than two monitor checks on an ACP or AQPE (Type V or E) in a twelve-month period;
 - (ii) Must conduct no less than two flight checks / evaluations as an ACP / AQPE in a twelve-month period; and
 - (iii) The total number of monitor checks and flight checks / evaluations conducted in a twelve-month period shall be no less than a combined total of six.

4.8 Monitor Checks on Delegates with Type M Authority

- (1) A Type M delegate will not be monitored while they are exercising Type M authority unless TCCA determines that there is a need to do so for sampling or performance-related reasons. In cases where TCCA chooses to observe the conduct of a monitor check, there could be a capacity limitation in the aircraft or simulator that prevents TCCA from observing the in-flight phase of the check. In such cases, TCCA will observe the pre-flight and post-flight phases of the monitor check.
- (2) Although there is no stated requirement to monitor a delegate while they are exercising Type M authority, there is still a requirement to monitor the delegate biennially while they are exercising Type A or Type E authority, as per the current policy in the ACP / AQPE Manuals.
- (3) During the above-mentioned biennial monitor check, if a Type M delegate receives a grading below three (3) on any of the five items assessed during an otherwise successful monitor check, the delegate's Type M authority will be revoked. In such cases, the delegates remaining authorizations will remain in effect. The delegate can apply to have the Type M authority reinstated after completing a subsequent monitor check that has no item(s) graded below three (3).
- (4) If the validity period of a delegate's monitor check has expired, the delegate is not authorized to exercise any ACP or AQPE privileges, including the Type M privilege. If the validity period of the 'monitor check workshop' has expired, the delegate can continue to exercise all ACP and AQPE privileges, **except** the Type M privilege.

4.9 Administration and Approvals for Monitor Checks

(1) Scheduling Monitor Checks

- (a) Air operators must provide their Issuing Authority with a list of planned monitor checks that are scheduled to be conducted by authorized company delegates (Type M authorization). The schedule must be provided to the Issuing Authority at least 90 days in advance of the **month** of the planned monitor(s). It is unlikely that the exact date of a monitor check will be known when this schedule is submitted, hence the need to only specify the **month** of the check; and
- (b) The following forms are available on-line in the TCCA Forms Catalogue and should be used to submit the planned schedule of checks: Form 26-0838 (ACP Schedule of Flight Checks) and Form 26-0845 (AQPE Monthly Schedule of Validations and Evaluations).

(2) Approving Monitor Checks

- (a) Upon receipt of the planned schedule, the applicable Issuing Authority will inform the air operator at least 60 days in advance of the **month** of the planned monitor(s) if any of the monitors will be conducted by TCCA for reasons related to performance, risk, or sampling purposes.

(3) ACP / AQPE Records

- (a) Regional Issuing Authorities will provide ACP / AQPE (Type M's) with historical data on flight checks conducted by an ACP / AQPE dating back to the previous monitor check. This information is required to support the briefing of the ACP / AQPE during a monitor check on their grading tendencies in comparison to national averages. There may also be a need to discuss the content of specific comment(s) made by an ACP or AQPE in a Flight Test Report(s), particularly in cases where the comment(s) is not consistent with the grading; and
- (b) The mechanism and timelines for exchanging this information between the region and the delegate conducting the monitor check(s) will be as determined / agreed upon by both parties.

4.10 Conduct of a Monitor Check

- (1) Monitor checks must be conducted in accordance with the guide provided in Appendix A –*Monitor Check Guide*.

4.11 Assessing a Monitor Check

- (1) Monitor checks must be assessed in accordance with the Performance Standard provided in Appendix B.

4.12 Quality Assurance

- (1) Air operators that sponsor Type M delegates must ensure that measures are implemented to support the quality assurance of monitor checks. As a minimum, a means of communication must be established to facilitate the internal passage of information between Type M delegates to promote standardization and identify areas of concern. This sharing of information is expected to occur no less than once each twelve-month period, and a written summary of the information must be retained in company records for three years.
- (2) The primary responsibility of a Type M delegate is to promote the standardization of flight checks, ensuring that checks are conducted in the manner described in the ACP / AQPE Manual, as applicable. Type M delegates are also expected to promote and preserve the integrity and

impartiality of flight checks. TCCA will support this endeavour by increasing internal efforts to regularly review flight test reports and evaluations generated by **all** ACPs and AQPEs. The aim of this measure is to look for trends in grading, pass rates, comment accuracy and administrative accuracy that trigger a concern and require intervention by TCCA.

