

- Recommendation 1 Agreed
- Recommendation 3 Not necessarily agree when the cause of the accident may be readily apparent.
- Recommendation 4 I see no reason why not.
- Recommendation 5 Agreed but query why you need more than one Commissioner if they have the appropriate experience.
- Recommendation 6 Agreed
- Recommendation 7 Agreed re “leadership and management experience and capabilities in cultural change of large organisations” but query why experience in aviation industry should not be a preference as this would seem to be consistent with other aspects of the report, eg Directors and ATSB Commissioner. RB
- Recommendation 8 In general agree but with point b provided the cost of such surveys is not prohibitive
- Recommendation 9 Agreed. I note this has happened in the past in CASA SYD office with an Ansett B767 Captain as an FOI. If managed properly can provide a “win-win” outcome.
- Recommendation 10 Agreed
- Recommendation 13 Makes sense
- Recommendation 14 Agreed – this has always been my position
- Recommendation 15 Agreed
- Recommendation 16 Agreed – provided the training programs are designed and presented by someone who understands the true nature of the problem. I know that when the FAA required CASA’s technical staff to undertake training the programs were written (at great costs) by an organisation without prior aviation experience
- Recommendation 17 Strongly agree
- Recommendation 18 Strongly agree
- Recommendation 21 Much care required on this point. Remember the confusion that existed when CASA and Industry were considered as “Partners”?
- Recommendation 22 But at what cost? Problem with small offices is that you can have very ‘localised’ ways of doing business. There is precedent in CASA (and CAA) as to why this may not be a good idea.
- Recommendation 23 Absolutely agree
- Recommendation 25 I thought this all ready existed. If so effective training of CASA auditors is essential to ensure categorisation is consistently applied across all CASA offices.
- Recommendation 26 Absolutely agree – a regulatory decisions database is the way to go. Other regulators all ready use such systems.
- Recommendation 27 I have experience with both BARS and IOSA audits by commercial auditors and there are some very important issues to consider but could be most effective in practice.
- Recommendation 28 I believe this to be the case now. The main issue here is how you want to define risk – what are the parameters – are all lives of equal value? Eg fare paying pax v individual consent (Warbirds). This requires careful consideration. RB
- Recommendation 29 This may be problematic with the current status of the Regulatory Reform. There are so many different “styles” out there now – even within the CASRs (1998). What I believe needs to be done is for the Government to decide upon what style and format of regs they want and then to incrementally transition all the regs (both current and future) to this style. Effort must be put into keeping the regs relevant and to continuously improve them. This is where a Regulatory Decisions database could greatly contribute to a continuous improvement model.
- Recommendation 31 Comments as per # 30 above.
- Recommendation 32 Strongly agree

- Recommendation 33 Agree in principle but needs to be considered in conjunction with # 30 and 31 above. I have seen many deadlines come and go without any positive outcomes.
- Recommendation 34 Strongly agree
- Recommendation 35 Not my area of expertise but feel that this issue may require further consideration from appropriately qualified practitioners. I know the issues from an AAT perspective re medical appeals.
- Recommendation 36 I agree with aligning with International practise provided there are no 'special' circumstances in respect to the diversity of airports in Australia.
- Recommendation 37 There are many issues here and I feel may require further consideration.