Sofema Aviation Services Compliance Masterclass – May 2026

- How Can I Become an EASA Compliance Auditor
- 7 Best Practice Auditing Tips to Navigating an EASA Compliance Audit
- EASA Auditing Masterclass - Balancing "The Book" with Risk-Based Pragmatism
- Compliance Auditing Considerations - Providing Positive Feedback & Managing Reports to Drive Positive Changes.
- EASA Internal Audit Root Cause Analysis Techniques
- Meeting the Challenge of the two P's (Production & Protection) for EASA Aviation Business Area Owners.
- HOW CMS can Transform Regulatory Data into Measurable Efficiency, Safety, and Savings
- EASA Auditor Best Practices - Strategies for Objective Regulatory Reporting
- Considering the Future of EASA Compliance Auditing – With Reference to EASA AI Roadmap 2.0, EU AI Act (Regulation (EU) 2024/1689) and NPA 2025-07
- Compliance Considerations Related to Aircraft Acquisition (Buying, Dry lease, Wet Lease)
- Q Can We Manage Components Off Wing without a "C" Rating Approval – when the inspection is included in the AMM (Small company)

How Can I Become an EASA Compliance Auditor

Becoming an EASA Auditor in OPS, CAMO, or Part-145 environments marks a major career shift from performing technical tasks to evaluating the systems that govern them.

This position necessitates a high level of technical competency, an exhaustive understanding of the applicable legal framework, and the professional objectivity required to manage confrontational or high-pressure situations.

Professional Experience and Qualifications

EASA regulations, specifically AMC1 145.A.30 and AMC1 CAMO.A.305, mandate that auditors possess relevant knowledge and documented experience.

- **Operational Background:** Auditors are typically recruited from specialized technical roles.

  - In a Part-145 environment, this generally requires history as a Licensed Aircraft Maintenance Engineer.
  - In CAMO, experience in Continuing Airworthiness Management or Technical Records is expected.
  - For OPS, candidates usually have significant experience in Flight Operations or Ground Operations management.
- **Experience Threshold:** A minimum of five to ten years of industry experience is standard. This duration ensures the auditor has sufficient technical context to evaluate the practical application of procedures.
- **Demographics:** Due to these experience requirements, individuals usually enter this field after a decade of professional service, typically at or beyond age 30, ensuring a level of professional maturity necessary for the role.

Interpersonal Competencies

An auditor must maintain professional standards during evaluations to ensure the integrity of the compliance process. Essential competencies include:

- **Impartiality:** The ability to evaluate former colleagues or departments without bias.
- **Evidence-Based Inquiry:** Utilizing structured questioning techniques to gather objective evidence of compliance rather than relying on verbal assurances.
- **Conflict Management:** Maintaining a professional demeanor when identifying critical safety non-compliances that may disrupt operations.
- **Technical Reporting:** Synthesizing complex data into formal, written reports that clearly cite the regulatory basis for every finding.

Qualification Pathway

The qualification process is divided into theoretical instruction and practical evaluation.

Theoretical Instruction

- **Regulatory Training:** Formal attendance of certified courses regarding the specific EASA Part (e.g., Part-145, Part-CAMO, or Part-ORO) is mandatory.

- **Audit Methodology:** Instruction on audit planning, execution, and finding classification based on the ISO 19011 standard.

Managing the Audit Programme

ISO 19011 outlines a systematic approach to managing an entire audit schedule over a specific period, such as a fiscal year. This process follows the Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle:

- Establishment: Defining the objectives and the extent of the audit program, including identifying risks like auditor unavailability or language barriers.
- Implementation: Selecting the audit team, assigning roles, and managing the logistics of individual audits.
- Monitoring and Review: Assessing whether the audit program is achieving its goals and identifying areas for improvement in the audit process itself.

Core Principles of Auditing

The standard establishes seven fundamental principles that ensure the audit process yields objective and reproducible results:

1. **Integrity:** The foundation of professionalism. Auditors must perform their work with honesty, responsibility, and legal compliance.
2. **Fair Presentation:** The obligation to report findings, conclusions, and reports truthfully and accurately. Significant obstacles or unresolved differences must be documented.
3. **Due Professional Care:** The application of diligence and reasoned judgment. Auditors must exercise a level of care appropriate to the importance of the task.
4. **Confidentiality:** Maintaining the security of information acquired during the audit process.
5. **Independence:** The basis for impartiality. Auditors must be free from bias and have no conflict of interest regarding the activities they are evaluating.
6. **Evidence-Based Approach:** Reaching reliable conclusions through verifiable data. Audit evidence must be based on samples of the available information.

Practical Evaluation

- **Observation Phase:** The candidate participates in multiple audits as an observer to understand internal quality system protocols.

- **Supervised Performance:** The candidate must conduct an audit under the direct supervision of an authorized senior auditor. Formal authorization is only granted once the supervisor verifies the candidate's competence in a live environment.

Authorization Timeline

For a candidate with the requisite technical background, the onboarding and authorization process generally spans three to six months:

- **Initial Month:** Completion of regulatory training and a comprehensive review of the organization's approved expositions (e.g., MOE, CAME, or OMM).
- **Months Two through Four:** Participation in observed and supervised audits.
- **Final Phase:** Formal competence assessment and issuance of authorization by the Compliance Monitoring Manager.

EASA Compliance vs. ISO 9001

The objectives of EASA and ISO audits are distinct and should not be conflated.

- **EASA Compliance:** The objective is the maintenance of aviation safety and adherence to European Union law.
    - An EASA auditor identifies non-compliance with specific legal requirements. Both external against EASA Regulations and Internal against the organisations documented process and procedures.
    - Failure to meet these standards results in the immediate loss of privileges or the grounding of aircraft.
- **ISO 9001 (2015/2026):** The objective is the continuous improvement of the Quality Management System and customer satisfaction.
    - The 2026 revision introduces expanded requirements for sustainability, organizational resilience, and digital security.
    - While EASA focuses on legal safety requirements, ISO focuses on the efficiency and maturity of the business processes.

EASA Compliance vs. ISO 9001

The objectives of EASA and ISO audits are distinct and should not be conflated.

- EASA Compliance: The objective is the maintenance of aviation safety and adherence to European Union law. An EASA auditor identifies non-compliance with specific legal requirements. Failure to meet these standards results in the immediate loss of privileges or the grounding of aircraft.
- ISO 9001 (2015/2026): The objective is the continuous improvement of the Quality Management System and customer satisfaction. The 2026 revision introduces expanded requirements for sustainability, organizational resilience, and digital security. While EASA focuses on legal safety requirements, ISO focuses on the efficiency and maturity of the business processes.

People Skills: The "Soft" Side of the Audit

An auditor who only knows the rules but can't talk to people will fail. Key skills include:

- Objective Detachment: You must be able to audit your former colleagues without bias. This requires a level of professional distance that can be socially challenging.
- Strategic Inquiry: The ability to ask open-ended questions that lead the auditee to reveal the "truth" of a process rather than just giving a "yes/no" answer.
- Conflict De-escalation: Audits are stressful. A competent auditor knows how to deliver a "Level 1 Finding" (a major safety non-compliance) without causing a total breakdown in communication.
- Clear Documentation: You must be able to translate a complex technical observation into a concise, legally defensible written report.

