SOFEMA
AVIATION SERVICES

Part CAMO Compliance Auditing - Best Practices for EASA Part 145 Compliance Audits

Steve Bentley FRAeS CEO of Sofema Aviation Services (SAS) takes a deep dive into the challenges of ensuring CAMO - 145 interface compliance whilst adding process value.

Introduction: Role of CAMO Auditors in the CAMO–AMO Dynamic

Continuing Airworthiness Management Organisations (CAMOs) and Approved Maintenance Organisations (AMOs) must work in tandem to keep aircraft safe and airworthy.

The CAMO plans and oversees maintenance needs (the “head”), while the AMO executes the physical work (the “hands”). In practice, especially under tight deadlines, these roles can blur – a perfectly planned schedule means nothing if execution falters, and flawless maintenance is useless if not properly planned or documented.

- The CAMO compliance auditor plays a critical role by ensuring that the interface between planning and execution functions smoothly and in full compliance with aviation regulations.
- The CAMO auditor validates that the CAMO–AMO coordination, contracts, and processes meet the requirements of Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 and that both parties uphold their responsibilities.

Regulatory Context: Under EASA rules (Part-CAMO and Part-145), the aircraft operator (or CAMO acting on the operator’s behalf) retains ultimate responsibility for continuing airworthiness.

- The CAMO must ensure all maintenance is performed by appropriately approved organizations and must have formal maintenance contracts defining each party’s duties.
- The CAMO’s compliance monitoring system is expected to oversee the performance of contracted AMOs – typically through audits and inspections – to confirm that maintenance is carried out in accordance with regulations and the operator’s standards.
- In essence, CAMO auditors act as the 2nd Line of defense (the first being the business area owner / nominated person)

- They verify that the planning–execution handshake is firm, that communication channels are effective, and that any gap between CAMO instructions and AMO actions is closed before it can impact airworthiness.

Collaborative Mindset: An effective CAMO–AMO relationship should evolve from a simple contractual transaction to a collaborative partnership.

Note - the interdependence of CAMOs and AMOs is key to moving away from an "us-and-them" mentality.

- Both sides share the common goal of safety.

- CAMO auditors can promote this mindset by looking not just for compliance ticks in boxes, but for evidence of healthy collaboration:
  - Joint planning meetings,
  - Integrated procedures, and
  - Open communication channels.

- By focusing audits on the **interface** (how information, work orders, and feedback flow between CAMO and AMO), auditors reinforce a culture of shared accountability and continuous improvement.

The Challenge of Tender-Based Maintenance Projects

Modern airline operations often outsource heavy maintenance projects to third-party AMOs through competitive tenders. While cost-effective, this practice means relationships are short-term and transactional rather than long-term partnerships.

- Each major maintenance check may involve a different provider, with little continuity or familiarity from project to project.

- As a result of the above CAMO compliance auditors frequently encounter the following challenges inherent in this tender-driven process:

  - Limited Familiarity - The CAMO and the selected AMO may have never worked together before.
  - Procedures, software systems, and corporate cultures can differ significantly, forcing a steep learning curve for both parties on each new project

- Without sufficient preparation, both teams risk misunderstandings and mistakes due to these organizational differences.
- A CAMO auditor might find, for example, that a one-off maintenance provider was not fully briefed on the operator's required procedures, leading to omissions in documentation or deviations from the intended process.

- **Transactional Mindset -** When maintenance is contracted via a fixed-price tender with tight deadlines, each side may focus narrowly on fulfilling its own contractual obligations.
    - Open communication can suffer – the AMO might be hesitant to report problems or request help, fearing extra costs or blame, and the CAMO might maintain a strict "oversight" stance rather than an engaging one

Note – A lack of transparency is risky; auditors often discover latent issues (e.g. undocumented deferrals, out-of-scope repairs) only after the project completion, whereas a more collaborative approach could have enable the issue to be addressed in real time.