4.13 Program Updates

- (1) Updates on the implementation of the Type M authorization will be delivered through ACP / AQPE Bulletins, as required.

5.0 INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

- (1) Not applicable.

6.0 DOCUMENT HISTORY

- (1) Not applicable.

7.0 CONTACT OFFICE

For more information, please contact:
Commercial Flight Standards - AARTF

Fax: 613-990-6215
E-mail: AARTInfoDoc@tc.gc.ca

Suggestions for amendment to this document are invited, and should be submitted to AARTInfoDoc@tc.gc.ca

Original signed by

Robert Sincennes
Director, Standards
Civil Aviation, Transport Canada

APPENDIX A — MONITOR CHECK GUIDE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- (1) The purpose of this guide is to provide persons who are conducting initial, recurrent or requalification monitor checks on ACPs and AQPEs with guidance on how to conduct the monitor check and complete the associated administrative tasks.
- (2) The procedures in this guide must be complied with and used in conjunction with section 6 of the ACP Manual and chapter 9 of the AQP Evaluator Manual.
- (3) CASIs must also refer to SI 700-002 for additional information on administrative duties associated with monitor checks.

2.0 AIM OF THE MONITOR CHECK

- (1) The primary aim of the ACP / AQPE monitor check is to confirm that the ACP / AQPE meets the requirements to conduct flight checks in a safe, competent and impartial manner in accordance with the practices defined in the ACP / AQPE Manuals.
- (2) Monitor checks also provide an opportunity to review the grading tendencies of an ACP / AQPE in comparison to the national average, and discuss any other matters related to the ACP or AQPE program that may be mutually beneficial.
- (3) The monitor check can also be used to improve standards of instruction and training through feedback to the ACP / AQPE with respect to flight check exercises, policies and/or procedures (i.e., SOPs) that are out of date, weak or commonly unsuccessful.
- (4) To provide the best opportunity to achieve the intent and aim of a monitor check, it is not an acceptable practice to assign ACPs, AQPEs or senior managers such as a Chief Pilot or Flight Operations Manager as a crew member (PPC candidate) on a monitored flight check.

3.0 PHASES OF THE MONITOR CHECK

- (1) The following five phases are assessed during an ACP/AQPE monitor:
 - (a) Flight Check Briefing;
 - (b) In-Flight Assessment;
 - (c) Flight Check Debriefing;
 - (d) Administration; and
 - (e) Knowledge and Professional Conduct.

4.0 ADMISSION TO THE MONITOR CHECK

- (1) For admission to a monitor check, the ACP / AQPE is required to present:
 - (a) A valid Commercial (for ACP Helicopter only authority) or Airline Transport Pilot Licence (for ACP and AQPE authority) in the same aircraft category; and
 - (b) Proof that he or she has the authority and required qualifications to conduct the flight check, as defined in the ACP / AQP manuals (such as Letter of Accreditation [for recurrent monitors], Type Rating, PPC, Special Authorizations, and operational experience or recent experience, as applicable).