Training: Technical vs. Practical

Training is split into "knowing the law" and "learning how to hunt."

Technical Training

- Regulatory Courses: You must attend formal training on the specific EASA Part you are auditing (e.g., Part-145, Part-CAMO, or Part-ORO). These usually last 2 to 5 days.
- Audit Techniques: A dedicated course (often based on ISO 19011) that teaches you how to plan an audit, conduct interviews, and classify findings.

Practical Training (On-the-Job)

- Phase 1 (Observer): You shadow a senior auditor for 3 to 5 audits, learning how they navigate the facility and manage the auditee.
- Phase 2 (Witnessed): You lead the audit while a senior auditor watches you. They assess your "auditor conduct" and your ability to find relevant evidence. Only after a successful "witnessed audit" are you formally authorized.

7 Best Practice Auditing Tips to Navigating an EASA Compliance Audit

Navigating an EASA (European Union Aviation Safety Agency) compliance audit requires moving beyond a "checklist manifesto" and toward a diagnostic conversation.

In a high-stakes regulatory environment, the goal isn't just to find a non-compliance, but to understand the systemic health of the organization.

Here are 7 best practice auditing tips designed to extract deep insights within an EASA framework, presented with a focus on practical application and verbal technique.

Use the "Counter-Factual" Inquiry

Asking "What is wrong?" often triggers a defensive "Nothing" response. Instead, ask: "If you were designing this process from scratch today, which step would you take to make it safer or more efficient?"

- **The Insight:** This bypasses the fear of admitting a mistake and reveals where the current process is clunky, bypassed, or misunderstood. It identifies the "bottlenecks" that often lead to non-compliance when people are under pressure.

Audit the "Informal System"

EASA OPS, Part-145 or Part-CAMO organizations often have two worlds: the "Official Procedure" (the OPS Manual Part A, MOE or CAME) and the "Work-Around."

- **The Technique**: Observe a task first without speaking. Then ask: "I noticed you did [X] differently than the manual; walk me through why your way is more effective in the heat of the moment."

- This identifies the gap between Work-as-Imagined (the manual) vs. Work-as-Done (the reality), which is where most safety risks live.

The "Resource Stress" Test

Compliance often fails not due to lack of will, but lack of capacity. To find the breaking point, ask the post-holder or technician: "On your busiest day last month, what part of the safety protocol felt the most difficult to maintain?"

- **The Insight:** This highlights "shortfalls" in staffing, time, or tooling that a standard document review would never capture. It tests the organization's adherence to resource management objectives.

Triangulate via "Vertical Slicing"

Do not rely solely on the high-level descriptions provided by Management. To test if the safety culture and operational standards are actually "lived" throughout the organization, ask the same process-oriented question to three different levels of the hierarchy (e.g., a Front-line Employee, a Middle Manager/Post-holder, and the Accountable Manager).

- The Technique: Ask: "If you encounter a situation that doesn't look 'right' but isn't explicitly covered by the manual, what is the exact process for stopping the operation, and who has the final word?"
- The Insight: If the front-line staffer says, "I just ask my lead," the manager says "They follow the SMS reporting chain," and the Accountable Manager says "We have a robust safety committee," you have identified a Standardization Gap.

When answers vary, it is revealed that the "Official Policy" has not been effectively translated into "Operational Reality." This discrepancy is a direct lead-in to findings regarding Internal Communication (Part-OR/145/CAMO.A.200), Safety Training, or Management System Effectiveness.

Follow the "Paper Trail" Backwards

Most auditors follow a process from start to finish (input to output). To find hidden weaknesses, try **Reverse Traceability**.

- **The Technique:** Pick a completed EASA Form 1 or a certificate of release to service (CRS) and work backward to the initial purchase order or the training record of the specific person who signed it.

- **The Insight:** This tests the robustness of the record-keeping system under pressure, revealing if links in the chain—like sub-contractor oversight—are actually missing.

Evaluate the "Safety Culture" via Reaction

EASA focuses heavily on Management Systems (MS) and "Just Culture."

- **The Technique:** Ask: **"When was the last time a 'Near Miss' was reported here, and what was the celebratory outcome of that report?"**
- **The Insight:** If the answer is "We don't have near misses," you've found a major weakness in the **Internal Reporting System**. A healthy EASA environment should have a high volume of low-severity reports; a lack of them suggests a culture of fear or apathy.

The "Future-Proof" Close

At the end of an audit segment, use a speculative question to gauge the maturity of their Compliance Monitoring Function.

- **The Technique: "If a major audit finding were to occur in this department six months from now, what do you think would be the most likely cause?"**
- **The Insight:** This forces the auditee to perform a "Pre-Mortem." Their answer is usually a direct map to their highest-risk area that they are already worried about but haven't yet addressed.

Summary of Conversational Reframing

To gain the best results, pivot your questioning style from "Compliance Verification" to "Operational Insight":

- Instead of asking if the manual is up to date, ask **which part of the manual is the hardest to follow in real life.**
- Instead of asking if they are trained, ask them to **show you the last time they had to look something up because they weren't 100% sure.**
- Instead of asking if they have enough staff, ask **which task gets delayed first when the hangar is full.**

Sofema Aviation Services Compliance Masterclass – May 2026

Best Practice In an EASA environment, always frame your "insights" back to the Regulation Reference. It's much harder for an organization to argue against a "direction of weakness" when you can link it directly to a failure in meeting the intent of a specific AMC (Acceptable Means of Compliance).

EASA Auditing Masterclass - Balancing "The Book" with Risk-Based Pragmatism

White Paper Discussion Presented by Steve Bentley FRAeS CEO of Sofema Aviation Services

Introduction - Here we will discuss each of the following points in turn:

- Applying a more practical, risk-based approach during audits
- Balancing compliance without losing effectiveness
- How to avoid being perceived as ‘policing’ and instead promote a culture of safety and continuous improvement.
- How to interpret EASA requirements with flexibility
- How to ensure consistency between different auditors?”

The Bedrock of EASA comprises the Implementing Rules (IRs) – “hard law”- where there is no flexibility Hard Law. The competence of a senior auditor lies in how they navigate the "Soft Law" the Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMC) and Guidance Material (GM).

- **The Foundation of Hard Law -** When an auditor encounters a direct violation of an IR approach must be absolute to ensure we maintain the structural integrity of the regulatory framework.

Applying the Risk-Based Lens

The "line" is drawn at the intersection of safety impact and systemic stability.

- A practical, risk-based approach asks: “Does this deviation increase the probability of a technical failure or an operational hazard?” whether the risk is solid or administrative.

Drawing the Line - Effectiveness is lost when auditors focus on "low-value" findings that do not contribute to safety.

- We should ensure effectiveness by prioritizing findings that reveal a breakdown in the Management System or Safety Culture.

- If the "book" is used to punish minor administrative lapses while ignoring a toxic culture where engineers are afraid to report defects, the audit has failed its primary objective.

2. From "Policing" to Partnership: Promoting a Culture of Continuous Improvement

The "Auditor-as-Police" archetype is a vestige of the pre-SMS era. It creates a "hide-and-seek" culture where Nominated Persons (NPs) only show the auditor what they want them to see. To move toward a culture of continuous improvement, the auditor must transition into the role of a **Systemic Consultant**.

