

OTAR PARTs 21, 43 & 145 - LOG OF COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE CONSULTATION PERIODS 01 JULY TO 26 AUGUST 2025

OTAA Reference	Date	Commenter	Comment Summary	Discussion/Decision	Status
<p>CICAA email 27 July 2025</p> <p>Subpart B. Paragraph 21.25(a)(1)</p>	<p>27 July 2025</p>	<p>Tony Walsh</p>	<p>CS - 21.25 (a) (2) the Type Design has been approved by the Agência Nacional de Aviação Civil (ANAC) of Brazil by the issue of a Type Certificate and the aircraft type has previously had a Type Certificate issued or validated by an NAA listed in paragraph 21.25(a)(1) in red: This should be Type Acceptance Certificate; the type Certificate is issued by a Contracting State or the European Aviation Safety Agency on behalf of the European Union Member States to define the design of an aircraft type and to certify that the design meets the appropriate airworthiness requirements of that State. Article 23(2) of the AN(OT)O States: A “Type Acceptance Certificate” means a document issued by the Governor for an aircraft on the basis of a Type Certificate for that aircraft type that is acceptable to the Governor. Article 23(4) of the AN(OT)O States: A “Type Certificate” means a document issued by a Contracting State or the European Aviation Safety Agency on behalf of the European Union Member States to define the design of an aircraft type and to certify that the design meets the appropriate airworthiness requirements of that State. Suggest Subpart B. Paragraph 21.25(a)(1) amended to clarify acceptance of a Type Certificate validated by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) of the United States, Transport Canada, the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) or the UK Civil Aviation Authority</p>	<p>Noted, I think the intent of the 21.25(a)(2) paragraph was to include ANAC designs into 21.25(a) while excluding the very old ANAC (mainly Embraer) Type Designs of aircraft that had not been designed and built under the bilateral process of validation with the FAA or EASA, hence “previously had a TC issued or validated by the FAA etc.” Considering other comments regarding the obsolescence of ANAC Type Certificates in the Territories, I think we should leave it unchanged at this amendment and recirculate the proposal at next OTAA Group meeting, with a view to removing the whole paragraph.</p>	<p>Discussed at AIR Webinar 12 Nov 2026 (minutes available) and amended document for second consultation</p>

<p>CICAA email 27 July 2025</p> <p>Subpart C. Paragraph 21.73(a)(4)</p>	<p>27 July 2025</p>	<p>Tony Walsh</p>	<p>Subpart C. Paragraph 21.73(a)(4) deleted, Paragraph 23.73(a)(2) and Paragraph 23.73(b)(1) amended to remove conflict and clarify the acceptance of modification data from a NAA that is not the issuing State of the Type Certificate identified on the Type Acceptance Certificate against which the C of A for the aircraft was issued.</p> <p>(1) It's a matter of interpretation but this change is not now as clear on how we can accept unvalidated STC's. The text says: 'and complies' with the applicable type certification standards. Before is said 'and has been declared to comply'. I guess we could accept the text on this point. We would still get the design organisation to confirm compliance with the TC basis for an unvalidated STC.</p> <p>(2) Deletion of (a)(4) makes it more difficult for owner/operators to get minor design changes approved. I would even go as far as to say even 'trivial' design changes. NB: I am fully aware of the EASA process of compliance demonstration and verification. I wrote guidance on the subject when I was in the UK CAA. The changes to the text in (a)(2) says 'and complies with the applicable type certification standards'. So, the minor design change would have to be demonstrated to comply with the TC standard. The text previously would allow non-minor design changes/major alterations to be installed in accordance with 'acceptable data' without the full certification process. So, what is needed is a simplified process for minor design changes. In my opinion.</p>	<p>Noted, it seems that maybe I am not clear, by what you mean by an unvalidated STC that has been "declared to comply", do you mean for example accepting a FAA STC on an EASA TC Aircraft? If so, then it could be accepted under 21.73(a)(2), although the content of 21.73(b)(4) has not changed and still puts the obligation on the applicant to declare interoperability and compatibility with the existing type design etc.</p> <p>Noted, as I understood it, the use of acceptable data for minor alterations was implicit as permitted per the applicable NAA Standards of paragraph 21.73(a)(1) and (2). Therefore, to remove the conflict between paragraph 21.73(a)(4) and paragraph 21.73(a)(2), paragraph 21.73(a)(4) was removed. To clarify the case for the use of acceptable data for minor modifications, as per DT comments, I have restored the intent of 21.73(a)(4) into 21.73(a)(2)(ii). There is also an OTAC that provides some guidance on the use of acceptable data in Design Change approvals (OTAC 21-2).</p>	<p>Discussed at AIR Webinar 12 Nov 2026 (minutes available) and amended document for second consultation</p>
---	---------------------	-------------------	---	--	--