5.0 CONDUCT OF THE MONITOR CHECK

5.1 Pre-Flight Briefing with the ACP / AQPE

- (1) The person conducting the monitor check will meet the ACP or AQPE before the flight check to discuss the following items:
 - (a) Purpose of the monitor;
 - (b) Content of the *Monitor Report Form*;
 - (c) Intended flow of the flight check, including the need for a brief meeting immediately following the in-flight assessment to discuss post-flight briefing points before debriefing the candidate(s); and
 - (d) Emphasize that the person conducting the monitor is not there to make decisions for the ACP / AQPE.
- (2) The following items must also be discussed with the ACP / AQPE, as applicable:
 - (a) Date of their last recurrent training course and when the next recurrent course is due;
 - (b) A review of relevant Advisory Circulars (AC) and ACP / AQPE Bulletins;
 - (c) A review of previous Flight Test Reports since the last monitor. Discuss any applicable trends in evaluation errors or tendencies, and pass/fail rates in comparison to the national average and ensure that the narrative in the reports is consistent with the mark awarded and linked to the wording and performance criteria defined in the ACP / AQPE manuals and applicable Flight Test Guide;
 - (d) Discuss the flight check authorizations applicable to the ACP's / AQPE's accreditation to ensure that they match operational needs and are consistent with the qualifications and currency of the ACP / AQPE;
 - (e) Ensure that the script or plan of action for the flight check is in compliance with the applicable PPC Schedule and follows all guidelines outlined in the applicable sections of the *CARs*, *ACP Manual*, and the *AQP Evaluator Manual*, as applicable. In general, the script or plan of action should provide fair, realistic and effective scenarios or exercises that create a positive experience and maximize opportunities to evaluate pilot / crew performance;
 - (f) For flight checks in an aircraft, review aircraft documents, weather, NOTAMS and ATC considerations; and
 - (g) For flight checks in a simulator, review unserviceable or defective equipment.

5.2 Pre-Flight Briefing with the Candidate(s) undergoing the Flight Check

- (1) Before the ACP / AQPE conducts the briefing with the flight check candidate(s), the person conducting the monitor will ensure that:
 - (a) The candidate(s) are aware that you will be a passive participant during the flight check to observe the ACP's / AQPEs performance; and
 - (b) That you will require time immediately after the flight check to confer with the ACP / AQPE prior to the conduct of the post-flight briefing.
- (2) During the ACP's / AQPE's briefing to the candidate(s), the person conducting the monitor will only intervene if asked, or if incorrect information is being provided that could negatively affect the outcome of the flight check.

5.3 In-Flight Assessment

- (1) During the in-flight assessment, the person conducting the monitor must maintain a passive role to the greatest extent possible. Observe whether the ACP / AQPE is conducting the flight check in accordance with the Performance Standard stated in Appendix B of this circular.
- (2) Avoid intervening during the flight check unless asked to do so by the ACP / AQPE, or if you observe incorrect actions being taken by the ACP / AQPE that could affect the safety or outcome of the flight check.
- (3) In the unlikely event that the ACP / AQPE is conducting the flight check in a manner that is clearly inhibiting the performance of the candidate(s) and / or is likely to be the cause of an unsuccessful flight check, the person conducting the monitor shall stop the flight check and inform the candidate(s) that the flight check is being temporarily suspended. In such cases, the ACP / AQPE must be debriefed on the concerns / issues in private, followed by one of the following actions, as appropriate:
 - (a) The person conducting the monitor, if adequately prepared and properly qualified to do so, can assume the role of the ACP / AQPE and complete the flight check to minimize the impact on the candidate(s); or
 - (b) If the above option is not exercised, the flight check must be terminated and managed in accordance with section 6.37 of the ACP Manual.
- (4) Upon completion of the flight check, the person conducting the monitor shall briefly confer with the ACP / AQPE to confirm agreement on the outcome (successful / unsuccessful). The candidate(s) must be informed of the outcome as soon as practical. If the person conducting the monitor and the ACP / AQPE disagree on the outcome, an agreement must be reached before informing the candidate(s). If there is no agreement, the evaluation of the person conducting the monitor will take precedence and will be used to debrief the candidate(s).

5.4 Post-Flight Meeting with the ACP / AQPE

- (1) After determining the successful / unsuccessful outcome of the flight check, the person conducting the monitor will meet privately with the ACP / AQPE to discuss the following matters prior to debriefing the candidates:
 - (a) Confirm the items to be discussed at the post-flight briefing;
 - (b) Discuss the ACP's / AQPE's justification for any item(s) graded as a (1) or (2), and the grading of any other item(s) that is worthy of discussion; and
 - (c) Confirm the method / technique to be used for the post-flight briefing, as defined in the ACP or AQPE Manual, as applicable.