The Transparency Shift
Auditors avoid the "policing" label by practicing **Collaborative Auditing**. This involves discussing potential findings with the Business Area Owner (BAO) in real-time. There should be "no surprises" at the closing meeting. When a finding is identified, the auditor should frame it as a "Systemic Vulnerability" rather than a "Personal Failure."

The Auditor as a Mirror

Instead of saying, *"You are non-compliant,"* the effective auditor asks, *"How does your current process prevent a mistake here?"* By letting the BAO discover the gap themselves, the auditor promotes ownership. This shift fosters a **Just Culture**, where the organization views the audit as a free "stress test" of their defenses rather than a threat to their license.

Adding Value

Continuous improvement is triggered when the auditor highlights **Observations** (not just findings) that suggest better ways of working based on industry best practices. This demonstrates that the auditor is an asset to the organization's growth, not just a hurdle to its operation.

The Interpretation Paradox: Flexibility vs. Consistency
One of the greatest challenges in the EASA environment is that "Easy Access Rules" are often anything but easy to interpret. To what extent can an auditor be flexible?

Flexibility within the AMC/GM Framework - EASA allows for **Alternative Means of Compliance (AltMoC)**. This is the ultimate expression of flexibility. An auditor should be open to an organization's unique way of meeting a requirement, provided the organization can provide data-driven evidence that their method achieves an equivalent

level of safety. Flexibility is acceptable only when it is **documented, risk-assessed, and transparent.**

Ensuring Auditor Consistency - Inconsistency between auditors is a leading cause of frustration for NPs and Accountable Managers. To mitigate this, Sofema and similar high-level organizations advocate for:

- **The Compliance Library:** A centralized database of internal "Interpretative Bulletins." When a complex regulation is interpreted in a specific way, it is recorded so future auditors follow the same logic.
- **Peer Review and Shadow Audits:** Regularly "auditing the auditor" ensures that one individual isn't being overly lenient while another is being excessively rigid.
- **Standardization Meetings:** Senior auditors should meet regularly to discuss "Grey Areas" and align their philosophies.

The Objective Standard - Consistency is achieved not by making every auditor think the same, but by ensuring they all use the same **objective evidence criteria**. If three different auditors look at the same set of data, the evidence should lead them to the same conclusion, regardless of their personal style.

Final Thought: The goal of the modern EASA auditor is not to find a "guilty party," but to find a "broken process." When we align our audits with the principles of Root Cause Analysis and Performance-Based Oversight, we stop being a burden to the Business Area Owner and start being the guardian of their operational resilience.
In your experience, when you encounter a "grey area" in the AMC, do you find your organization tends to lean toward the most conservative interpretation, or do you actively seek out Alternative Means of Compliance to boost operational efficiency?

Compliance Auditing Considerations - Providing Positive Feedback & Managing Reports to Drive Positive Changes.

Introduction - The shift from a culture of blame to a culture of systemic improvement is a cornerstone of modern aviation safety management.

- When an organization reacts to audit findings by blaming the "person in charge," it incentivizes the concealment of errors, which ultimately degrades safety and operational efficiency.

Sofema Aviation Services Compliance Masterclass – May 2026

The most effective audit reports are those that make it impossible for management to ignore a systemic flaw by removing the easy "escape route" of blaming an individual. Professional auditing is about providing the data necessary for an organization to evolve.

Important Consideration - To drive meaningful change through compliance auditing, the focus must shift from individual culpability to organizational resilience.

The Principle of Just Culture Auditing

To recognize that most errors result from systemic weaknesses rather than individual negligence.

- Differentiate between Error and Violation: An error is an unintentional mistake caused by poor procedures, fatigue, or environmental factors. A violation is a deliberate choice to ignore a rule.
- Audits should target the "error-producing conditions" (e.g., ambiguous manuals, inadequate staffing, or poor software interfaces) rather than the individual who committed the error.

Incorporating Positive Observations

An audit report that only lists failures is often viewed as a hostile document. Including positive feedback, referred to in professional auditing as **"**Areas of Strength" or "Best Practices," serves two purposes:

- it provides a balanced view of the department and
- reinforces high-standard behaviors.

Highlight Compliance: Explicitly document areas where the department has exceeded the minimum regulatory requirements.

- **Acknowledge Improvements:** If a previously identified finding has been resolved effectively, acknowledge the robustness of the new process.
- **Effect:** This builds professional rapport. When the "person in charge" feels their successes are recognized, they are more likely to accept and act upon the identified non-compliances.

Reporting for Systemic Change

To prevent the "blame game," the language used in the audit report must be clinical and focused on the process.

- **Avoid Personal Identifiers:** Do not name individuals in the finding.
    - Instead of writing, "The Production Manager failed to update the records," write, "The records management process did not ensure the timely entry of data."
- **Focus on "Why," Not "Who":** Use Root Cause Analysis (RCA) to dig deeper.
    - If a task was missed, ask if the individual had the correct tools, sufficient time, and clear instructions. Usually, the "human error" is merely the final symptom of a deeper systemic failure.
- **Classify the Risk, Not the Person:** Present the finding in terms of its impact on airworthiness or operational safety.
    - This elevates the discussion from a personal failure to a technical risk that must be mitigated by the organization.

Collaborative Corrective Action Plans (CAP)

The auditor identifies the **Non-Compliance**, but the person in charge should own the **Corrective Action**.

- **The Auditor's Role:** Clearly define the gap between the current state and the regulatory requirement.
- **The Manager's Role:** Propose a solution that fits the operational reality of the office.
- **The Collaborative Goal:** By involving the manager in the solution, the audit becomes a tool for them to secure the resources or policy changes they need to do their job effectively.
    - The auditor becomes an ally who helps the manager "fix" a broken system, rather than a judge who penalizes them for its failure.

Managing the "Blame" from Senior Management

If the organization's leadership tends to blame individuals, the auditor must act as a buffer.

- **Executive Summaries:** In reports to senior management, emphasize the systemic trends. If multiple departments have similar findings, present it as an organizational resource issue or a failure of the overarching Management System, rather than a series of individual failures.
- **Data-Driven Reporting:** Use metrics to show that when processes are improved, non-compliances drop. Demonstrate that "fixing the person" rarely prevents a recurrence, while "fixing the process" provides long-term stability.

EASA Internal Audit Root Cause Analysis Techniques

Sofema Aviation (SA) considers in depth the process to identify systemic risks before they become findings in an EASA audit, additionally how to ensure that the Quality Control processes are compliant and effective.

Introduction

In the EASA environment, the shift from purely compliance-based oversight to performance-based oversight requires organizations to move beyond "checking boxes." To maintain a robust AOC (Air Operator Certificate), Part-145, or Part-CAMO approval, internal audits must function as a diagnostic tool rather than just a verification exercise.

Enhancing Audit Depth with Root Cause Analysis (RCA)

Audits often fail because they stop at the Direct Cause (what happened) rather than reaching the Root Cause (why the system allowed it to happen).

Summary of Concerns for EASA Compliance

The "Paperwork vs. Reality" Gap: The biggest risk in EASA auditing is an organization that looks perfect on paper but operates differently on the hangar floor or in the cockpit.