- **Weak Pre-Project Integration:** Unlike an in-house maintenance team or established partnership, a one-time contractor AMO might not be involved in the early planning stages.
- Key details – special tooling needs, known trouble areas from the aircraft's history, lessor return conditions, quality expectations – may only surface when the aircraft arrives for maintenance
    - This reactive approach reduces efficiency and can lead to scope creep or delays.
    - From an audit perspective, lack of early involvement is a red flag: it often correlates with misaligned work packages, last-minute procedure changes, or misunderstandings about work scope.
- **Impact on Compliance -**Tender-based relationships, if not well-managed, tend to be procedurally weaker at the interface.
    - The CAMO's Continuing Airworthiness Management Exposition (CAME) and the AMO's Maintenance Organisation Exposition (MOE) might not be

fully harmonized for the project's needs, simply because the organizations have not built a working rhythm.
  - The compliance auditor should pay special attention to whether interface controls (briefings, agreed procedures, oversight plans) were established for each tendered project.
  - Absent or inadequate interface agreements often manifest as findings - for example, maintenance records not in the format the CAMO requires, or maintenance actions performed that do not align with the operator's continuous airworthiness program.

STC and Modification Oversight

Heavy maintenance visits often coincide with major modifications or repairs to the aircraft, cabin refurbishments, avionics upgrades, structural repairs, or incorporation of Supplemental Type Certificates (STCs) for new equipment.

- Such projects add another layer of complexity because a third party – a design organization (Part 21, Subpart J approved) – usually enters the mixlinkedin.com. Oversight of modifications therefore demands *tri-party* coordination among the CAMO, the AMO, and the design/engineering organization.

- The auditor should consider and take note of the following best practices for managing STC projects which start with rigorous planning and communication before the aircraft enters the maintenance bay.
  - The Auditor should check for dedicated pre-check meetings focused on the modification aspects of the visit, where engineers from the design organization, CAMO planners, and AMO representatives review the engineering orders and data packages
  - All required parts, tooling, and approved data (drawings, instructions, etc.) should be confirmed on-site *before* the heavy check begins
  - Additionally, the parties should agree on how to handle any necessary design changes or deviations (for example, if a snag requires a change to the STC design, what is the process to obtain and approve that change).
  - By including the mod tasks in the overall maintenance work package – with clear references to design documents and special instructions – the

CAMO and AMO ensure that nothing falls through the cracks amidst routine maintenance work

- A robust integrated plan will list STC-related tasks alongside regular inspection tasks, and assign them appropriate downtime and manpower.

Key Oversight Challenges: Even with good planning, CAMO auditors need to check that certain critical points in STC management are being addressed:

- **Engineering Data Coordination:** The CAMO is typically responsible for obtaining or accepting the design data (STC certificates, engineering orders, repair schemes) and making sure it is the correct revision and appropriate for the aircraft's configuration
  - The data must also be integrated into the continuing airworthiness context – for instance, the CAMO should assess whether the modification will alter the aircraft's maintenance program or require updates to manuals.
  - The AMO, for its part, must use the provided data correctly and completely and should not proceed with the mod if clarifications are needed.
  - Poor communication in this handoff can lead to an AMO technician working from
- **Design Approvals and Delays:** It's not uncommon for STC projects to be delayed by design issues – perhaps a drawing isn't approved in time, or additional engineering analysis is needed mid-project.
  - In such cases, the CAMO must act as a mediator between the AMO and the design organization
  - Auditors should verify that there are procedures for contacting the design organization quickly and that any delay is managed

Note - If design-related delays are frequent or unmanaged, it indicates a weakness in project planning or contractual terms.

- **AMO Capability and Approvals:** Not all Part-145 organizations are experienced with every type of modification.
  - The CAMO should vet the AMO's capability to perform the specific STC or repair – including checking that the AMO has the necessary equipment, expertise, and scope of approval.