5.5 Post-Flight Debriefing with the Candidate(s)

- (1) When the ACP / AQPE is conducting the post-flight debriefing, observe whether the debriefing is being conducted in accordance with the Performance Standard stated in the "Flight Check Debriefing" section in Appendix B of this circular.
- (2) Avoid intervening during the debriefing unless asked to do so, or if there is incorrect information being provided that could negatively affect the outcome of the flight check.
- (3) Before the ACP / AQPE provides the candidate(s) with completed forms, such as a Flight Test Report, or Application for Endorsement of a Rating, the forms must be reviewed for content and accuracy by the person conducting the monitor, to include particular attention to the following items:
 - (a) Ensure the text and structure of comments on the Flight Test Report are consistent with the applicable guidance and marking scale contained in the ACP and AQPE Manuals; and

- (b) Confirm that all forms and/or records have been completed in an accurate and complete manner. *(Note, for Initial and Requalification monitors, the CASI is the signing authority on all forms and licensing documents. CASIs should refer to SI 700-02 for further guidance on this matter).*

6.0 ASSESSING AND DEBRIEFING THE MONITOR CHECK

6.1 Assessing the Performance of the ACP / AQPE

- (1) The five phases of the monitor check are each graded separately, with a single grade assigned for each phase. Grading is based on the Performance Standard in Appendix B. A grading matrix is provided in Appendix C to assist with grading and to promote standardization. For AQPE monitor checks, it is acceptable to use the AQPE grading matrix instead of Appendix C.
- (2) A monitor check is assessed as “Successful” when:
 - (a) There are no grades of (1); and
 - (b) There are no more than two grades of (2).
- (3) A monitor check is assessed as “Unsuccessful” when:
 - (a) There is one or more grades of (1); or
 - (b) There are three or more grades of (2).

6.2 Debriefing the ACP / AQPE on a Successful Monitor Check

- (1) The ACP / AQPE shall be debriefed in private to discuss the following items:
 - (a) Discuss the ACP / AQPE’s performance, addressing all five phases of the flight check and highlighting strengths, weaknesses, and suggestions for improvement;
 - (b) If the monitor was an initial monitor, advise the ACP / AQPE of the following:
 - (i) A delegate is not authorized to conduct a flight check prior to receiving a Letter of Accreditation;
 - (ii) A recurrent monitor will be required prior to the first day of the 13th month, based on the completion date of the initial monitor; and
 - (iii) Remind the delegate of their responsibility to coordinate the scheduling of their next monitor to ensure that it occurs within 90 days before the expiry date.
 - (c) If the monitor was a recurrent monitor, advise the ACP / AQPE of the following:
 - (i) The monitor is valid for 24 months if the Monitor Report Form has no grades of (2);
 - (ii) The monitor is valid for 12 months if the Monitor Report Form has one or two grades of (2);
 - (iii) If the monitor was conducted for the purposes of revising the authorities on a Letter of Accreditation, the ACP / AQPE is not authorized to exercise any of the **revised** authorities prior to receiving a revised Letter of Accreditation; and
 - (iv) Remind the ACP or AQPE of the responsibility to coordinate the scheduling of their next monitor to ensure that it occurs within 90 days before the expiry date.

6.3 Debriefing the ACP / AQPE on an Unsuccessful Monitor Check

- (1) The ACP / AQPE shall be debriefed in private to discuss the following items:
 - (a) Discuss the ACP's / AQPE's performance, addressing all five phases of the flight check and highlighting strengths, weaknesses, and areas that require remedial training prior to reapplying for a subsequent assessment;
 - (b) Inform the ACP / AQPE that Transport Canada will issue one of the following letters:
 - (i) A "Notice of Suspension" with respect to the ACP's / AQPE's Letter of Accreditation (for recurrent monitors); or
 - (ii) A "Notice of Refusal to Issue" with respect to an ACP's / AQPE's application for an initial delegation, or requalification or revision to an existing delegation.
 - (c) Inform the ACP / AQPE of the right to request a review of the assessment by the Transportation Appeal Tribunal of Canada (TATC). The deadline to request this review will be specified in the letter from Transport Canada;
 - (d) As an alternative to pursuing a TATC review, advise the ACP / AQPE that they can also request a review of the assessment by the applicable Issuing Authority. If the delegate is not satisfied with the review completed by the Issuing Authority, the option of requesting a review by the TATC remains available. Additional information is available on the TATC website and the ACP / AQPE Manuals; and
 - (e) The person who conducted the monitor is responsible for notifying the applicable Issuing Authority of the unsuccessful assessment within two business days. Air operators that have an established practice in place to notify the applicable regional authority of flight check results (such as PPCs) can use the same practice to provide the notification of an unsuccessful monitor check.