- **Focus on Documentation:** Ensure that the CAME (Continuing Airworthiness Management Exposition) or MOE (Maintenance Organization Exposition) actually reflects what people do.
- **Evidence-Based Auditing:** Auditors should spend 20% of their time in the office and 80% "on-site" observing real-time tasks.

Sofema Aviation Services Compliance Masterclass – May 2026

How would you describe the current relationship between your Quality department and the operational teams—is it viewed as a partnership or a "policing" force?

Identifying Systemic Risks Before They Become Findings

EASA expects a proactive Safety Management System (SMS). Systemic risks are the "latent conditions" that sit quietly in your organization until a specific set of circumstances triggers a non-compliance or incident.

The Swiss Cheese Model Approach

Systemic risks occur when the "holes" in your layers of defense align. To catch these before an external EASA auditor does:

- **Data Aggregation:** Don't look at audit findings in isolation. Use **Trend Analysis** to see if minor discrepancies in different departments (e.g., Training and Maintenance) point to a shared cultural or resource issue.
- **The "Pre-Mortem" Technique:** During internal audits, ask staff: "If this process were to fail tomorrow, how would it happen?" This identifies "Normalization of Deviance" where staff have created "workarounds" that haven't caused trouble *yet*.
- **Safety Culture Surveys:** Systemic risk is often rooted in culture. If technicians feel pressured to meet "On-Time Performance" (OTP) at the expense of "Technical Dispatch," that is a systemic risk that will eventually manifest as a major audit finding.

Enhancing Audit Depth with Root Cause Analysis (RCA)

Audits often fail because they stop at the Direct Cause (what happened) rather than reaching the Root Cause (why the system allowed it to happen).

- The "Blame" Trap - Identifying "Human Error" as a root cause is a common failure. In EASA terms, human error is a symptom of a systemic weakness, not the cause.
- Use structured tools like the Fishbone (Ishikawa) Diagram or the 5 Whys. Auditors should be trained in Human Factors (HF) to understand why a technician or coordinator deviated from a procedure.

- "Repeat Findings." If the same finding appears in consecutive audits, the previous RCA was likely ineffective or the corrective action was only a "band-aid."

Strategic Shift: From "What" to "How"

Instead of asking, *"Is this document signed?"* (Compliance), ask, *"How does the current workflow ensure this document is signed every time, even during peak operational pressure?"* (Performance/Depth).

Ensuring Quality Control (QC) is Compliant and Effective

While Quality Assurance (QA) checks the system, Quality Control (QC) checks the product (the aircraft, the part, the data). In an EASA framework, QC must be the "first line of defense."

Challenges: QC vs. QA Confusion

A common item of concern is when an organization relies on the Internal Auditor to catch technical errors. By the time an auditor finds a mistake, the QC process has already failed.

Best Practices for Effective QC:

Layered Audits (LPA): Implement high-frequency, very short checks by department leads. This ensures that "Quality" is owned by production, not just the Quality Department.

Competency-Based Assessments: Ensure that QC staff (e.g., Certifying Staff or Support Staff) are not just "qualified" on paper but "competent" in practice. EASA Part-145.A.35 emphasizes this distinction.

Independence of the Compliance Monitoring Manager (CMM): To remain effective, the quality system must have a direct reporting line to the Accountable Manager, bypassing intermediate operational pressures.

Summary of Concerns for EASA Compliance

The "Paperwork vs. Reality" Gap: The biggest risk in EASA auditing is an organization that looks perfect on paper but operates differently on the hangar floor or in the cockpit.

- **Focus on Documentation:** Ensure that the **CAME** (Continuing Airworthiness Management Exposition) or **MOE** (Maintenance Organization Exposition) actually reflects what people do.
- **Evidence-Based Auditing:** Auditors should spend 20% of their time in the office and 80% "on-site" observing real-time tasks.

How would you describe the current relationship between your Quality department and the operational teams—is it viewed as a partnership or a "policing" force?

Meeting the Challenge of the two P's (Production & Protection) for EASA Aviation Business Area Owners.

In 2026, the EASA landscape focuses heavily on the **Management System (MS)**. For an internal auditor, the goal is to bridge the gap between the regulatory requirement for **Protection** and the commercial drive for **Production**.

When a finding occurs, it is indeed a failure of the Quality Control (QC) oversight owned by the Nominated Post Holder (NPH). However, the way you communicate this determines whether you are seen as an obstacle or a strategic partner.

1. The Power Dynamic: Production vs. Protection

The "Two P's" represent a constant tug-of-war. Management often views **Production** as the engine and **Protection** as the brakes. Your job is to reframe Protection (Compliance) as the **navigation system** that prevents the engine from driving off a cliff.

- **The Auditor's Role:** You represent the independent Compliance Monitoring Function.
- **The Post Holder's Reality:** They are the "Process Owner." If a finding exists, their own QC checks failed to catch it.
- **The Gap Strategy:** You must diplomatically point out that while they own the production results, they also own the **defensive barriers**. A finding is simply evidence that their "barriers" are currently porous.

2. Diplomatic But Effective Reporting

To maintain accountability without burning bridges, you must shift the focus from the individual to the system.

The "System-Centric" Language

Avoid accusatory language like "You failed to supervise." Instead, use objective, system-based phrasing: *"The current Quality Control oversight for this business area did not identify the deviation in [Process X]."* This places the "blame" on the process, which the NPH is then empowered to fix, rather than on their personal character.

The "Mirror" Technique

Frame yourself as a mirror. Tell the NPH: *"My role is to show you what the Authority (EASA/NAA) will see before they arrive. This finding is an opportunity for us to close a gap internally so it doesn't become a regulatory or safety event later."* This positions you as their "early warning system."

3. Maneuvering Management Pressure

When management pressures production personnel to the point of compromising safety, you are no longer just auditing checklists; you are auditing **Safety Culture**.

Linking Pressure to Risk

Management speaks the language of risk and cost. If you see shortcuts being taken due to pressure, don't just cite the regulation. Explain the **Business Risk**:

- *"The current throughput pressure is creating a trend of non-conformities. If this trend continues, we face a high probability of a Level 1 finding, which could lead to a suspension of our Part 145/21 certificate and a total halt in production."*

Using SMS as a Shield

In 2026, EASA SMS requirements are robust. Remind the NPH that they have a legal obligation to provide the **resources** necessary to perform work safely. If they pressure staff to skip steps, they are personally bypassing the organization's Safety Management System, which carries significant legal and professional liability for the Post Holder.

4. Maintaining Relationships while Staying Firm

Building a good relationship is about **predictability, transparency, and fairness.**

- **The "No Surprises" Policy:** Never include a finding in a final report that hasn't been discussed face-to-face first. This allows the NPH to digest the information and offer context, reducing the "fight or flight" defensive response.
- **Highlight Strengths:** A 100% negative report feels like an attack. Ensure your report also notes areas of high performance or improvement. This builds "social capital," making the NPH more likely to listen when you deliver the "hard" findings.
- **Be the Solution Partner:** When a finding is issued, don't just walk away. While you cannot design the fix (to maintain independence), you can help brainstorm the **Root Cause**. If the root cause is "Management Pressure," helping them document that allows the NPH to go to senior leadership and ask for the resources they actually need.

By acting as a "Critical Friend," you ensure that the NPH remains accountable for their Quality Control gaps while feeling supported in the face of intense production demands.