<p>CICAA email 27 July 2025 Subpart K. Paragraphs 21.303, 21.303 and 21.305</p>	<p>27 July 2025</p>	<p>Tony Walsh</p>	<p>Proposed change: Subpart K. Paragraphs 21.303, 21.303 and 21.305 amended to clarify the acceptance of materials, parts, components and appliances, standard parts and raw materials.</p> <p>(1) 303(a) & (b) Text changes would now allow both new and used repaired parts to come from ANAC approved organisations. Previously we only accepted new parts from the ANAC system since the confidence of the repair facilities within the ANAC system is not high.</p> <p>(2) 303(c) Allows a part to be put into stores and released onto any aircraft of any ownership of the same OT register. Comments: (i) This is starting to look like a 'C' Rating even the Form in Appendix A of OTAR 145 looks like an FAA/EASA release certificate, which it is not. This area was intended to allow owners/operators to perform work on their own parts and then put them back onto their own aircraft. (ii) There is no mention of a CAMO who would be responsible for determining the history and CA of the part. (iii) The text refers to an OTAR Part 43 approval. There is no such thing.</p> <p>(3) 21.303 (c) Used repaired or modified components which have been maintained under a OTAR Part 145 or Part 43 Approval, There is no Part 43 Approval.</p>	<p>Noted, although the case for used parts from ANAC Repair Stations is not known and would probably be rare or non-existent in practice. I have amended paragraph 21.303(b) to restrict used repaired or modified components to those released by Organisations under NAA approvals in 21.25(a)(1) only, which now excludes ANAC under 21.25(a)(2).</p> <p>Yes, it is a form of a mini-C Rating, in that it was introduced to permit Organisations to work on and release components, not installed on an aircraft, to provide services for OTAR Operators in the same Territory. This has not changed since introduced at BCAA request at Issue 9 in Feb 2021. There is no mention of a CAMO, since an uninstalled component, at the time of its release, would be independent of any particular aircraft release. The OTAR 43 "Approval" referred to was meant to relate to Paragraphs 43.51 and 43.101 which may approve maintenance in some circumstances, by individuals outside of a OTAR 145 Approval. OTAR 145 refers to OTAR 43 for release requirements, however I take the point and therefore have removed the OTAR 43 references in the amendments.</p> <p>Reference to OTAR 43 removed, see above (iii)</p>	<p>Discussed at AIR Webinar 12 Nov 2026 (minutes available) and amended document for second consultation</p>
---	---------------------	-------------------	---	--	--