6.4 Complaints against a Person Conducting a Monitor Check

- (1) During the debriefing, a candidate(s) must be informed of their right to lodge a formal complaint if they indicate that the person conducting the monitor has displayed inappropriate or unprofessional behavior. Inform the candidate that the process to make a complaint is identical to the process outlined in the ACP Manual in section 4.23 – "Complaints Concerning an ACP's conduct".

7.0 ACP / AQPE MONITOR REPORT FORM

- (1) The ACP / AQPE Monitor Report Form must be completed and submitted to TCCA within five (5) working days.
- (2) The Monitor Report Form is accessed, completed and submitted on-line. A PDF version of the form is also available for reference purposes in the TCCA Forms Catalogue (Form # 26-0844). The on-line version of the form has an 'information' icon associated with each field that can be accessed to view completion instructions.
- (3) The link to access the on-line portal / form is posted on the TCCA website for the ACP / APQ programs. The address for the ACP / AQP website is as follows:
 - (a) <https://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/civilaviation/standards/commerce-operationalstandards-acp-menu-380.htm>
- (4) There are two separate links provided – one for industry delegates and a separate link for CASIs. Industry delegates must have a "GC Key" account to access the on-line portal.
- (5) CASIs can only access the on-line portal through the TCCA Intranet using a TCCA approved device. (CASI access via the public internet or through the link used by external delegates is not possible).

- (6) Monitor Report Forms that are completed and submitted on-line are directed to a central mailbox of the applicable TCCA regional authority. Upon receipt of the report, the following actions will be completed by TCCA, regardless of whether the report was submitted by a CASI or an industry delegate:
- (a) The report will be re-directed to the appropriate regional TCCA representative who will review the contents of the report for accuracy and acceptance;
 - (b) The TCCA representative will “accept” or “reject” the report;
 - (c) When a report is ‘accepted’, an email notification and copy of the accepted monitor report will be sent to the person that submitted the report; and
 - (d) When a report is ‘rejected’, the person who submitted the report will receive an email that states the corrective action that is required prior to re-submission.
- (7) In accordance with paragraph 8(2)(a) of the Privacy Act, a copy of the ACP / AQPE Monitor Report Form can be provided to and retained by the following persons / agencies, as applicable:
- (a) ACP / AQPE;
 - (b) CASI or ACP / AQPE (Type M) who conducted the monitor;
 - (c) The air operator that employs the ACP / AQPE (Type M); and
 - (d) TCCA.
- (8) Distribution of the monitor report to any persons or agencies, other than those named above, is in contravention of the *Privacy Act* and is not authorized.

APPENDIX B - PERFORMANCE STANDARD

1.0 PERFORMANCE STANDARD

1.1 The five phases of the monitored flight check are to be assessed in accordance with the performance standards provided below.

(Phase One) - FLIGHT CHECK BRIEFING	
<i>Aim</i>	<i>To determine that the ACP/AQPE can prepare, coordinate and deliver a proper flight check briefing. This may include a knowledge assessment and/or instruction (as applicable).</i>
Elements	Performance Standard
Location	Selects a location that is professional, distraction-free and properly equipped for the flight check briefing.
Preparation and Delivery	Plans and delivers a flight check briefing that is thorough, accurate, clear, logically ordered and an appropriate length.
Rapport	Establishes a cordial and professional relationship with the candidate(s) that facilitates trust and open communication and places the candidate(s) at ease.
Questions (If applicable)	Asks questions during the oral assessment that are operationally relevant, well-structured, delivered in a clear manner, and contain the required depth to effectively determine a candidate(s) knowledge.
Instruction (AQP Only)	Applies timely instruction and effective instructional techniques, as required, during validations.