HOW CMS can Transform Regulatory Data into Measurable Efficiency, Safety, and Savings

To Consider How Compliance Monitoring Systems can Demonstrate Measurable, Quantifiable Benefits to both Auditees and Senior Management, Particularly in Terms of Operational Efficiency, Safety Improvement, and Cost Avoidance?

Introduction

When a CMS is transparent and integrated into daily life, audits become a continuous, low-impact check rather than a disruptive annual event.

- By providing auditees with real-time access to their own compliance status, the system empowers them to self-correct.
- This fosters a "Just Culture" where the focus is on fixing the system rather than blaming the individual, which is perhaps the most significant, albeit qualitative, benefit of all.

To bridge the gap between compliance as a "necessary burden" and compliance as a "strategic asset," organizations must shift their focus from mere box-ticking to data-driven performance.

- For operators, maintainers, and Continuing Airworthiness Management Organizations (CAMOs), this typically hinges on using Compliance Monitoring Systems (CMS) to turn regulatory data into actionable business intelligence.

Operational Efficiency: From Reactive to Proactive

For the CAMO and Maintainers, operational efficiency is potentially impacted by administrative friction - A robust CMS demonstrates benefit by streamlining these workflows.

- **Process Bottleneck Identification:** By quantifying the time elapsed between a maintenance finding and its closure, management can identify specific departments or outstations where resources are mismatched.
- **Reduced Rework and "Grounded" Time:** In a maintenance environment, a CMS that tracks "First-Time Quality" (FTQ) metrics provides a measurable reduction in rework.
    - For the operator, this translates directly to higher aircraft availability and a more predictable flight schedule.
- **Predictive Compliance:** Instead of waiting for an audit to find an expired certification or a missed AD (Airworthiness Directive), integrated systems use automated alerts.
    - This shifts the staff's workload from "crisis management" to "planned execution," significantly lowering the stress on individual maintainers and planners.

Safety Improvement: Quantifying the "Margin of Safety"

Safety is notoriously difficult to measure because its ultimate success is the absence of an event. However, a high-functioning CMS provides senior management with leading indicators that quantify the strengthening of the safety net.

- **Trend Analysis and Risk Correlation:** By categorizing non-conformities (e.g., human factors, tooling issues, or documentation gaps), the CMS allows the Safety Manager to see patterns before they manifest as incidents.

Cost Avoidance: The Financial Shield

The most persuasive argument for senior management is often the prevention of "leakage" unnecessary costs incurred through negligence or inefficiency.

Here is a breakdown of how a CMS drives lean efficiency and stops the bleed of resources:

Eliminating Administrative "Wastage"

Sofema Aviation Services Compliance Masterclass – May 2026

In many organizations, highly skilled engineers and CAMO planners spend up to 30% of their time on "shadow work" (double-checking spreadsheets, chasing physical signatures, or cross-referencing disparate databases.)

- **The Benefit:** A digitized CMS acts as a single source of truth. It automates the verification of maintenance tasks against the AMP (Aircraft Maintenance Program), meaning your technical staff spend their time on airworthiness, not data entry.
- **Quantifiable Metric:** Reduction in "Man-Hours per Work Package" by automating the compliance validation step.

Streamlining the "Audit Cycle" Friction

Traditional audits are disruptive; they pull key personnel away from their primary duties to find documents or explain processes.

- **The Benefit:** By moving to **continuous monitoring** rather than "snapshot" auditing, the disruption is smoothed out over the year. This prevents the seasonal productivity dip that usually occurs right before a major CAA (Civil Aviation Authority) oversight visit.
- **Quantifiable Metric:** Total number of "Operational Hours Lost" to audit preparation and execution.

Resource Optimization and Lean CAMO

Waste often comes from "Over-Processing" doing more work than the regulation requires because the organization isn't sure where the line is.

- **The Benefit:** A precise CMS defines the exact "Minimum Equipment" and "Required Actions" for compliance.
    - This prevents "Gold-Plating" (unnecessary maintenance or over-frequent inspections) that doesn't actually improve safety but does drain the budget.
- **Quantifiable Metric:** Percentage reduction in non-mandatory component changes or over-scheduled inspections.

Reducing Technical Delays (AOG Avoidance)

For an operator, the ultimate waste is an aircraft on the ground (AOG) due to a preventable documentation error or a missed life-limit on a part.

- **The Benefit:** Real-time compliance monitoring flags "expiring" items weeks in advance with high reliability.
    - This allows for parts to be ordered via standard shipping rather than expensive "AOG Express" rates, and ensures labor is scheduled during normal shifts rather than costly overtime.

- **Quantifiable Metric:** Ratio of "Planned vs. Unplanned" maintenance events and associated logistics costs.

- **Warranty and Asset Value Preservation:** For a **CAMO**, meticulous compliance records are vital for the residual value of the aircraft.
    - A CMS ensures that all "Back-to-Birth" documentation is pristine. This avoids the massive costs associated with "technical records recovery" during a lease return or aircraft sale, which can easily run into hundreds of thousands of dollars.
- **Insurance Premium Optimization:** Many underwriters now look at the robustness of an operator's digital compliance trail. Demonstrable, low-risk audit profiles can be used as leverage to negotiate lower insurance premiums, turning the CMS into a direct revenue-protection tool.

Addressing the Human Element (Auditees)

For the Maintainers and Operators on the ground (the auditees), the benefit of a modern CMS is the reduction of "Audit Anxiety."

For senior management, the ultimate efficiency gain is the honest reporting of errors. If an auditee is anxious, they hide mistakes. Hidden mistakes are the most expensive and dangerous form of wastage.

- **The Modern Shift:** By using a CMS to identify *systemic* trends rather than *individual* blame, the organization reinforces a Just Culture.
- The data shows that "Process X is frequently missed," which leads to a management fix (e.g., better lighting or updated tooling) rather than a disciplinary meeting.
- **The Benefit:** When the "Human Element" trusts the system, they report issues early. This early reporting is the most effective form of cost avoidance available to an operator, as it allows for scheduled fixes rather than emergency AOG recoveries.

EASA Auditor Best Practices - Strategies for Objective Regulatory Reporting

Sofema Aviation (SA) consider best practice techniques related to EASA Compliant Auditing – Writing Objective Reports to ensure Narrative Clarity, Evidentiary Integrity, and Bias Mitigation

Sofema Aviation Services Compliance Masterclass – May 2026

Introduction - In the EASA environment, an audit report is a legal record of a competent authority's or an organization's oversight activity. The transition from raw data to a formal report requires a disciplined approach to ensure that findings are indisputable, actionable, and free from the "auditor's ego."

The Core Principles of Objectivity

To be objective, a report must rely on verifiable evidence rather than intuition. In an EASA Part OPS - Part-145, Part-CAMO, or Part-21 context, this means mapping every observation directly to a specific regulatory requirement (e.g., a "shall" statement in an Implementing Rule).

- **Fact over Feeling:** Replace adjectives like "poor," "inadequate," or "sloppy" with descriptive facts. Instead of saying "The tool control was poor," state "Three calibrated torque wrenches were found without entry in the tool tracking system."
- **Neutrality of Tone:** Avoid inflammatory language. The goal is to identify a gap in the safety management system, not to assign personal blame to a post-holder.

