



Advisory Circular

Subject: Monitoring Approved Check Pilots (ACPs) and Advanced Qualification Program Evaluators (AQPEs)

Issuing Office:	Civil Aviation, Standards	Document No.:	AC 700-051
File Classification No.:	Z 5000-34	Issue No.:	02
RDIMS No.:	15753410-V12	Effective Date:	2022-04-01

Table of contents

1.0	Introduction	3
1.1	Purpose	3
1.2	Applicability	3
1.3	Description of changes.....	3
2.0	References and requirements	4
2.1	Reference documents	4
2.2	Cancelled documents.....	4
2.3	Definitions and abbreviations	4
3.0	Background	6
4.0	Program details	7
4.1	General.....	7
4.2	Eligibility requirements - ACP (Type M) and AQPE (Type M)	7
4.3	Eligibility requirements - sponsoring air operator.....	8
4.4	Implementation.....	8
4.5	Application and approval process	8
4.6	Initial training requirements	9
4.7	Qualification and recent experience requirements.....	9
4.8	Observing delegates with a Type M authority	10
4.9	Administration and approvals for monitors.....	10
4.10	Conducting a monitor	11
4.11	Assessing a monitor	11
4.12	Quality assurance	11
4.13	Program updates.....	12
5.0	Information management	12
6.0	Document history	12
7.0	Contact us	12

Appendix A — Monitor guide..... 13
Appendix B — Performance standard 19
Appendix C — ACP/AQPE Monitor Grading Matrix 24
Appendix D — Similar aircraft types 29

1.0 Introduction

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

1.1 Purpose

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

1.2 Applicability

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

1.3 Description of changes

- (1) The ministerial delegation of authority that allows a small segment of industry pilots to exercise ACP/AQPE privileges continues to expand in scope. An increasing number of ACPs/AQPEs will receive additional privileges on their delegation of authority, which will allow them to assist TCCA with the monitoring of ACPs/AQPEs.
- (2) Due to the number of changes incorporated into this Issue, readers should review the content of the entire document. The major changes are the following:
 - (a) Definition of CRM added;
 - (b) Definitions and terminology consistent with the ACP, AQPE and air operator certification programs updated;
 - (c) Clarification on the ACP/AQPE Monitor (Revision) added;
 - (d) The term 'Monitor' versus 'Monitor Check' now used;
 - (e) Flight operations quality assurance program now specified;
 - (f) Clarification on building recent experience for newly qualified Type M candidates added;
 - (g) Type M 'monitor check workshop' requirement removed;
 - (h) Link to the external ACP/AQPE Program website and reference to the internal ACP/AQPE Program – Inspector Resource site added;
 - (i) New statement that comments are encouraged for grades of 3 and 4 added;
 - (j) Alignment in the use of 'poor' between the ACP/AQPE Monitor Grading Matrix and the ACP program's 4-Point Marking Scale (Grading Matrix) provided; and
 - (k) List of similar aircraft types updated.

2.0 References and requirements

2.1 Reference documents

(1) The following reference materials must be used in conjunction with this document:

- (a) *Aeronautics Act* (R.S., 1985, c. A-2)
- (b) Transport Canada Publication, TP 6533E, Approved Check Pilot Manual
- (c) Transport Canada Publication, TP 14672, Advanced Qualification Program Evaluator Manual

Note: Additional program documents (e.g., Advisory Circular (AC) 700-042 – Crew Resource Management (CRM)) are referenced in the material above.

2.2 Cancelled documents

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

2.3 Definitions and abbreviations

(1) The following **definitions** are used in this document:

- (a) **ACP/AQPE Monitor (Initial)** – An initial assessment to confirm that an ACP/AQPE can conduct a flight check in accordance with the applicable performance standard.
- (b) **ACP/AQPE Monitor (Recurrent)** – A frequency-based recurring assessment to confirm that an ACP/AQPE is maintaining the ability to conduct a flight check in accordance with the applicable performance standard. This monitor is normally scheduled on a fixed-interval schedule, occurring one year after an ACP/AQPE Monitor (Initial), and once every second year thereafter (intervals can vary, depending on risk-based circumstances). This monitor may be combined with an ACP/AQPE Monitor (Revision).
- (c) **ACP/AQPE Monitor (Requalification)** – An assessment that is conducted by a CASI on an ACP/AQPE when the validity period of their last monitor has expired by no more than 24 months.
- (d) **ACP/AQPE Monitor (Revision)** – An assessment that is conducted by a CASI on an ACP/AQPE for the purpose of revising authorizations on a Letter of ACP/AQPE Accreditation. This monitor may be combined with an ACP Monitor (Recurrent).
- (e) **ACP/AQPE Course (Type M)** – A course delivered by TCCA designed to teach CASIs/ACPs/AQPEs how to conduct a monitor on an ACP/AQPE. This course may be referred to as the 'Monitor Check Course' in other publications and administration forms.
- (f) **Active operational pilot** – In this circular, refers to a pilot that meets the minimum flight currency requirements specified by the air operator, or the qualification / recent experience requirements specified in the *Canadian Aviation Regulations (CARs)* / *Commercial Air Services Standard (CASS)* for the applicable subpart, whichever is higher.
- (g) **Advanced Qualification Program Evaluator (AQPE)** - A person holding an official authorization to conduct evaluations and/or validations on behalf of the Minister of Transport pursuant to Part 1, Section 4.3(1) of the *Aeronautics Act*, within a given air operator's approved Advanced Qualification Program (AQP). There are four types of AQPEs:

- (i) **Type E** - An AQPE who is authorized to conduct validations and evaluations;
 - (ii) **Type V** - An AQPE who is authorized to conduct validations;
 - (iii) **Type O** - An AQPE who is authorized to conduct select evaluations only (i.e., operational); and
 - (iv) **Type M** - An AQPE who is authorized to conduct monitors on Type E and Type V AQPEs.
- (h) **Air operator** – In this circular, an air operator refers to the holder of a certificate under Part VII of the CARs.
- (i) **Approved Check Pilot (ACP)** – A person holding an official authorization to conduct any or all of the following activities on behalf of the Minister of Transport pursuant to Part 1, Section 4.3(1) of the *Aeronautics Act*: Pilot Proficiency Checks (PPCs), Line Checks, certain qualification checks, and monitors. There are three types of ACPs:
- (i) **Type A** - An ACP who is authorized to conduct PPCs, Line Checks, and certain qualification checks where the CARs require such a check to be conducted by an authorized person;
 - (ii) **Type B** - An ACP who is only authorized to conduct Line Checks and certain qualification checks where the CARs require such a check to be conducted by an authorized person; and
 - (iii) **Type M** - An ACP who is authorized to conduct monitors on ACPs (Type A).
- (j) **Civil Aviation Safety Inspector (CASI)** – In this circular, refers to a Transport Canada Inspector who is trained and authorized to conduct flight checks and ACP/AQPE monitors.
- (k) **Company employee** - A person that is employed on a part-time basis, full-time basis or contract basis.
- (l) **Conduct** - To take an active role in all phases of a flight check, including pre-flight preparation and briefing, the control and pace of the various sequences, assessment of the candidate's performance, and the debriefing and completion of the required documents.
- (m) **Crew Resource Management (CRM)** - The effective utilization of all resources including crew members, aircraft systems, supporting facilities and persons to achieve safe and efficient operations. The objective of CRM is to enhance communication, interaction, human factors and management skills of the crew members concerned. Emphasis is also on the non-technical aspects of crew performance.
- (n) **Flight check** - In this circular, refers to a PPC, Line Check, certain qualification checks, evaluation, or validation flight check in a simulator or an aircraft.
- (o) **Issuing Authority** – A Transport Canada Technical Team Lead (TTL) or Associate Director of Operations (ADO) that may issue an ACP delegation, an AQPE delegation and/or issue notices of refusal to issue, suspension, refusal to renew or cancellation pertaining to an ACP/AQPE delegation.
- (p) **Letter of ACP/AQPE Accreditation** – An official authorization to exercise an ACP/AQPE ministerial delegation.
- (q) **National Operations** – The organization in TCCA Headquarters that is responsible for the oversight of a defined list of national air operators in Canada and the external delegates providing a service to these air operators.
- (r) **Professional suitability** – In this circular, refers to a delegate that possesses the knowledge, competency, judgment, integrity and communication skills (both oral and

written) to represent the Minister in a favorable manner and who has demonstrated the willingness to work cooperatively with TCCA to promote aviation safety.