  - If the AMO needed a one-time approval or had to subcontract part of the mod (e.g. specialized composite repair), these arrangements should be secured well in advance
  - A scramble to accommodate a capability gap after the project starts is a classic *planning shortfall* that strains the CAMO–AMO
  - As part of audit due diligence, one might check if the maintenance contract or work order addressed any special arrangements (for example, requiring the AMO to inform the CAMO of any subcontractors or to obtain CAMO approval for subcontracting certain tasks).

- The CAMO's team (often a Maintenance Control Center or engineering liaison group) should have a solid understanding of Part 21 design change processes and how they intersect with Part-145 work
  - In practice, this means CAMO personnel overseeing the maintenance event can interpret engineering orders, ensure the AMO's queries are resolved through proper design channels, and confirm that all mod paperwork (like an STC's Instructions for Continued Airworthiness) is incorporated into the aircraft records.

Important Note - having an engineering-aware CAMO liaison on duty is essential – "Technical engineering understanding of Part 21 Subpart G & J functions (the technical management of major mods and repairs) is essential for those overseeing maintenance projects"

Shared Goal Philosophy:

- A recurring theme in best practices is treating modifications not as isolated contract deliverables but as shared goals for the aircraft's future operation.
- Auditors should look for tangible evidence of effective collaboration between the CAMO and AMO during STC embodiment projects.
  - This includes joint risk assessments tailored to the modification work and CAMO-led training or briefing sessions for AMO staff addressing specific technical or operational considerations.

Real-Time Event Coordination (AOG and Urgent Repairs)

- Aircraft-on-ground (AOG) events and other urgent repairs test the CAMO–AMO interface in high-pressure, time-critical conditions.

- The CAMO must coordinate a rapid return-to-service, frequently by engaging an external Part-145 organization for troubleshooting or repairs on short notice.
- Speed and clarity of communication become paramount during AOG events. Without pre-established protocols, there is high potential for confusion. For example, if the AMO's engineer on site is unsure about the operator's technical policy for a deferral or needs data from the aircraft records, any delay in reaching the CAMO can directly translate to extended downtime.
- The final accountability for airworthiness lies with the certifying engineer who must sign the Certificate of Release to Service (CRS) - How effective is the overall process and how is competence managed.
- CAMO auditors need to ensure that no procedural or managerial pressure undermines this principle. A good sign is when both CAMO and AMO management explicitly empower engineers to make safety-first decisions during AOG events, and have agreed processes to resolve disagreements (for example, involving the CAMO's postholder if an impasse arises).

Best Practices for AOG Interface: To strengthen the CAMO–AMO interface in real-time scenarios, consider the following practices:

- **AOG Support Agreements:** The CAMO should have clear Service Level Agreements (SLAs) with one or more AMOs for AOG support in various regions.
  - These agreements typically spell out guaranteed response times, the procedure for raising an AOG event, and the logistics (e.g. passes, transport for mechanics, parts supply chain) in advance.
  - From an audit standpoint, check that these agreements exist and that both sides have documented procedures for AOG events (often in the CAME for the operator and in the MOE for the maintenance org).
- **Emergency Communication Protocols:** Well-defined communication protocols are crucial.
  - This includes a single point of contact at the CAMO available 24/7 (such as a Maintenance Control Center duty engineer) and reciprocally a contact at the AMO, so there is no confusion about who talks to whom.
  - Many operators establish a dedicated AOG desk or hotline.

  - Regular drills or exercises can be done to ensure everyone knows the protocol.
  - Auditors might verify if contact lists are up-to-date and if any debrief reports from past AOG incidents identified communication gaps.