(Phase Two) - IN-FLIGHT ASSESSMENT	
<i>Aim</i>	<i>To determine that the ACP/AQPE can properly conduct and accurately grade the in-flight phase of the flight check.</i>
Elements	Performance Standard
Management	Conducts the in-flight phase with a good flow and pace, with a duration appropriate to the type of check. In a simulator, this includes an assessment of how well the ACP or AQPE operates or coordinates the operation of the device. In an aircraft, this includes an assessment of safety of flight considerations.
Role Playing	In a simulator, role-plays entities such as ATC, dispatch, maintenance, and additional crew members in an accurate and realistic manner.
Script or Plan	Adheres to the PPC script or plan of action, adjusting for unexpected disruptions or occurrences and properly managing 'repeats' for maneuvers, as applicable.
Professionalism	Maintains a professional and impartial relationship with the candidate(s), thereby encouraging reciprocal behavior.
Grading	Grades performance in an accurate, reasonable, and timely manner.
Instruction (AQP Only)	Applies timely instruction and effective instructional techniques, as required, during validations.

(Phase Three) - FLIGHT CHECK DEBRIEFING	
<i>Aim</i>	<i>To determine that the ACP/AQPE can prepare and conduct a proper flight check debriefing.</i>
Elements	Performance Standard
Debriefing Method	Uses an appropriate debriefing method that reflects the outcome of the flight check. For a successful flight check, facilitates a debriefing whereby the candidate(s) are doing the fault analysis with little assistance (to the extent possible). For an unsuccessful flight check, applies an appropriate technique.
Duration	Ensures the duration of the debriefing is commensurate with the performance of the candidate(s).
Content and Relevance	Highlights strengths and weaknesses of the candidate(s), ensuring that required/relevant items are covered and emphasized. Avoids the emphasis of piloting techniques that are inconsistent with standard operating procedures.
Linking Technical and Non-Technical Performance	Draws links between technical and non-technical performance in a manner that enhances the candidate(s) skill-sets with respect to CRM, situational awareness, threat and error management, and safety of flight.
Instruction (AQP Only)	Applies timely instruction and effective instructional techniques, as required, during validations.

(Phase Four) - ADMINISTRATION	
<i>Aim</i>	<i>To determine that the ACP/AQPE can effectively complete the required administrative actions.</i>
Elements	Performance Standard
Candidate(s) Eligibility	Accurately confirms the eligibility of the candidate(s) to undertake the flight check.
Grading and Comment Accuracy	Accurately determines final grading with access to reference material and formulates clear and accurate written comments where required.
Administrative Actions	Completes and annotates applicable Transport Canada and air operator forms / reports / licensing documents / records in a thorough, clear and accurate manner.

(Phase Five) – KNOWLEDGE AND PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT	
<i>Aim</i>	<i>To determine that the ACP/AQPE understands the duties and responsibilities associated with their delegation of authority and acts accordingly and possesses the required regulatory and operational knowledge.</i>
Elements	Performance Standard
Professional Conduct	Displays a positive attitude towards the ACP or AQPE program and conducts the flight check in an impartial and reasonable manner. This includes responding appropriately to all observed actions and faults that occur during the flight check, which can be summarized as ‘duty of care’.
Knowledge	Demonstrates a good understanding of ACP/AQPE policies and procedures, ACP/AQPE indemnification, and the CARs/CASS. Demonstrates a good understanding of the air operator’s training program, operations manual (COM), flight operations, and aircraft SOPs and technical knowledge.