- (s) **Special Authorization** - An approval which is documented in the Operations Specifications. The term is interchangeable with Specific Approval. The term special authorization replaces 'Ops Spec'. Refer to TP 4711 for more information.
 - (t) **Specific Approval** - An approval which is documented in the Operations Specifications. The term is interchangeable with Special Authorization. Refer to TP4711 for more information.
 - (u) **Surveillance / oversight on ACPs/AQPEs** – Refers to the conduct of monitors on these delegates and the periodic administrative review of their performance and records on file with TCCA.
 - (v) **Transitional Safety Management System** – In this circular, refers to the implementation of a safety management system that does not have all the components to be recognized as a complete safety management system.
- (2) The following **abbreviations** are used in this document:
- (a) **ACP:** Approved Check Pilot
 - (b) **AQP:** Advanced Qualification Program
 - (c) **AQPE:** Advanced Qualification Program Evaluator
 - (d) **CARs:** *Canadian Aviation Regulations*
 - (e) **CASI:** Civil Aviation Safety Inspector
 - (f) **CASS:** *Commercial Air Services Standard*
 - (g) **CRM:** Crew Resource Management
 - (h) **FTR:** Flight Test Report
 - (i) **LOE:** Line Operational Evaluation
 - (j) **MV:** Manoeuvres Validation
 - (k) **POI:** Principal Operations Inspector
 - (l) **PPC:** Pilot Proficiency Check
 - (m) **PVI:** Program Validation Inspection
 - (n) **SMS:** Safety Management System
 - (o) **SOP:** Standard Operating Procedure
 - (p) **TATC:** Transportation Appeal Tribunal of Canada
 - (q) **TCCA:** Transport Canada Civil Aviation
 - (r) **HQ:** Headquarters

3.0 Background

- (1) ACPs/AQPEs have consistently demonstrated the ability to conduct flight checks in a competent and professional manner. This is reinforced by the historically high pass rate that ACPs/AQPEs have achieved during monitors conducted by TCCA.
- (2) Surveillance of most ACPs/AQPEs is a low-risk activity within TCCA's broad scope of aviation oversight and warrants better use of risk-based surveillance practices. Creating a shared arrangement between TCCA and industry to conduct recurrent monitors provides a balanced

approach to risk management. In turn, this enables the efficient use of TCCA resources and allows TCCA to leverage valuable industry experience and commitments to safety to enhance the overall quality and effectiveness of the ACP/AQPE programs.

4.0 Program details

4.1 General

- (1) Industry delegates who are approved to conduct ACP/AQPE monitors will receive an additional authority on their Letter of ACP/AQPE Accreditation, titled: ACP (Type M) and/or AQPE (Type M), where the 'M' represents 'monitor'. An industry delegate with Type M authority is representing the Minister during the conduct of a monitor.
- (2) ACPs/AQPEs who meet the eligibility criteria in this circular **and** are employed (sponsored) by an eligible air operator can apply for Type M authority. Delegates that receive Type M authority will be authorized to conduct certain monitors on ACPs/AQPEs within their organization. Other monitors may only be conducted by CASIs.
- (3) Monitors that may be conducted by an ACP/AQPE (Type M) are as follows:
 - (a) ACP/AQPE Monitors (Recurrent).
- (4) Monitors conducted by a CASIs are as follows:
 - (a) ACP/AQPE Monitor (Initial);
 - (b) ACP/AQPE Monitor (Requalification);
 - (c) ACP/AQPE Monitor (Revision);

Note: At the discretion of the Transport Canada Issuing Authority, an ACP/AQPE Monitor (Revision) may not be required for the purposes of revising authorities on a Letter of ACP/AQPE Accreditation;
 - (d) ACP/AQPE Monitors (Recurrent)

Note: At the discretion of the Transport Canada Issuing Authority, an ACP/AQPE Monitor (Recurrent) may be required where there are performance or risk- related concerns. This is in addition to normal recurrent requirements;
 - (e) Monitors on an ACP/AQPE (Type M); and
 - (f) Monitors on ACPs/AQPEs who are not employed (sponsored) by the same air operator as the ACP/AQPE (Type M).
- (5) In addition to the monitors listed in the above paragraph, the Issuing Authority has the discretion to carry out an ACP/AQPE Monitor (Recurrent) on any ACP/AQPE for sampling purposes.
- (6) Eligible air operators are not obligated to sponsor ACPs/AQPEs for the Type M authorization. However, it is anticipated that eligible air operators will choose to participate in this initiative to add flexibility to the scheduling of monitors and contribute to the quality and effectiveness of the ACP/AQPE programs.

4.2 Eligibility requirements - ACP (Type M) and AQPE (Type M)

- (1) ACPs/AQPEs must meet all the following requirements to be considered for a Type M authorization and must continue to meet these requirements to retain Type M authority:
 - (a) A valid ACP (Type A) or AQPE (Type E) authorization on their Letter of ACP/AQPE Accreditation;
 - (b) A valid medical certificate or temporary loss of medical for 90 days or less;

- (c) A minimum of four years of experience as an ACP (Type A) or AQPE (Type E) and actively employed as an ACP/AQPE for a minimum of 24-months immediately preceding the Type M application;
- (d) No grade below three (3) on any item during their previous monitor;
- (e) A minimum of 32 PPCs conducted as an ACP or a combination of 32 MVs and LOEs conducted as an AQPE (of which no more than 50% were MVs);
- (f) Employed as an active operational pilot with the sponsoring air operator - see definition of "active operational pilot" in this circular;
- (g) Professional suitability as determined by the Issuing Authority - see definition of "professional suitability" in this circular; and
- (h) Nominated by the sponsoring air operator and approved by the Issuing Authority.