- **Decision Trees and Authority:** Both organizations should understand the decision-making flow in urgent cases.
  - For example, if an unexpected damage is found, can the AMO proceed with a standard repair, or must they await CAMO engineering instruction?
  - If a part is not available, who decides to cannibalize from another aircraft or to defer the item?
  - Clear guidelines (potentially a simple flowchart or checklist) agreed upon in advance save time.
  - It should be explicit that the CAMO is responsible for any deviation from the approved maintenance program (like using MEL or granting concessions), and the AMO is responsible for the quality of the work and the release.
  - Importantly, each AOG event should be treated as both a technical and compliance exercise – speed is vital, but not at the expense of proper documentation and adherence to procedures.

Auditors play a critical role in evaluating the resilience and effectiveness of the CAMO–AMO interface during real-time maintenance events.

- Their task is to assess whether the existing systems and procedures can withstand operational pressure without compromising compliance.
- This often involves reviewing past incidents—such as AOG situations—or conducting simulated scenarios to verify that appropriate governance mechanisms were in place.
- Auditors should look for evidence of procedural shortcuts taken under stress, assess how these were addressed, and determine whether the organization conducted internal reviews or implemented corrective actions.
- By focusing on preparedness, clarity of roles, and communication protocols, auditors support the development of a robust interface that maintains regulatory compliance even in high-pressure situations.

Harmonizing Procedures and Quality Standards

Every aviation organization has its own internal procedures, standards, and culture documented in its manuals. When a CAMO and an AMO collaborate, these procedural ecosystems meet – and sometimes clash.

- A common source of findings during CAMO audits of Part-145 maintenance events is a misalignment between the operator's required processes and the maintenance organization's way of working. Some typical examples of procedural misalignment include:

Deferred Defect Management: The operator's CAMO might have specific procedures for deferred defects (MEL items) – perhaps stricter monitoring or additional sign-offs – which the AMO's staff might not be used to if they mainly serve many customers with varying rules. If an AMO releases an aircraft with a deferred defect but fails to follow the operator's procedure (e.g. not notifying the CAMO or not using the correct label/log entry format), the release to service could be considered invalid or non-compliant.

- **Documentation and IT Systems:** The CAMO may require use of a particular maintenance tracking system or certain documentation standards (for instance, how component changes are recorded).
    - If the AMO uses its own paperwork format, there is potential for data to be lost in translation.
        - Auditors to examine samples of work packages to ensure the content flows correctly between CAMO instructions and AMO records.
- **Quality Standards and Tolerances:** Sometimes a CAMO (especially under influence of an aircraft lessor or a very safety-conscious corporate policy) will impose standards that exceed the regulatory minimums.
    - If these expectations are not clearly communicated to the maintenance provider, misaligned expectations result.
    - To address these issues, harmonization of procedures and standards at the CAMO–AMO interface is critical.

The following approaches are considered best practice:

- **Mutual Document Review:** Before a maintenance project begins, the CAMO's continuing airworthiness team and the AMO's quality department should exchange and review relevant parts of each other's manuals (CAME vs. MOE).
    - This identifies differences in advance.
    - For key processes (like handling of fuel tank safety issues, or reporting of incidents), agreeing on a common procedure or bridging document will prevent errors.
    - Any significant variances should be resolved or explicitly agreed upon so that compliance is assured regardless of whose procedure is followed.
- **Service Level Agreements (SLAs):** As part of the maintenance contract or a project agreement, include an SLA that defines the expected quality and procedural standards.
    - For instance, the SLA can specify documentation requirements (e.g. "AMO will use Operator's work cards and sign off in Operator's system"), turnaround times for queries, and acceptance criteria for work. These act as a bridge between different corporate cultures.
    - Where a CAMO's standards differ from baseline regulation, the SLA should spell this out to avoid ambiguity. (SLAs are a tool to make expectations explicit and enforceable.)
- **Cross-Training on Procedures:**
    - EASA specifically emphasizes that CAMOs must ensure AMO certifying staff are adequately trained on relevant CAMO procedures to avoid misunderstandings.
- **Joint Quality Audits/Inspections:**
    - Maintenance contracts should allow the CAMO to monitor the maintenance organisation in terms of compliance with applicable requirements, and stipulate how the results of such monitoring are handled by the AMO
    - In essence, the contract should enable integrated oversight.
    - The compliance auditor's role here is to verify that this harmonization is happening (e.g. checking that the contract has the necessary clauses, that

training records show joint sessions, and that no major procedural gaps are evident in practice).