Best Practices for Narrative Structure

The narrative must rely on a logical flow to maintain readability. The ASB (Audit Statement Baseline) method is highly effective for narrative-only reporting:

- **The Requirement (The "Should"):** Clearly state the regulation or manual reference.

Example: "In accordance with AMC1 CAMO.A.305(c), the organization must ensure that personnel have received relevant type training."

- **The Finding (The "Is"):** Describe the exact condition observed.

Example: "During the review of training records for Staff ID 445, no evidence of B737 MAX engine run-up training was available."

- **The Gap (The "Difference"):** Explicitly state why the finding constitutes non-compliance.

Example: "Consequently, the staff member performed specialized tasks without the required training certification mandated by the CAME."

Avoiding Common Pitfalls

Writing without the structural support of tables can lead to "narrative drift" where the point of the finding gets lost in prose. Be mindful of these issues:

- **Generalization:** Avoid words like "always," "never," or "constantly." If you find one error, report one error. If you find a systemic trend, provide the sample size (e.g., "In 5 out of 10 work packages reviewed...").
- **The "Hidden" Recommendation:** Under EASA principles, an auditor identifies the *non-compliance*, while the auditee identifies the *Root Cause and Corrective Action*. Avoid telling the auditee how to fix it within the finding; this preserves your independence.
- **Passive Voice Ambiguity:** Using the passive voice can hide the "actor." Use active voice for clarity. "The records were not signed" is weaker than "The Certifying Staff did not sign the release statement."

Enhancing Clarity in Text-Heavy Reports

Without tables to break up the data, use structural formatting to keep the reader engaged:

- **Numbered Lists for Evidence:** If you are listing multiple aircraft registrations or document numbers, use a vertical list to ensure the auditee can easily track each item for their internal investigation.
- **Bold Technical References:** Bold the specific EASA regulation numbers (e.g., **145.A.47(b)**) to make them "pop" against the surrounding text.
- **The "So What?" Test:** After writing a finding, ask yourself if a third party, who was not at the audit, could understand exactly what is wrong just by reading your words. If it requires verbal explanation, it isn't objective yet.

Final Quality Review

Before finalizing the report, perform a "Bias Check." Read the report specifically looking for "opinion creep." If a sentence contains a word that describes an emotion or a subjective judgment (e.g., "disappointing," "careless"), delete it.

The strength of an EASA audit lies in its cold, hard alignment with the safety standards.

Sofema Aviation Services Compliance Masterclass – May 2026

What specific area of the EASA regulations—such as Part-145 maintenance or Part-CAMO continuing airworthiness—will these reports primarily focus on?

Considering the Future of EASA Compliance Auditing – With Reference to EASA AI Roadmap 2.0, EU AI Act (Regulation (EU) 2024/1689) and NPA 2025-07

In the 2026 regulatory landscape, EASA compliance auditing is undergoing its most radical transformation since the shift from prescriptive rules to performance-based oversight.

As an auditor, your focus should move away from purely checking "what" was done to investigating "how" (If a machine decided it should be done) and whether the human remained in control of that decision.

The future of auditing is defined by a number of regulations and source documents including **EASA AI Roadmap 2.0**, **Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (EU AI Act)**, and the forthcoming **NPA 2025-07**.

The Strategic Blueprint: EASA AI Roadmap 2.0

The Roadmap 2.0 serves as the conceptual anchor for all future audits. It establishes a human-centric philosophy: AI must augment human performance, not replace it.

- For an auditor, this means verifying that your organization has mapped its AI tools to the correct Level of Automation:
- **Level 1 (Human Augmentation):** The AI provides cognitive assistance (e.g., highlighting a potential crack in a blade image), but the human makes the final decision.
- **Level 2 (Human-AI Collaboration):** The human and AI work as a team, with the AI potentially initiating actions that the human must actively monitor or override.
- **Level 3 (Limited Autonomy):** The AI makes decisions that are only reviewed after the fact—a level EASA is approaching with extreme caution, likely not seeing full implementation in safety-critical systems for years.

The Legal "Hard Law": EU AI Act (Regulation (EU) 2024/1689)

Sofema Aviation Services Compliance Masterclass – May 2026

While EASA provides the technical standards, the **EU AI Act** provides the legal enforcement power. As of **August 2026**, full obligations for high-risk AI systems are being enforced across the EU.

Because many aviation systems are part of a certified product (like a flight control system or an engine monitoring tool), they are automatically classified as "High-Risk" under the Act. This changes my audit checklist to include:

- **AI Management Systems (AIMS):** - Auditor Task to check if there is a formal governance structure for AI, similar to how you manage your Quality or Safety systems.
- **Data Lineage:** To see evidence of where the training data came from and how you ensure it is free from "bias" that could lead to safety failures (e.g., an AI that performs well on modern engines but fails to recognize faults on older, analog-heavy fleets).

The Technical Reality: NPA 2025-07

NPA 2025-07 introduces the Seven Dimensions of Trustworthiness

Instead of a simple "Pass/Fail" on a maintenance task, To audit your AI against seven core properties:

Human Agency & Oversight: to look for "Override Logs." If your AI recommended a part replacement and your technician disagreed, did the system allow that override, and was the reasoning recorded?

Technical Robustness & Safety: To demonstrate how the AI handles "edge cases" or sensor data gaps without crashing or providing dangerous advice.

Transparency & Explainability: The "Hidden Black Box" is now prohibited. If an AI flags a fault, it must provide a "human-interpretable" explanation so a licensed engineer can verify the logic.

Privacy & Data Governance: Ensuring that the data used for machine learning complies with privacy laws and maintains integrity throughout the lifecycle.

Diversity & Fairness: Auditing for "model drift" or bias that could result in uneven safety standards across different operational environments.

Societal & Environmental Wellbeing: Verifying that AI efficiency gains (like fuel saving) do not inadvertently compromise safety margins.

Accountability: Establishing a clear digital "paper trail" from the AI developer to the end-user who signed off the work.

The Shift to Continuous Oversight

2026 Brings Continuous Risk Management.

- **Real-Time Data Feeds** To consider the possibility of accessing AI's **Performance Indicators** remotely to see if the system is "drifting" from its certified baseline.
- **SMS Integration:** AI is no longer an "IT project"; it is a core component of your Safety Management System (SMS). To audit how your AI findings are analyzed, actioned, and fed back into your risk assessments.

The Auditor's Perspective: to establish no **Automation Bias**. Where there are signs that staff have become "passive observers" who trust the machine too much.

- Training records should show specific "AI literacy" training on how to challenge the machine.

Special Consideration Concerning the August 2026 enforcement deadline

Is the Management System capable of documenting the "explainability" of your digital decisions, or is the relevant technical documentation siloed within your IT department?

Compliance Considerations Related to Aircraft Acquisition (Buying, Dry lease, Wet Lease)

Introduction

The compliance department’s role in aircraft acquisition is defined by the rigorous integration of Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 (Continuing Airworthiness) and Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 (Air Operations).

Today the compliance function is the primary oversight enabler related to the "Technical Bridge," ensuring that an asset’s airworthiness status remains continuous during the high-risk transition of ownership or operational control.