4.3 Eligibility requirements - sponsoring air operator

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

4.4 Implementation

- (1) The Type M authority was introduced in 2019 as part of a two-phased implementation strategy. Initially, all air operators under CARs Subpart 705 and four air operators under CARs Subparts 702-704 were invited to participate. This introductory phase was successfully completed in early 2021. Phase two commenced mid 2021 following an analysis of feedback.
- (2) Full implementation of the Type M authority is now in place with air operators under CARs Subpart 702-704 eligible to participate in accordance with requirements specified in this Advisory Circular.

4.5 Application and approval process

- (1) Eligible air operators who wish to participate in this initiative are responsible for developing a process to identify the best internal candidates for a Type M authorization based on organizational needs.
- (2) The ratio of Type M authorizations versus the number of ACPs/AQPEs that exist within an air operator should reflect the applicable logistical considerations and availability of Type M delegate(s). As a minimum, the air operator must employ sufficient ACPs (Type A) or AQPEs

(Type E), such that each person holding an ACP/AQPE (Type M) authority within the air operator will be conducting monitors on **no less than four ACPs/AQPEs**. The primary objective is to ensure that Type M authorizations are kept to the minimum required to meet operational needs, which will assist with quality control and increase the likelihood that Type M authorizations are only issued to ACPs/AQPEs who have demonstrated the best attributes for the role.

- (3) Air operators are required to liaise with their TCCA POI to determine operational needs and discuss potential candidates for the Type M authorization. After the air operator and POI agree on a tentative plan, the air operator must provide the applicable regional TCCA office with a completed ACP Application Form (26-0837) or AQPE Application Form (26-0843) and resumé for each candidate. The application forms are available online in the TCCA Forms Catalogue. The resumé must clearly indicate how the applicant meets the required qualification and experience requirements specified in this circular.
- (4) The Transport Canada Issuing Authority will assess an application(s) and inform the operator of the candidate(s) suitability for a Type M authorization. The Transport Canada Issuing Authority will coordinate the enrolment of a candidate(s) on the ACP/AQPE Course (Type M) and add the Type M authorization to the candidate's Letter of ACP/AQPE Accreditation upon successful completion of the course.

4.6 Initial training requirements

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

4.7 Qualification and recent experience requirements

- (1) ACPs/AQPEs (Type M) must continue to meet the following qualification and recent experience requirements in order to exercise the Type M authority:
 - (a) Qualification requirements:
 - (i) Completed the TCCA ACP/AQPE Course (Type M);
 - (ii) Type rated on the aircraft (blanket or individual) that the monitor is being conducted on, or type rated on a similar aircraft type, as per the approved list in Appendix D;
 - (iii) Valid PPC on one of the aircraft types on the ACP/AQPE's Letter of ACP/AQPE Accreditation;
 - (iv) Knowledge of special authorizations/specific approvals, capabilities, or qualifications, such as RNP and/or RNP AR, RVR 1200/600/300 Cat II/III operations, offshore instrument approaches, heads up display, and enhanced vision systems, as applicable to the check;
 - (v) Knowledge of company operations manual(s), standard operating procedures, special authorizations/specific approvals, Aircraft Flight Manuals (AFMs), Minimum Equipment Lists (MELs), Safety Management System (SMS) and any other pertinent operational publications that are applicable to the check;
 - (vi) If acting as a flight crew member during the monitor, the ACP must be qualified and current on type in accordance with the CARs and company requirements; and

- (vii) No performance or risk-related matters that renders the ACP/AQPE unsuitable for a Type M authorization, as determined by TCCA.

Note: The originally planned 'monitor check workshop' is no longer a qualification requirement. Instead, delegates with a Type M authority will have the opportunity to refresh their knowledge and skills through various Type A re-qualification activities (e.g., annual Administrative Monitors conducted by TCCA and ongoing ACP/AQPE Monitor briefings/debriefings).

- (b) Recent experience requirements:

- (i) A Type M delegate's ongoing proficiency at conducting monitors is paramount. The following are recent experience requirements:

- (A) **Monitors** - Within the previous 12 months, conducted no fewer than two monitor checks on an ACP (Type A) or AQPE (Type V or E);
- (B) **Flight Checks / Evaluations** - Within the previous 12 months, conducted no fewer than two flight checks / evaluations as an ACP (Type A) or AQPE (Type E); and
- (C) **Combined Total** - Within the previous 12 months, conducted no fewer than (a combined total of) six monitors and flight checks / evaluations.