- When done well, a harmonized approach yields tangible benefits: fewer misunderstandings, higher first-time quality, and a consistent level of compliance that satisfies both the regulator and the operator's own standards.

Oversight Strategies and Communication Protocols

A strong CAMO–AMO interface is underpinned by deliberate oversight mechanisms and clear communication protocols. Rather than assuming that both organizations will naturally coordinate, best practices call for formalizing how they work together.

- CAMO compliance auditors should assess whether these mechanisms are in place and effective:
- Formal Interface Agreements - Successful collaborations often rely on a Joint Procedures Manual (JPM) or similar documented agreement that explicitly spells out how the CAMO and AMO will interface for a given project or ongoing contract.
- A JPM essentially merges relevant portions of the CAMO's CAME and the AMO's MOE for the scope of their cooperation, creating a single auditable reference for the joint team.
    - Auditors will use such an agreement to establish a bench mark to audit against (especially for complex projects)
    - If there is no JPM or equivalent, the auditor might dig into how consistent the collaboration is – often the absence of a formal interface is correlated with inconsistent practices or reliance on personal relationships, which is risky.

Maintenance Contracts with Oversight Clauses: Beyond technical procedures, the legal contract between the operator (or CAMO) and the maintenance provider is a crucial tool to enforce compliance.

- **The contract should do more than define scope and price** – it should also embed quality and communication expectations.
- Contracts should also clearly allow the CAMO to perform audits or inspections of the AMO's work (including subcontracted work) at any time and outline that the AMO will address any findings or issues identified.

- EASA's guidance (AMC to Part-CAMO) provides a checklist of elements for maintenance contracts, highlighting consistency and oversight provisions as key aspects
- During audits, checking the contract's contents against these recommendations is useful. If an element like "right of access for CAMO auditors" or "requirement for progress reports" is missing, that is a recommendation the auditor can raise to improve the oversight framework.

Defined Communication Protocols: Miscommunication is a common culprit in CAMO–AMO friction.

- Agree on the frequency and format of progress updates (daily emails, weekly calls, an online dashboard, etc.).
- Designate primary contacts – e.g. a project manager from the CAMO and a production manager from the AMO – to channel communications.
- Define how and when to escalate issues. For instance, if a significant airworthiness issue or a potential delay is identified, the protocol might be that the AMO's quality manager informs the CAMO's quality/compliance manager immediately, triggering a higher-level review.

Regular coordination meetings, as mentioned, are vital.

- Auditors often attend or review minutes from such meetings as evidence that issues are being caught and resolved in real time.

Integrated Information Systems: Although not always possible, integrating IT systems (or providing mutual access) can greatly enhance transparency.

- Some operators provide their contracted AMOs limited access to the operator's maintenance management software to directly receive task cards and enter completion data.
    - This real-time sharing cuts down on transcription errors and delays. Where full integration isn't feasible, even agreeing on a common spreadsheet or cloud-based tracking tool for the project can be beneficial.
    - CAMO auditors may not dictate what system to use, but they will be interested in *how information flows*.

- The regulator expects the CAMO to exercise control and visibility over the maintenance, and the AMO to cooperate in that oversight

Systemic Disconnects and Cultural Friction

Despite formal agreements and good intentions, systemic disconnects can arise due to organizational silos and cultural differences. “Silo mentality” is a well-known threat to efficiency and safety in aviation organizations.