APPENDIX C – MONITOR CHECK GRADING MATRIX

					MARKS			
					4	3	2	1
FLIGHT CHECK BRIEFING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Location used was properly equipped, professional, and distraction-free. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Location used was good, with minor deficiencies that had no substantive impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Location used was acceptable but had deficiencies that impacted the briefing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Location used was unacceptable with multiple deficiencies that created an unprofessional and ineffective briefing environment. 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preparation and delivery were thorough, accurate, clear, concise, and of appropriate length. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preparation and delivery were good, with minor errors or omissions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preparation and delivery were weak, reflected by some errors and omissions in the briefing, lack of clarity, or inappropriate length. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preparation and delivery were unacceptable as a result of numerous errors and omissions in the briefing or a significant lack of clarity. 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rapport with candidate(s) was very good and facilitated open communication. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rapport with candidate(s) was positive and did not significantly impede communication or create uneasiness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rapport with candidate(s) was weak and noticeably inhibited interaction and communication. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rapport with candidate(s) was unacceptable or created significant barriers to communication and cooperation. 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions had a high level of operational relevance and were delivered effectively. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions had a reasonable level of operational relevance and were delivered reasonably well. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some questions had little operational value or relevance and lacked clarity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions were poorly selected with no operational value or relevance and / or lacked significant clarity and were not effective. 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instruction and technique were appropriate and effective (AQP Only). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instruction and technique were generally appropriate and effective with minor areas for improvement (AQP Only). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instruction and technique were weak and marginally effective (AQP only). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instruction and technique were poor and ineffective. (AQP only). 				

					MARKS			
					4	3	2	1
IN-FLIGHT ASSESSMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Session was efficiently managed, with a good flow. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Session was efficient and well-managed, with minor areas for improvement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Session was managed in an acceptable manner but lacked efficiency with noticeable disruptions to the flow. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management of session was haphazard and negatively impacted the outcome. 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Role-playing (as applicable) was realistic and effective. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Role-playing (as applicable) was realistic and effective, with minor areas for improvement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Role-playing (as applicable) was acceptable but lacked realism and / or accuracy at times. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Role-playing (as applicable) repeatedly lacked accuracy and realism and was noticeably confusing for the candidate(s). 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Session was conducted in accordance with the script or plan of action with no unwarranted deviations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Session was conducted in accordance with the script or plan of action with minor deviations that were not warranted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were notable deviations, omissions, or additions to the script or plan of action that were not warranted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major unwarranted deviations from the script or plan of action resulted in the omission of required items or the unnecessary repetition of items. 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Displayed a high level of professionalism throughout session. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Displayed professionalism throughout session with minor areas for improvement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Displayed some lapses in professionalism. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professionalism displayed was unacceptable. 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grading of sequences was timely and accurate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grading of sequences was timely and accurate with minor areas for improvement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grading of sequences was not always timely or accurate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grading of sequences was repeatedly inaccurate, or delayed grading resulted in missed items and/or inaccurate grade(s). 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instruction and technique were appropriate and effective (AQP Only). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instruction and technique were generally appropriate and effective with minor areas for improvement (AQP Only). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instruction and technique were weak and marginally effective (AQP only). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instruction and technique were poor and ineffective. (AQP only). 				

					MARKS			
					4	3	2	1
FLIGHT CHECK DEBRIEFING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debriefing length and technique were optimum and commensurate with the candidate(s) performance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debriefing length and technique were good, with minor areas for improvement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debriefing duration was not commensurate with candidate(s) performance. • Debriefing technique was marginally effective. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debriefing duration was excessively short or long and created a negative experience for the candidate(s). • Debriefing technique was inappropriate and ineffective. 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content and relevance were accurate, thorough, and appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content and relevance were generally good, with minor omissions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notable omissions in the content, and / or notable areas of irrelevance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Omitted significant areas of the flight test that warranted discussion or had significant discussion on irrelevant items. 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant strengths and weaknesses were properly identified and accurately addressed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most relevant strengths and weaknesses were properly identified and addressed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notable omissions in identifying and addressing relevant strengths and weaknesses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misidentified, or failed to adequately discuss relevant strengths and weaknesses. 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linking technical and non-technical performance was clearly demonstrated and addressed relevant CRM, Situational Awareness, and Threat and Error Management matters. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linking technical and non-technical performance was generally good, and addressed most relevant CRM, Situational Awareness, and Threat and Error Management matters. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notable omissions in the linking of technical and non-technical performance. Numerous omissions of relevant CRM, Situational Awareness, and Threat and Error Management matters. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no effort to link technical and non-technical performance. Relevant CRM, Situational Awareness, and Threat and Error Management matters were poorly addressed or omitted. 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instruction and technique were appropriate and effective (AQP Only). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instruction and technique were generally appropriate and effective with minor areas for improvement (AQP Only). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instruction and technique were weak and marginally effective (AQP only). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instruction and technique were poor and ineffective (AQP only). 				