Note 1: A 'previous 12 months' period is with respect to the day in a month on which a subsequent monitor is to take place.

Note 2: Exceptions to the above-stated requirements may be approved by the Transport Canada Issuing Authority on a case-by-case basis when warranted by circumstances.

4.8 Observing delegates with a Type M authority

- (1) A Type M delegate will not normally be observed while they are exercising Type M authority unless TCCA determines that there is a need to do so for sampling or performance-related reasons. In cases where TCCA chooses to observe the conduct of a monitor, there could be a capacity limitation in the aircraft or simulator that prevents TCCA from observing the in-flight phase of the check. In such cases, TCCA will observe the pre-flight and post-flight phases of the monitor.

Note: This TCCA oversight activity is known as an ACP/AQPE (Type M) Observation.

- (2) Although there is no stated requirement to observe a delegate while they are exercising Type M authority, there is still a requirement to monitor the delegate biennially while they are exercising Type A or Type E authority, as per the current policy in the ACP/AQPE Manuals.
- (3) During the above-mentioned biennial monitor, if a Type M delegate receives a grading below three (3) on any of the five items assessed during an otherwise successful monitor, the delegate's Type M authority will be revoked. In such cases, the delegates remaining authorizations will remain in effect. The delegate can apply to have the Type M authority re-instated after completing a subsequent monitor that has no item(s) graded below three (3).
- (4) If the validity period of a delegate's monitor has expired, the delegate is not authorized to exercise any ACP/AQPE privileges, including the Type M privilege.

4.9 Administration and approvals for monitors

- (1) Scheduling monitors

- (a) Air operators must provide their Issuing Authority with a list of planned monitors that are scheduled to be conducted by authorized company delegates (Type M authorization).

The schedule must be provided to the Issuing Authority at least 90 days in advance of the **month** of the planned monitor(s). It is unlikely that the exact date of a monitor will be known when this schedule is submitted, hence the need to only specify the **month** of the check; and

- (b) The following forms are available online in the TCCA Forms Catalogue and should be used to submit the planned schedule of checks: Form 26-0838 (ACP Schedule of Flight Checks) and Form 26-0845 (AQPE Monthly Schedule of Validations and Evaluations).
- (2) Approving monitors
- (a) Upon receipt of the planned schedule, the applicable Issuing Authority will inform the air operator at least 60 days in advance of the **month** of the planned monitor(s) if any of the monitors will be conducted by TCCA for reasons related to performance, risk, or sampling purposes.
- (3) Review of ACP/AQPE candidate records and discussion.
- (a) Regional Issuing Authorities will provide the ACP/AQPE (Type M) with historical data on flight checks conducted by an ACP/AQPE dating back to the previous monitor. This information is required to support the briefing of the ACP/AQPE during a monitor on their grading tendencies in comparison to national averages. There may also be a need to discuss the content of specific comment(s) made by an ACP/AQPE in a Flight Test Report(s), particularly in cases where the comment(s) is not consistent with the grading; and
 - (b) Where a 'mock event' is applicable, a brief discussion on realistic flying performance should occur.
 - (c) The mechanism and timelines for exchanging this information between the region and the delegate conducting the monitor(s) will be as determined / agreed upon by both parties.

4.10 Conducting a monitor

- (1) Monitors must be conducted in accordance with Appendix A – Monitor guide.

4.11 Assessing a monitor

- (1) Monitors must be assessed in accordance with Appendix B – Performance standard.

4.12 Quality assurance

- (1) Air operators that sponsor Type M delegates must ensure that measures are implemented to support the quality assurance of monitors. As a minimum, a means of communication must be established to facilitate the internal passage of information between Type M delegates to promote standardization and identify areas of concern. This sharing of information is expected to occur no less than once each twelve-month period, and a written summary of the information must be retained in company records for three years.
- (2) The primary responsibility of a Type M delegate is to promote the standardization of flight checks, ensuring that checks are conducted in the manner described in the ACP/AQPE Manual, as applicable. Type M delegates are also expected to promote and preserve the integrity and impartiality of flight checks. TCCA will support this endeavour by increasing internal efforts to regularly review flight test reports and evaluations generated by **all** ACPs/AQPEs. The aim of this measure is to look for trends in grading, pass rates, comment accuracy and administrative accuracy that trigger a concern and require intervention by TCCA.

4.13 Program updates

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

5.0 Information management

- (1) Not applicable.

6.0 Document history

- (1) Not applicable.