			<p>(4) 21.303 (e) Remove – An organisation may fabricate a restricted range of parts to be used in the course of undergoing work within its own facilities in a manner acceptable to the Governor. There should be a list of restricted parts for fabrication, or else anything can be fabricated and difficult to regulate from afar.</p> <p>(5) 21.305(b) in conformance with any Type Certificate Holders criteria; The word ‘any’ should be replaced with ‘the’.</p>	<p>Agreed, 21.303(e) removed as requested from OTAR 21 and added to 145.59(h) including an example list. There is also guidance in OTAC 145-12.</p> <p>Agreed, 21.305(b) amended.</p>	
CICAA email 27 July 2025 OTAR 145.7(a)(3)	27 July 2025	Tony Walsh	<p>145.7(a)(3) added paragraph to clarify that an Option 1 rating and scope of approval may vary from the approval granted by the applicable foreign NAA, when approved by the Governor and in compliance with 145.7(a)(4). Excellent change. Supports ‘Option 1.5 approvals.</p>		
CICAA email 27 July 2025 OTAR 145.59(a), (b), (c)	27 July 2025	Tony Walsh	<p>Proposed change: Paragraph 145.59(a), 145.59(b) and 145.59(c) amended to clarify the release to service requirements for uninstalled Engines, Propeller, Components and Appliances by OTAR Part 145 Organisations or Persons authorised in accordance with 145.115 or OTAR 43.101.</p> <p>(1) Same comments as for 21.303 (c) above except CAMO is mentioned but the CA aspects are not fully covered in my opinion. CAMO in (b)(iv) only confirms (b) (i), (ii) & (iii). 59 (g) only refers to the owner or operator retaining the airworthiness status. In accordance with the requirements of OTAR Part 21 Subpart K, Engines, Propellers, Appliances and Components maintained on or off an aircraft under a OTAR Part 145 or Part 43 Approval, There is no Part 43 Approval.</p> <p>(2) 145.59(c): for the transfer of parts or components between aircraft of different Ownership or Operation under 145.59(b), the OTAR 43.105 Release to Service Certification should be in the form of that given in Appendix A, or other format as approved or accepted by the aircraft’s designated Overseas Territory Aviation Authority.</p> <p>(3) 145.59(g): Serviceable engines, propellers or components removed from a Territory registered aircraft, under the control of the aircrafts Owner or Operator who</p>	<p>Reference to OTAR 43 removed from 145.59(b), see above 21.303(c)(iii).</p> <p>The reference to OTAR 43 is valid here since 145.7 refers to OTAR 43 for the format of Release to Service.</p> <p>I take the point that an uninstalled component’s release to service is quite different to an aircraft release to service.</p>	<p>Discussed at AIR Webinar 12 Nov 2026 (minutes available) and amended document for second consultation</p>

			<p>retains the airworthiness status of the components, may be issued with OTAR 43.105 Release to Service Certification, which should be in the form of that given in Appendix A, or other format as approved or accepted by the aircraft Operators Overseas Territory Aviation Authority.</p> <p>APPENDIX A Clearly states: 1.5 - Aircraft are not to be released using the Certificate; 1.6 - The Certificate does not constitute approval to install the item on a particular aircraft, engine, or propeller but helps the end user determine the component airworthiness approval status.</p>	<p>The Component release is only for the work performed uninstalled and does not convey any approval to install on an aircraft, similar to an EASA Form 1 or 8130-3.</p>	
<p>CICAA email 27 July 2025</p> <p>OTAR 145 Appendix A</p>	<p>27 July 2025</p>	<p>Tony Walsh</p>	<p>Proposed change: Appendix A, Certificate format amended to clarify and align the certification of maintenance on uninstalled Engines, Propellers and Components, with OTAR 43.105(b) and 145.115. Certificate renamed and formatted to avoid confusion with authorised release formats used by international Airworthiness Authorities accepted under OTAR Part 21.25(a).</p> <p>(1) Does not have a form number now. Does it need to?</p> <p>(2) Still looks like an international release certificate although it does say it is not an international release certificate.</p>	<p>We were asked to make the form look different to a Form 1 or 8130-3. I thought dropping the number helps, since the critical part of the form is the release statement and format, rather than a form number which may imply to some that it is internationally compliant, which of course it isn't.</p> <p>It is a fair bit different now, but at the end of the day it is still a form doing much the same purpose as a Form 1, but with a more limited scope.</p>	<p>Discussed at AIR Webinar 12 Nov 2026 (minutes available) and amended document for second consultation</p>
<p>CICAA email 27 July 2025</p> <p>OTAR 43.53(c)</p>	<p>27 July 2025</p>	<p>Tony Walsh</p>	<p>Proposed change: Paragraph 43.53(c) new sub paragraph added to clarify align the certification of Overhaul on uninstalled Engines, Propellers and Components, with OTAR 43.105 and 145.59</p> <p>A person shall not state in any maintenance record document entry that an aircraft, airframe, engine, propeller or other aircraft component has been overhauled unless it has been:</p>		<p>Discussed at AIR Webinar 12 Nov 2026 (minutes available) and amended document for second consultation</p>