- In the CAMO–AMO context, silos manifest as each side viewing its role in isolation – the CAMO focusing only on its regulatory responsibilities, and the AMO only on accomplishing the work as contracted – without fully appreciating the other’s perspective or constraints.
  - When the relationship is purely transactional, each organization might default to protecting its own interests. If a problem occurs – say a delay due to parts shortage – finger-pointing may ensue rather than joint problem solving.
  - Cultural friction can exacerbate this: one company might have a culture of bluntly calling out issues, which another perceives as hostile criticism.
  - Without a partnership mindset, small disagreements can sour into larger distrust.

Differing Interpretations of Regulations - Both CAMOs and AMOs operate under EASA’s rules, but their perspectives often differ.

- A CAMO specialist might interpret an Airworthiness Directive or a requirement in the maintenance program very conservatively, whereas an AMO might lean on the literal scope of its Part-145 approval.
- An AMO might proceed with what *it* considers an acceptable action which the CAMO later deems improper. This kind of disconnect can lead to audit findings and even regulatory violations if the authority’s interpretation aligns with the CAMO’s view (which it often will, as the CAMO is the one answerable to the authority in the end).

Bridging the Divide To counteract silo mentality, industry leaders advocate fostering a culture of shared accountability between CAMO and AMO.

- This means each party not only takes care of their own duties but also remains alert to the overall success of the maintenance activity.

- Shared accountability is not about diminishing individual responsibilities; it's about creating an overlap by design, so that there is less chance something is "nobody's job."

Improving Cross-Organizational Culture: Some strategies to reduce systemic and cultural friction include:

- **Joint Team Building:** When possible (especially in long-term engagements), encourage joint training or team-building sessions. Even a simple kickoff meeting with both CAMO and AMO teams present can humanize the relationship, making cooperation more likely. This is particularly important in diverse cultural settings or when language barriers exist; meeting face-to-face (or via video conference) can build trust and clarify communication styles.
- **Clearly Defined Interfaces (No Man's Land Reduction):** As discussed earlier, explicitly defining roles and interface processes helps remove the "no man's land" where each side thinks the other is handling something. Written interface documents or checklists for overlap areas (like who reviews the aircraft technical log daily during a maintenance visit – CAMO engineer or AMO certifying staff, or both) leave less to chance. If anyone feels an activity is drifting into gray area, they should feel empowered to **speak up immediately and get clarity**. Management should support this behavior and not penalize someone for questioning responsibilities.
- **Alignment on Regulatory Standards:** Both parties should regularly calibrate their understanding of regulatory requirements. Joint workshops on new regulations or sharing of interpretations (with authority guidance if needed) can preempt conflicts.

Systemic Issues Require Management Attention, not just Procedural Fixes.

A CAMO compliance auditor may observe disconnects If, say, repetitive communication failures are noted between a CAMO and a particular AMO, the solution might involve a management-to-management discussion or a revision of the partnership approach, rather than just another memo to staff.

- In severe cases, it could mean reconsidering the choice of maintenance provider if the cultural clash is too great to ensure compliance.
- Regulators expect the CAMO to manage these relationships effectively; inability to do so can be seen as a leadership and oversight weakness within the CAMO.

- Therefore, resolving systemic disconnects is not just good practice but a matter of compliance accountability.

Cross-Training on Procedures and Policies - Key Competency Areas:

- **Regulatory Knowledge for AMOs:** Ensure AMO staff, especially leaders and certifiers, know the big-picture regulatory context.
    - They should understand that Part-145 approval comes with obligations to follow not just their own MOE but also any operator-provided procedures under contract.
    - Familiarity with Part-CAMO requirements (even though those apply to the CAMO) can help an AMO anticipate what the CAMO will be looking for.
- **Technical Knowledge for CAMOs:** Equip CAMO personnel with enough technical knowledge to engage in meaningful oversight.
- **Communication and Teamwork Skills are Crucial**. Training on how to conduct effective meetings, how to write clear work instructions, or how to perform an audit constructively can all improve the CAMO–AMO dynamic.
- **Continuous Learning -** From a compliance monitoring perspective, auditors often look at training records and interview personnel to gauge competency. If an auditor finds that an AMO's staff is ignorant of an operator-specific procedure that directly affects airworthiness, that is a clear finding of ineffectiveness in the interface management.