7.0 Contact us

For more information, please contact:
Commercial Flight Standards - AARTF
AARTFInfo-InfoAARTF@tc.gc.ca

We invite suggestions for amendment to this document. Submit your comments to:
Standards Branch Documentation Services
E-mail: AARTDocServices-ServicesdocAART@tc.gc.ca

Original signed by

Félix Meunier
Director, Standards
Civil Aviation, Transport Canada

Appendix A — Monitor guide

1.0 Introduction

- (1) The purpose of this guide is to provide persons who are conducting a monitor on an ACP/AQPE with guidance on how to conduct the monitor and complete the associated administrative tasks.
- (2) The procedures in this guide must be complied with and used in conjunction with the ACP Manual and the AQP Evaluator Manual.

2.0 Aim of a monitor

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

3.0 Phases of a monitor check

- (1) The following five phases are assessed during an ACP/AQPE Monitor:
 - (a) Flight check briefing;
 - (b) In-flight assessment;
 - (c) Flight check debriefing;
 - (d) Administration; and
 - (e) Knowledge and professional conduct.

4.0 Admission to a monitor

- (1) For admission to a monitor, the ACP/AQPE is required to present:
 - (a) A valid Commercial or Airline Transport Pilot Licence; and
 - (b) Proof that they have the authority (or candidacy) and required qualifications to conduct the flight check, as defined in the ACP/AQP Manuals.

5.0 Conducting a monitor

5.1 Pre-flight briefing with an ACP/AQPE

- (1) The person conducting the monitor will meet the ACP/AQPE before the flight check to discuss the following items:
 - (a) Purpose of the monitor (i.e., initial, recurrent, requalification, or revision);
 - (b) Content of the ACP/AQPE Monitor Report;
 - (c) Flow of the flight check, including the need for a brief meeting immediately following the in-flight assessment to discuss post-flight briefing points before debriefing the flight check candidate(s);
 - (d) Designation of the check/evaluation pilot of record; and
- (2) The person conducting the monitor will emphasize that they are not there to make decisions for the ACP/AQPE.
- (3) The following items must also be discussed with the ACP/AQPE, as applicable:
 - (a) The date of their last ACP/AQPE course;
 - (b) A review of relevant Advisory Circulars (AC) and ACP/AQPE Bulletins;
 - (c) A review of previous Flight Test Reports since the last monitor (if available);

Note: Discuss any applicable trends in evaluation errors or tendencies, and pass/fail rates in comparison to the national average and ensure that the narrative in the reports is consistent with the mark awarded and linked to the wording and performance criteria defined in the ACP/AQPE Manuals and applicable Flight Test Guide;
 - (d) A review of flight check authorizations (present or intended) applicable to the ACP's/AQPE's accreditation to ensure that they match operational needs and are consistent with the qualifications and currency of the ACP/AQPE;
 - (e) A review of the flight check script or plan of action to ensure that it is in compliance with the applicable PPC Schedule and follows all guidelines outlined in the applicable sections of the CARs, CASS, ACP Manual, and the AQP Evaluator Manual, as applicable;

Note: In general, the script or plan of action should provide fair, realistic and effective scenarios or exercises that create a positive experience and maximize opportunities to evaluate pilot / crew performance;
 - (f) For flight checks in an aircraft - review aircraft documents, weather, NOTAMs and ATC considerations; and
 - (g) For flight checks in a simulator - review unserviceable or defective equipment.

5.2 Pre-flight briefing with flight check candidate(s)

- (1) Before the ACP/AQPE conducts the briefing with the flight check candidate(s), the person conducting the monitor will ensure that:
 - (a) The candidate(s) are aware that the person conducting a monitor will be a passive participant during the flight check to observe the ACP's/AQPE's performance; and
 - (b) That the person conducting a monitor will require time immediately after the flight check to confer with the ACP/AQPE prior to the conduct of the post-flight briefing.

- (2) During the ACP's/AQPE's briefing to the candidate(s), the person conducting the monitor will only intervene if asked, or if incorrect information is being provided that could negatively affect the outcome of the flight check.

5.3 In-flight assessment

- (1) During the in-flight assessment, the person conducting the monitor must:
 - (a) maintain a passive role to the greatest extent possible; and
 - (b) observe whether the ACP/AQPE is conducting the flight check in accordance with the Performance Standard stated in Appendix B of this circular.

Note: There may be circumstances where the person conducting a monitor may be required to occupy a flight crew position. This would normally occur during an airborne 'mock event'/PPC (i.e., no actual PPC candidate) where a seated position precludes effective monitoring. The person conducting the monitor would role-play a candidate to facilitate the monitor. In these situations, it is critical that both regular flight crew and role-playing functions are well defined, reasonable and briefed in support of flight safety and assessment accuracy. Refer to qualification and recent experience requirements in this circular. Additionally, in an airborne environment, refer to safety pilot requirements in the ACP Manual.