Compliance Architecture under EASA 1321/2014

Sofema Aviation Services Compliance Masterclass – May 2026

The Part-CAMO Imperative (Annex Vc) - For any acquisition, the Compliance Monitoring Manager (CMM) must ensure the organization's Continuing Airworthiness Management Organisation (CAMO) has the scope of work and the capability to incorporate the new tail number.

1. Under CAMO.A.315, the compliance department must audit the "bridging" of the aircraft's prior maintenance program to the acquirer's Aircraft Maintenance Program (AMP).

Record Integrity & M.A.305 (Annex I)

Compliance is typically responsible for the forensic audit of the aircraft's continuing airworthiness records.

- For SMEs, this means verifying Back-to-Birth (BTB) traceability for all Life Limited Parts (LLPs). Under the 2026 digital standards, this involves validating the "Digital Birth Certificate" and ensuring that all Airworthiness Directives (ADs) and mandatory Service Bulletins (SBs) are not only recorded but physically embodied and verifiable.

Regulatory Nuances by Acquisition Type

Outright Purchase: The ARC and Export CofA - When purchasing, the compliance focus is on the Airworthiness Review Certificate (ARC) validity. (Or Issue if new to the EU Register) If the aircraft is transitioning from a non-EASA registry (e.g., FAA to EASA), compliance usually manages the Import Process.

This involves an extensive physical survey and record audit to ensure the aircraft conforms to the EASA Type Certificate Data Sheet (TCDS). Compliance must ensure that the Export Certificate of Airworthiness (ECofA) from the exporting state is fully reconciled with EASA Part-M requirements.

Dry Lease: Transfer of Management Responsibility

In a dry lease, the lessee's CAMO takes full responsibility for the aircraft's airworthiness. The compliance department's primary challenge is the Lease Return Conditions.

- They must negotiate the technical "hand back" criteria to ensure that the maintenance performed during the lease term satisfies both EASA 1321/2014 and the lessor's residual value requirements.

- Failure to align the lessee's AMP with the lessor's requirements often leads to multimillion-dollar "technical debt" at the end of the lease.

Wet Lease (ACMI): ORO.AOC.110 Compliance

In a wet lease scenario, where the lessor retains operational control, the compliance department acts as an Oversight Auditor. Under ORO.AOC.110, the lessee must ensure that the lessor's safety standards are equivalent to their own.

- This is particularly complex if the lessor is a Third Country Operator (TCO). Compliance must verify the lessor's EASA TCO Authorization and ensure that the lessor's Part-145 maintenance organization is approved to perform work that meets the lessee's home-state requirements.

2026 Best Practices for Industry Professionals

- **Pre-Acquisition Phase-In Plan:** Compliance should lead a "Phase-In" meeting months before delivery to map the aircraft's current status against the destination state's National Aviation Authority (NAA) variations. (This prevents "grounded-on-arrival" scenarios).
- **Implementation of Part-IS (Information Security):** By 2026, EASA requires CAMOs to manage information security risks. Compliance must audit the digital data transfer protocols of the aircraft's "Health Monitoring" data to ensure that sensitive operational telemetry is protected against cyber threats during the transition of ownership.

Challenges and Critical Issues

- **Latent Technical Debt in Records:** A significant potential issue is the "Missing Link" in the LLP chain. If a previous operator utilized a non-EASA-approved MRO for a component overhaul, compliance must identify early, as it can invalidate the ARC and require a costly component replacement.
- **Regulatory Divergence (The Brexit Legacy):** In 2026, managing aircraft that move between UK CAA and EASA remains a compliance hurdle. Despite high alignment, minor differences in AD compliance timelines or Form 1 vs. Form 8130-3 acceptance can create legal gridlock during acquisition.

- **The "Shadow" Sanctions Risk:** In the current geopolitical climate, an aircraft may be "clean" today but have a tail number history associated with a sanctioned entity five years prior. Compliance must use advanced forensic tools to ensure the aircraft is not "tainted," which would make it unfinishable by Tier 1 banks or uninsurable by the London market.
- **Part-145 Capacity Constraints:** Compliance must verify that the MRO that holds the specific Rating and Approval for the airframe/engine combination.

EASA Auditing Masterclass - Balancing "The Book" with Risk-Based Pragmatism

Introduction - Here we will discuss each of the following points in turn:

- Applying a more practical, risk-based approach during audits
- Balancing compliance without losing effectiveness
- How to avoid being perceived as 'policing' and instead promote a culture of safety and continuous improvement.
- How to interpret EASA requirements with flexibility
- How to ensure consistency between different auditors?"

The Bedrock of EASA comprises the Implementing Rules (IRs) – "hard law"- where there is no flexibility Hard Law. The competence of a senior auditor lies in how they navigate the "Soft Law" the Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMC) and Guidance Material (GM).

- **The Foundation of Hard Law -** When an auditor encounters a direct violation of an IR approach must be absolute to ensure we maintain the structural integrity of the regulatory framework.

Applying the Risk-Based Lens

The "line" is drawn at the intersection of safety impact and systemic stability.

- A practical, risk-based approach asks: "Does this deviation increase the probability of a technical failure or an operational hazard?" whether the risk is solid or administrative.

Drawing the Line - Effectiveness is lost when auditors focus on "low-value" findings that do not contribute to safety.

- We should ensure effectiveness by prioritizing findings that reveal a breakdown in the Management System or Safety Culture.

- If the "book" is used to punish minor administrative lapses while ignoring a toxic culture where engineers are afraid to report defects, the audit has failed its primary objective.

2. From "Policing" to Partnership: Promoting a Culture of Continuous Improvement
The "Auditor-as-Police" archetype is a vestige of the pre-SMS era. It creates a "hide-and-seek" culture where Nominated Persons (NPs) only show the auditor what they want them to see. To move toward a culture of continuous improvement, the auditor must transition into the role of a **Systemic Consultant**.

The Transparency Shift
Auditors avoid the "policing" label by practicing **Collaborative Auditing**. This involves discussing potential findings with the Business Area Owner (BAO) in real-time. There should be "no surprises" at the closing meeting. When a finding is identified, the auditor should frame it as a "Systemic Vulnerability" rather than a "Personal Failure."

The Auditor as a Mirror
Instead of saying, *"You are non-compliant,"* the effective auditor asks, *"How does your current process prevent a mistake here?"* By letting the BAO discover the gap themselves, the auditor promotes ownership. This shift fosters a **Just Culture**, where the organization views the audit as a free "stress test" of their defenses rather than a threat to their license.

Adding Value
Continuous improvement is triggered when the auditor highlights **Observations** (not just findings) that suggest better ways of working based on industry best practices. This demonstrates that the auditor is an asset to the organization’s growth, not just a hurdle to its operation.

3. The Interpretation Paradox: Flexibility vs. Consistency
One of the greatest challenges in the EASA environment is that "Easy Access Rules" are often anything but easy to interpret. To what extent can an auditor be flexible?

Flexibility within the AMC/GM Framework

EASA allows for **Alternative Means of Compliance (AltMoC)**. This is the ultimate expression of flexibility. An auditor should be open to an organization’s unique way of meeting a requirement, provided the organization can provide data-driven evidence that their method achieves an equivalent level of safety. Flexibility is acceptable only when it is **documented, risk-assessed, and transparent.**

Sofema Aviation Services Compliance Masterclass – May 2026

Ensuring Auditor Consistency
Inconsistency between auditors is a leading cause of frustration for NPs and Accountable Managers.