					MARKS											
					4	3	2	1								
ADMINISTRATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmation of candidate(s) eligibility was timely and accurate. 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmation of candidate(s) eligibility was timely and conducted with minor errors that were resolved. 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmation of candidate(s) eligibility occurred late in the flight check, or there were notable errors in the assessment of eligibility. 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmation of candidate(s) eligibility did not occur. 			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grading and comments on the applicable report / record were accurate and appropriate. 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grading and comments on the applicable report / record were generally accurate and appropriate. 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although not affecting the pass / fail assessment, grading on the applicable report / record FTR had areas of inaccuracy and comments that did not always reflect the grading. 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant errors in grading and comment accuracy affected the quality, validity or outcome of the flight assessment. 			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All required fields on all forms / records / license(s) were accurately completed. 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All required fields on all forms / records / license(s) were accurately completed, with minor errors or omissions. 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notable difficulty or errors filling out forms / records / license(s). 				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant difficulty or errors filling out forms / records / license(s). 			

					MARKS			
					4	3	2	1
KNOWLEDGE AND PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thorough and current knowledge of the ACP / AQPE program(s) and policies, including indemnification policy. • Thorough and current knowledge of CARs / CASS. • Thorough and current knowledge of technical (flight manual) and company related publications (COM, SOPs, etc.) related to the aircraft type / flight check. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good knowledge of the ACP / AQPE program(s) and policies, including indemnification policy, with minor lapses noted. • Good knowledge of CARs / CASS, with minor lapses noted. • Good knowledge of technical (flight manual) and company related publications (COM, SOPs, etc.) related to the aircraft type / flight check, with minor lapses noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notable gaps in knowledge of the ACP / AQPE program(s) and policies, including indemnification policy. • Notable gaps in knowledge of CARs / CASS. • Notable gaps in technical (flight manual) and company related publications (COM, SOPs, etc.) related to the aircraft type / flight check. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant shortfalls in knowledge of the ACP / AQPE program(s) and policies, including indemnification policy. • Significant shortfalls in knowledge of CARs / CASS. • Significant shortfalls in knowledge of technical (flight manual) and company related publications (COM, SOPs, etc.) related to the aircraft type / flight check. 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exercise of authority was always impartial and always reflected 'duty of care'. • Displayed positive and enthusiastic attitude towards the program without waver. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No notable areas of concern with exercise of authority or 'duty of care'. • Generally displayed a positive and enthusiastic attitude towards the program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notable lapses in the exercise of authority or 'duty of care', such that company / candidate(s) interests appeared to occasionally have primacy. • Displayed an ambivalent attitude towards the program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Company / candidate(s) interests were consistently placed ahead of the responsibilities to conduct the flight test in an impartial manner. No adherence to 'duty of care'. • Displayed a negative attitude towards the program. 				

APPENDIX D – SIMILAR AIRCRAFT TYPES

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- (1) Similar aircraft types represent two or more aircraft types of the same make from the same aircraft generation, which share a high level of commonality in terms of technology, design features and flight characteristics.
- (2) Listed below are aeroplane and helicopter types that require individual type ratings but are deemed similar for the purposes of this AC.

2.0 AEROPLANE

- (1) Similar aeroplane types:
 - (a) AT42 and AT72
 - (b) B757 and B767
 - (c) BA31 and BA41
 - (d) C525, C25A and C25B
 - (e) C500, C550 and C560
 - (f) EA32 and EA33
 - (g) FA10 and FA20
 - (h) FA50 and FA90
 - (i) GALX, G100 and G150
 - (j) G2 and G3
 - (k) G4 and GLF5
 - (l) H25 and H251
 - (m) LR23, LR24, LR25, LR28 and LR29
 - (n) LR35 and LR36
 - (o) E50P and E55P

3.0 HELICOPTER

- (1) Similar helicopter types:
 - (a) BH22 and BH23
 - (b) HU52 and HU60
 - (c) S313 and S318
 - (d) S316 and S319