- (2) Avoid intervening during the flight check unless asked to do so by the ACP/AQPE, or if you observe incorrect actions being taken by the ACP/AQPE that could affect the safety or outcome of the flight check.
- (3) In the unlikely event that the ACP/AQPE is conducting the flight check in a manner that is clearly inhibiting the performance of the candidate(s) and/or is likely to be the cause of an unsuccessful flight check, the person conducting the monitor shall stop the flight check and inform the candidate(s) that the flight check is being paused. In such cases, the ACP/AQPE must be debriefed on the concerns / issues in private, followed by one of the following actions, as appropriate:
 - (a) The person conducting the monitor, if adequately prepared and properly qualified to do so, may assume the role of the ACP/AQPE and complete the flight check to minimize the impact on the candidate(s); or
 - (b) (If the above option is not available) terminate the flight check and manage rescheduled opportunity in accordance with the ACP/AQPE Manual.
- (4) Upon completion of the flight check, the person conducting the monitor shall briefly confer with the ACP/AQPE to confirm agreement on the outcome (i.e., successful/unsuccessful). The candidate(s) must be informed of the outcome as soon as practical. If the person conducting the monitor and the ACP/AQPE disagree on the outcome, an agreement must be reached before informing the candidate(s). If there is no agreement, the evaluation of the person conducting the monitor will take precedence and will be used to debrief the candidate(s).

5.4 Post-flight meeting with an ACP/AQPE

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

5.5 Post-flight debriefing with a candidate(s)

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

Note: For an ACP Monitor (Initial), ACP Monitor (Requalification) and ACP Monitor (Revision), the CASI is the signing authority (i.e., check pilot of record) on all forms and licensing documents.

6.0 Assessing and debriefing a monitor

6.1 Assessing the performance of an ACP/AQPE

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

6.2 Debriefing an ACP/AQPE on a successful monitor

- (1) The ACP/AQPE shall be debriefed in private to discuss the following items:
 - (a) Discuss the ACP/AQPE’s performance, addressing all five phases of the flight check and highlighting strengths, weaknesses, and suggestions for improvement;
 - (b) If the monitor was an ACP Monitor (Initial), advise the ACP/AQPE of the following:
 - (i) A delegate is not authorized to conduct a flight check prior to receiving a Letter of ACP/AQPE Accreditation;
 - (ii) An ACP Monitor (Recurrent) will be required prior to the first day of the 13th month, based on the completion date of their ACP Monitor (Initial); and

- (iii) Remind the delegate of their responsibility to coordinate the scheduling of their next monitor to ensure that it occurs within 90 days before the expiry date.
- (c) If the monitor was an ACP Monitor (Recurrent), advise the ACP/AQPE of the following:
 - (i) The monitor is valid for 24 months if the ACP/AQPE Monitor Report has no grades of (2);
 - (ii) The monitor is valid for 12 months if the ACP/AQPE Monitor Report has one or two grades of (2);
 - (iii) If the monitor was conducted for the purposes of revising the authorities on a Letter of ACP/AQPE Accreditation, the ACP/AQPE is not authorized to exercise any of the **revised** authorities prior to receiving a revised Letter of ACP/AQPE Accreditation; and
 - (iv) Remind the ACP/AQPE of the responsibility to coordinate the scheduling of their next monitor to ensure that it occurs within 90 days before the expiry date.

6.3 Debriefing the ACP/AQPE on an unsuccessful monitor

- (1) The ACP/AQPE shall be debriefed in private to discuss the following items:
 - (a) Discuss the ACP's/AQPE's performance, addressing all five phases of the flight check and highlighting strengths, weaknesses, and areas that require remedial training prior to reapplying for a subsequent assessment;
 - (b) Inform the ACP/AQPE that Transport Canada may issue a "Notice of Suspension" or a "Notice of Refusal to Issue".
 - (c) Inform the ACP/AQPE of the right to request a review of the assessment by the Transportation Appeal Tribunal of Canada (TATC). The deadline to request this review will be specified in a notice from Transport Canada – Additional information is available on the TATC website;
 - (d) Advise the ACP/AQPE that, if not currently pursuing a TATC review, they may request a review of the assessment by the applicable Issuing Authority - Additional information is available in the ACP/AQPE Manuals; and
 - (e) The person who conducted the monitor is responsible for notifying the applicable Issuing Authority of the unsuccessful assessment within two business days. Air operators that have an established practice in place to notify the applicable regional authority of flight check results (such as PPCs) can use the same practice to provide the notification of an unsuccessful monitor.