Regulatory Expectations and Liability

Ultimate Responsibility – The Operator/CAMO: In the eyes of the regulator, the aircraft operator (through its CAMO) retains ultimate responsibility for continuing airworthiness, even when maintenance is contracted out. The operator via the CAMO must verify that the contracted AMO is not just approved generally, but **approved for the scope of work to be performed** (e.g. the correct aircraft type ratings, capabilities for engines, etc.). Ensuring this is often part of the CAMO auditor's duties before and during a contract.

Oversight via Compliance Monitoring: EASA Part-CAMO introduced more structured **compliance monitoring (quality) systems** on the CAMO side. These rules oblige the CAMO to audit and monitor the activities that affect airworthiness – including the performance of contracted maintenance.

- Essentially, the authority expects the CAMO to have an active auditing schedule covering its Part-145 contractors, to verify compliance with both Part-145 requirements and the specific contract terms
- Competent authorities (like national CAAs or EASA itself) will check during their oversight of a CAMO that such audits are being done and that any findings are managed.

Regulatory Developments – SMS and Safety Culture: In recent years, regulations have evolved to further integrate the roles of CAMO and AMO in managing safety.

- Part-CAMO now requires CAMOs to implement a Safety Management System (SMS), which includes hazard identification, risk assessment, and safety assurance activities covering all continuing airworthiness functions.
- Crucially, this extends to contracted activities. The CAMO's SMS is expected to encompass the maintenance contractors – meaning, for instance, that if a certain maintenance error trend is observed at an AMO, the CAMO's SMS should capture it and address it, perhaps via contract management or additional training, etc.
- Compliance auditors on the CAMO side must internalize their audits to test that the CAMO is indeed in control of and accountable for the maintenance outcomes.
- Documentation like contracts, oversight plans, and audit reports should clearly reflect that the CAMO knows its duties and is executing them.

Tools for Long-Term Collaboration and Improvement

Achieving sustained airworthiness compliance and efficiency requires looking beyond single projects and cultivating a long-term collaborative framework between CAMOs and AMOs.

- CAMO compliance auditors, with their panoramic view of an organization's multiple maintenance events and providers, are well placed to advise on and even facilitate these long-term improvements.
- **"No Surprises" Culture -** A fundamental cultural tool for collaboration is adopting a "no surprises" policy.
    - Both CAMO and AMO leadership should encourage teams to communicate issues as soon as they are known, rather than hoping to fix quietly or assuming the other side already knows. (A no-surprises culture means bad news is shared early.)

- An excellent practice is to hold a post-maintenance debrief between the CAMO and AMO once a major maintenance visit is completed.
    - Both sides review what went well and what issues arose, and most importantly, how to prevent the same issues in the future. (By capturing these insights and updating processes (or the joint procedures manual), the collaboration improves with each iteration.)
    - Continuous improvement should be a formal part of the interface management.

Shared Performance Metrics: Auditors should encourage the use of data in managing the CAMO–AMO relationship, as it makes oversight more objective and focused on system performance rather than personal opinions.

Leveraging Audits as Collaboration Tools - Rather than viewing audits (whether internal or authority audits) as necessary evils or opportunities to point fingers, CAMOs and AMOs can leverage them for improvement.

Cross-Organizational Feedback Loop: A long-term partnership should include mechanisms for feedback in both directions.

- The CAMO should regularly appraise the AMO's performance (ideally with constructive feedback)
- The AMO should have a channel to provide feedback to the CAMO on how the operator could facilitate better maintenance
- Creating a formal feedback session in quarterly business reviews or similar forums helps institutionalize this exchange.