			<p>An engine, propeller or other aircraft component has been overhauled and released to service by an approved Person or Organisation in accordance with OTAR 43.105(b) or OTAR 145.11.</p> <p>This should read: in the case of an engine, propeller or other aircraft component which has been overhauled etc. etc.</p>	<p>Agreed, paragraph 43.53(c) amended to read as suggested</p>	
<p>BCAA-AW-1-2025</p> <p>OTAR 21.73(a)(4)</p>	<p>4 Aug 2025</p>	<p>Michael Swann</p>	<p>a. 21.73(a)(4) permitting acceptance of minor repairs has been removed. There is now no provision for accepting a minor modification that does not declare conformity against the type certification standard defined on the TAC. This impacts;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need for a statement of tc compliance for all minor alterations/changes? • How OT issue Export C of As where they have already approved a change on the basis of 21.73(a)(4)? <p>b. The last sentence of 21.73(a)(3) still contains ‘; or’ at the end. This should be removed now that 21.73(a)(4) has been removed.</p>	<p>Proposed changes in draft OTAR Part 21 to address these comments, with draft consultation circulated for comment on 5 Sep ahead of AIR Webinar on 12 Nov.</p>	<p>Discussed at AIR Webinar 12 Nov 2026 (minutes available) and amended document for second consultation</p>
<p>BCAA-AW-2-2025</p> <p>OTAR 21.303</p>	<p>4 Aug 2025</p>	<p>Michael Swann</p>	<p>a. 21.303(c) includes a limitation for the OTAA Form 71 from an OTAR Part 145 approved organisation to be restricted to the same Overseas Territory as approved the Part 145 approved organisation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is this necessary? • The OTAR requirements are intended to and should apply equally across the OT’s • What are the implications on the approval mutual recognition policy? <p>b. 21.303(d) requires standard parts to be “accompanied by evidence of conformity traceable to the applicable standard”. This should include “accompanied by evidence declaring conformity to the applicable standard and identifying the manufacturer and supplier source”?</p> <p>c. 21.303(e) in respect of fabricating parts this statement should include “and as approved in its MOE”</p>	<p>Proposed changes in draft OTAR Part 21 to address these comments, with draft consultation circulated for comment on 5 Sep ahead of AIR Webinar on 12 Nov.</p>	<p>Discussed at AIR Webinar 12 Nov 2026 (minutes available) and amended document for second consultation</p>
<p>BCAA-AW-3-2025</p>			<p>43.53(c) is unnecessary. The contents therein are included in the revised OTAR Part 21 Subpart K and as such covered by 43.53(b).</p>	<p>Discussed during meetings and agreed to amend accordingly. Proposed changes in draft OTAR Part 21 to address these comments, with draft</p>	<p>Discussed at AIR Webinar 12 Nov 2026 (minutes available) and</p>

<p>OTAR 43.53 addition of (c)</p>				<p>consultation circulated for comment on 5 Sep ahead of AIR Webinar on 12 Nov.</p>	<p>amended document for second consultation</p>
<p>BCAA-AW-4-2025</p>	<p>4 Aug 2025</p>	<p>Michael Swann</p>	<p>Appendix A contains revision bars throughout. This appears to be incorrect and the revision bars should only be adjacent to the text changes. b. Changing the name of the Form 71 to Uninstalled Engine, Propeller or Component Maintenance Certificate and changing the format has no benefit, but creates unnecessary regulatory burden for all the maintenance organisations who have established and use the existing Form 71. c. The removal of subparagraphs 1.7 and 1.8 would appear to now permit dual release on an EASA Form 1 or an EASA CRS on the hitherto Form 71. Does this require a bilateral agreement? d. Why is this component CRS certificate in OTAR Part 145? Shouldn't it be in OTAR 43 with all other elements of CRS?</p>	<p>See similar comments above. Proposed changes in draft OTAR Part 21 to address these comments, with draft consultation circulated for comment on 5 Sep ahead of AIR Webinar on 12 Nov.</p>	<p>Discussed at AIR Webinar 12 Nov 2026 (minutes available) and amended document for second consultation</p>
<p>Mark Thomas email 5 Aug 2025 OTAR 21.303</p>	<p>5 Aug 2025</p>	<p>Mark Thomas</p>	<p>“ Subpart K. Paragraphs 21.303, 21.303 and 21.305 amended to clarify the acceptance of materials, parts, components and appliances, standard parts and raw materials.’ Should be '21.301'?</p>	<p>Proposed changes in draft OTAR Part 21 to address these comments, with draft consultation circulated for comment on 5 Sep ahead of AIR Webinar on 12 Nov.</p>	