6.4 Complaints against a person conducting a monitor

- (1) During the debriefing, a candidate(s) must be informed of their right to lodge a formal complaint if they indicate that the person conducting the monitor has displayed inappropriate or unprofessional behavior. Inform the candidate that the process to make a complaint is identical to the process outlined in either the ACP Manual or the AQP Evaluator Manual.

7.0 ACP/AQPE Monitor Report

- (1) Submission requirements and access
 - (a) The ACP/AQPE Monitor Report must be completed and submitted to TCCA within five (5) working days.

- (b) The ACP/AQPE Monitor Report is available on the **myTC Online Report Service** and (as a backup) as a fillable .PDF (form 26-0844). Registration for the myTC Online Report Service is required and is normally provided during Type M qualification training.
 - (c) Web-based links to the myTC Online Report Service are as follows:
 - (i) **ACP/AQPEs (Type M)** – Use the link provided on the external Approved Check Pilot (ACP) and Advanced Qualification Program (AQP) website.
 - (ii) **CASIs** – Use the link provided on the internal myTC ACP/AQPE Program – Inspector Resource site.
- (2) Report disclosure
- (a) In accordance with paragraph 8(2)(a) of the Privacy Act, a copy of the ACP/AQPE Monitor Report can be provided to and retained by the following persons / agencies, as applicable:
 - (i) ACP/AQPE;
 - (ii) CASI or ACP/AQPE (Type M) who conducted the monitor;
 - (iii) The air operator that employs/sponsors the ACP/AQPE (Type M); and
 - (iv) TCCA.
- (3) Distribution of the ACP/AQPE Monitor Report to any persons or agencies, other than those named above, is in contravention of the Privacy Act and is not authorized.

Appendix B — Performance standard

1.0 Performance standard

- 1.1 The five phases of the monitor (i.e., a monitored flight check) are to be assessed in accordance with the performance standards provided below.

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

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

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

Administration (phase four)	
Aim	To determine that the ACP/AQPE can effectively complete the required administrative actions.
Elements	Performance standard
Candidate(s) eligibility	Accurately confirms the eligibility of the candidate(s) to undertake the flight check.
Grading and comment accuracy	Accurately determines final grading with access to reference material and formulates clear and accurate written comments where required.
Administrative actions	Completes and annotates applicable Transport Canada and air operator forms / reports / licensing documents / records in a thorough, clear and accurate manner.

Knowledge and professional conduct (phase five)	
Aim	To determine that the ACP/AQPE understands the duties and responsibilities associated with their delegation of authority and acts accordingly and possesses the required regulatory and operational knowledge.
Elements	Performance standard
Professional conduct	Displays a positive attitude towards the ACP/AQPE program and conducts the flight check in an impartial and reasonable manner. This includes responding appropriately to all observed actions and faults that occur during the flight check, which can be summarized as 'duty of care'.
Knowledge	Demonstrates a good understanding of ACP/AQPE policies and procedures, ACP/AQPE indemnification, and the CARs/CASS. Demonstrates a good understanding of the air operator's training program, operations manual (COM), flight operations, and aircraft SOPs and technical knowledge.

Appendix C — ACP/AQPE Monitor Grading Matrix

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix D — Similar aircraft types

1.0 Introduction

- (1) The following similar aircraft types are provided for the purpose of monitoring qualified ACPs/AQPEs and where the monitoring CASI or ACP/AQPE (Type M) is not designated as the check/evaluation/validation pilot of record.
- (2) Similar aircraft types represent two or more aircraft types of the same make from the same aircraft generation, which share a high level of commonality in terms of technology, design features and flight characteristics.
- (3) Listed below are aeroplane and helicopter types that require individual type ratings but are deemed similar for the purposes of this AC.

2.0 Aeroplane

- (1) Similar aeroplane types:
 - (a) AT42 and AT72
 - (b) B757 and B767
 - (c) BA31 and BA41
 - (d) BD700 and G7500
 - (e) BE02, BE20 and BE30
 - (f) C525, C25A, C25B and C25C
 - (g) C500, C550 and C560
 - (h) EA32 and EA33
 - (i) FA10 and FA20
 - (j) FA50, FA90 and FA90X
 - (k) F2TH and F2THE
 - (l) GALX, G100 and G150
 - (m) G2 and G3
 - (n) G4, GLF5 and GLF6
 - (o) H25 and H251
 - (p) LR23, LR24, LR25, LR28 and LR29
 - (q) LR35 and LR36
 - (r) E50P and E55P

3.0 Helicopter

- (1) Similar helicopter types:
 - (a) BH22 and BH23
 - (b) HU52 and HU60

- (c) S313 and S318
- (d) S316 and S319