



**DECISION BY THE CAA
FOLLOWING A REGULATORY REVIEW**

No: 25

Publication date: 10 April 2014

**REVIEW OF CONDUCT OF AN EXAMINER AUTHORISATION ACCEPTANCE CHECK UNDER
REGULATION 6 OF THE CIVIL AVIATION AUTHORITY REGULATIONS 1991**

CAA Board members: Captain Roger Whitefield
Michael Medlicott

Background

The appellant (A) undertook an Examiner Authorisation Acceptance Check (EAAC) for the purpose of re-validating his class rating examiner authorisation. The test was conducted by a CAA staff flight examiner. At the end of that check, the examiner informed A that he was not prepared to recommend the re-validation of his authorisation.

A requested a review under Regulation 6 of the conduct of that check

The grounds on which the review is requested

A set out a number of criticisms of the conduct of the EAAC. These included:

- Surprise that the EAAC was conducted as a "pass/fail" event rather than an opportunity to carry out standardisation and offer advice.
- Given that they are pass/fail examinations, the lack of a proper pre-test brief, a full debrief in an accepted manner with a detailed written failure notice.
- Inconsistencies between the standards required and those required by a different CAA examiner when conducting an EAAC on A on another occasion.

The SRG case

Officials of the CAA's Safety Regulation Group (SRG) explained it has always been the case that the assessment of examiners is conducted on the basis that an examiner may not be re-validated.

SRG argued that there was no reason for a written notification of failure following the second check because A did not by that stage have any examiner privileges. A thorough debrief had been conducted.

SRG denied that there were any inconsistencies between the two checks. SRG explained why different debrief points were raised.

The latest version of this document is available in electronic format at www.caa.co.uk/publications, where you may also register for e-mail notification of amendments.



Documents

Document Sharing Hub

The decision

The Panel found that the EAAC was properly conducted.

Reasons for decision

The panel are firmly of the opinion that UK aviation safety is based on good law, high quality training and checking and the upholding of standards. This review goes to the heart of maintaining standards of both candidates and those empowered by the CAA to act as authorised examiners.

Whether or not an EAAC ought to be conducted on a pass/fail basis is a question of policy for SRG. It does not go to the question of whether this particular check was properly conducted. In point of fact, it seemed to the Panel self evident that any such check should carry with it the possibility of removing an examiner's authorisation where an appropriate standard is not met.

A expressed the opinion that he was not fully de-briefed after the first check and therefore was not in a position to rectify any deficiencies in his performance prior to the second check. The Panel concluded that the fail points in the second check were not related to those in the first.

On the question of alleged inconsistencies, the Panel accept the arguments put forward by SRG and accordingly find no material differences in the way in which the first and second checks were conducted.

The Panel do not consider that the decision debrief only verbally and not to provide a written notification of failure and reasons amounted to improper conduct of the check.

Recommendations

The Panel recommended that SRG reviews and publishes the guidance it provides for the conduct of an EAAC. It would be good practice if this guidance provided for the issuing of a document in writing at the conclusion of any such check setting out whether the candidate has passed or failed, key issues arising from the check and any recommended further training.

The Panel noted that SRG intends to write to A with advice on appropriate training prior to A undertaking a further check. The Panel recommended that this letter includes a thorough debrief on his performance in both checks.

The Panel suggested that A reassess his approach to testing in the light of these two failures.