To mitigate this, Sofema and similar high-level organizations advocate for:

- **The Compliance Library:** A centralized database of internal "Interpretative Bulletins." When a complex regulation is interpreted in a specific way, it is recorded so future auditors follow the same logic.
- **Peer Review and Shadow Audits:** Regularly "auditing the auditor" ensures that one individual isn't being overly lenient while another is being excessively rigid.
- **Standardization Meetings:** Senior auditors should meet regularly to discuss "Grey Areas" and align their philosophies.

The Objective Standard
Consistency is achieved not by making every auditor think the same, but by ensuring they all use the same **objective evidence criteria**. If three different auditors look at the same set of data, the evidence should lead them to the same conclusion, regardless of their personal style.

Final Thought: The goal of the modern EASA auditor is not to find a "guilty party," but to find a "broken process." When we align our audits with the principles of Root Cause Analysis and Performance-Based Oversight, we stop being a burden to the Business Area Owner and start being the guardian of their operational resilience.
In your experience, when you encounter a "grey area" in the AMC, do you find your organization tends to lean toward the most conservative interpretation, or do you actively seek out Alternative Means of Compliance to boost operational efficiency?

Q Can We Manage Components Off Wing without a “C” Rating Approval – when the inspection is included in the AMM (Small company)

A Short Answer is a qualified yes – However to Note it is nothing to do with Company Size

Sofema Aviation Services Compliance Masterclass – May 2026

The question of whether an organization can manage components off-wing without a Category C (Component) rating is a frequent point of discussion in EASA Part-145 and Part-CAO environments.

Under **Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014,** the short answer is indeed a qualified yes, but the regulatory "safety net" that allows this is very specific.

- It relies on the distinction between maintaining a component *as part of the aircraft* versus maintaining it as a *standalone asset*.

The Regulatory Basis: The "A" Rating Privilege

According to **AMC 145.A.42(b)(ii)** (and similar provisions in Part-CAO), an organization with an **Aircraft (A) rating** may maintain a component while it is temporarily removed for any of the following reasons:

- To improve access to other parts of the aircraft.
- To perform maintenance on the component itself, provided the instructions for that maintenance are found in the Aircraft Maintenance Manual (AMM).

The "Same Aircraft" Rule

The critical regulatory "hook" is the intent. The component is treated as an extension of the aircraft. As long as the component is intended to be reinstalled on the same aircraft before the final Certificate of Release to Service (CRS) is issued, the "A" rating is sufficient.

AMM vs. CMM: The Defining Line

The scope of work is dictated by the data source, not just the location of the component.

- **AMM (Aircraft Maintenance Manual):** If the manufacturer includes a procedure in the AMM (e.g., "Clean and inspect battery" or "Test ELT"), an "A" rated organization can do this on a bench.
- **CMM (Component Maintenance Manual):** Generally, if the work requires instructions, specialized tools, or test benches defined strictly in **the CMM, it falls into the realm of a "C" rating.**

Key Takeaway: If you are using the CMM to certify the work, you are acting as a Component Workshop, which requires a "C" rating and the issuance of an EASA Form 1.

The Challenge: When the Aircraft Leaves

The scenario becomes complex if the aircraft is ready to go, but the component is still on the bench (perhaps due to a discovered defect or a delay in parts).

If you have a "C" Rating:

The workshop can finish the work, issue an EASA Form 1, and return the component to stores as a "serviceable" part available for any aircraft in the fleet.

If you DO NOT have a "C" Rating:

You cannot issue an EASA Form 1. This leaves the component in a "regulatory limbo." To manage this, the organization must have a robust MOE (Maintenance Organization Exposition) procedure for:

- **Removal of Serviceable Components:** If a component is removed from an aircraft in a serviceable condition (and was serviceable when fitted), it can be tagged as such, provided the history is known.
- **Tagging and Segregation:** If the component was removed for maintenance and that maintenance wasn't completed before the aircraft departed, it remains **unserviceable** until a "C" rated shop certifies it.

Why Company Size is Irrelevant

The regulation does not care if you are a "one-man band" or a global MRO.

- **Safety is Standardized:** The risk of a faulty component is the same regardless of company size.
- **Procedures over Personnel:** A small company can perform off-wing tasks if their **MOE/CAE** defines the process and they have the approved tools/facilities listed in the AMM.

The Pre-Conditions for "Serviceable Removal"

- **The Source:** The component must have been removed from an EU-registered aircraft.
- **The Condition:** The component was in a serviceable condition while fitted to the aircraft. You cannot "repair" a broken part and use this process.
- **The Data:** You must use the Aircraft Maintenance Manual (AMM) for the removal and any subsequent "bench" testing/inspection.

The Verification Process (The "Investigation")

The certifying staff (B1/B2/B3) must verify the component's status to ensure it is fit for release. You need to document:

- **Traceability:** Which aircraft (Registration and MSN) did it come from?
- **Hours/Cycles:** What are the total times and, if applicable, the times since new (TSN) or since overhaul (TSO)?
- **AD/SB Status:** Are there any outstanding Airworthiness Directives or mandatory Service Bulletins?
- **Occurrence History:** Confirm the aircraft has not been involved in an accident, incident, fire, or flood (which would render the part "unsalvageable" without deeper shop inspection).

Completing the EASA Form 1

When an "A" rated organization issues a Form 1 for a removed serviceable component, the form acts as a "Statement of Reality" regarding its condition and history.

Key Blocks to Fill:

- **Block 11 (Status/Work):** Enter **"Serviceable"**.
- **Block 12 (Remarks):** This is the most critical section. It must contain a specific set of declarations. If this block is incomplete, the Form 1 is often rejected by other MROs.

Mandatory Information for Block 12:

1. "Serviceable component removed from an aircraft."

2. **Aircraft Details:** Registration, Type, Serial Number, and total flight hours/cycles of the aircraft at removal.
3. **Component Details:** Total flight hours/cycles/landings (as applicable).
4. **Maintenance Data:** Reference the AMM chapter/section used for removal and inspection (e.g., *"Removed and inspected I.A.W. AMM 24-20-00"*).
5. **AD/SB Status:** State that all applicable ADs are current or list the last one complied with.
6. **Non-Incident Statement:** *"The component was not removed from an aircraft involved in an accident or incident."*

- **Block 14a (Release to Service):** Check the box for **145.A.50 Release to Service**.
    - *Note:* You are certifying that the work (the removal and inspection) was done per Part-145 and the part is "ready for fly."

Supporting Paperwork (The "Back-to-Birth" File)

The Form 1 does not stand alone. To satisfy an auditor or a future buyer, you should staple the following to the Form 1:

1. **The Removal Work Order:** The actual job card signed by the mechanic who removed the part.
2. **The Aircraft Logbook Entry:** A copy of the page showing the component removal and the aircraft's total time.
3. **The "Birth Certificate":** If available, the original Form 1 that was used when the part was first installed on that aircraft.

Next Steps

Sofema Aviation www.sofemaaviation.com provides over 525 Courses, Packages & Diploma's please see the website or email team@sassofia.com

Sofema Aviation Services Compliance Masterclass – May 2026