



*Transmittal Note*

24 February 2005

**SUPPLEMENT TO**  
**ANNEX 8 — AIRWORTHINESS OF AIRCRAFT**  
**(Ninth Edition)**

1. The attached Supplement supersedes all previous Supplements to Annex 8 and includes differences notified by Contracting States up to 24 February 2005 with respect to all amendments up to and including Amendment 98.
2. This Supplement should be inserted at the end of Annex 8 (Ninth Edition). Additional differences received from Contracting States will be issued at intervals as amendments to this Supplement.

**IMPORTANT NOTE**  
**REGARDING THE SUPPLEMENT TO ANNEX 8, NINTH EDITION**

This Supplement to the *Ninth Edition* of Annex 8 includes differences notified by Contracting States with respect to all amendments up to and including Amendment 98. Differences notified by Contracting States with respect to Amendment 99 will be issued after 20 May 2006. These should be retained until the Supplement to the *Tenth Edition* is issued.

---

**SUPPLEMENT TO ANNEX 8 — NINTH EDITION**

**AIRWORTHINESS OF AIRCRAFT**

Differences between the national regulations and practices of Contracting States and the corresponding International Standards contained in Annex 8, as notified to ICAO in accordance with Article 38 of the *Convention on International Civil Aviation* and the Council's resolution of 21 November 1950.

FEBRUARY 2005

---

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

**RECORD OF AMENDMENTS**

<i>No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Entered by</i>

<i>No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Entered by</i>

**AMENDMENTS TO ANNEX 8 ADOPTED OR APPROVED BY THE COUNCIL  
SUBSEQUENT TO THE NINTH EDITION ISSUED IN JULY 2001**

<i>No.</i>	<i>Date of adoption or approval</i>	<i>Date applicable</i>

<i>No.</i>	<i>Date of adoption or approval</i>	<i>Date applicable</i>

## 1. Contracting States which have notified ICAO of differences

The Contracting States listed below have notified ICAO of differences which exist between their national regulations and practices and the International Standards of Annex 8 (Ninth Edition), up to and including Amendment 98, or have commented on implementation.

The page numbers shown for each State and the dates of publication of those pages correspond to the actual pages in this Supplement.

<i>State</i>	<i>Date of notification</i>	<i>Pages in Supplement</i>	<i>Date of Publication</i>
Antigua and Barbuda	27/11/02	1	24/2/05
Argentina	27/1/04	1–2	24/2/05
Armenia	6/4/04	1	24/2/05
Australia	7/9/03	1–2	24/2/05
Bahamas	22/11/02	1	24/2/05
Barbados	12/2/04	1	24/2/05
Belarus	29/8/03	1	24/2/05
Belgium	8/3/04	1–4	24/2/05
Belize	26/8/03	1	24/2/05
Benin	22/1/04	1	24/2/05
Brazil	27/6/03	1	24/2/05
Burkina Faso	23/6/03	1	24/2/05
Canada	27/2/04	1	24/2/05
Chile	4/4/03	1	24/2/05
China	20/1/04	1	24/2/05
Cook Islands	28/11/03	1–3	24/2/05
Croatia	7/5/02	1–2	24/2/05
Cuba	11/12/01	1	24/2/05
Czech Republic	13/3/03	1	24/2/05
Dominican Republic	19/2/03	1	24/2/05
Ecuador	9/4/03	1	24/2/05
Ethiopia	27/11/01	1	24/2/05
Fiji	20/11/03	1	24/2/05
Finland	2/3/04	1–4	24/2/05
France	28/6/04	1–2	24/2/05
Germany	4/6/02	1–2	24/2/05
Grenada	27/11/02	1	24/2/05
Guatemala	11/9/03	1	24/2/05
Guyana	20/6/03	1	24/2/05
Haiti	6/2/04	1	24/2/05
Honduras	28/5/04	1	24/2/05
Hungary	28/8/03	1	24/2/05
Ireland	18/6/04	1–4	24/2/05
Italy	31/5/02	1–2	24/2/05
Jamaica	12/9/01	1	24/2/05
Japan	24/5/02	1–2	24/2/05
Jordan	25/6/02	1–4	24/2/05
Kiribati	4/6/02	1	24/2/05

<i>State</i>	<i>Date of notification</i>	<i>Pages in Supplement</i>	<i>Date of Publication</i>
Kuwait	20/9/03	1	24/2/05
Latvia	4/10/02	1	24/2/05
Lesotho	24/6/04	1	24/2/05
Lithuania	24/10/01	1	24/2/05
Luxembourg	24/10/03	1	24/2/05
Maldives	28/8/01	1	24/2/05
Malta	11/8/01	1	24/2/05
Monaco	20/10/03	1	24/2/05
Myanmar	22/1/03	1	24/2/05
Namibia	18/2/04	1	24/2/05
New Zealand	24/8/04	1–3	24/2/05
Nicaragua	14/8/03	1	24/2/05
Nigeria	9/5/03	1	24/2/05
Norway	8/10/02	1	24/2/05
Oman	29/9/03	1	24/2/05
Palau	21/11/03	1	24/2/05
Papua New Guinea	15/1/02	1	24/2/05
Paraguay	17/9/01	1	24/2/05
Philippines	20/11/01	1	24/2/05
Poland	5/9/03	1	24/2/05
Qatar	8/9/01	1	24/2/05
Romania	20/11/01	1–2	24/2/05
Russian Federation	12/12/03	1	24/2/05
Saint Kitts and Nevis	27/11/02	1	24/2/05
Saint Lucia	27/11/02	1	24/2/05
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	27/11/02	1	24/2/05
Samoa	23/4/03	1–2	24/2/05
Seychelles	9/7/04	1	24/2/05
South Africa	13/11/01	1	24/2/05
Spain	9/5/03	1	24/2/05
Sri Lanka	4/11/04	1	24/2/05
Tajikistan	23/10/02	1	24/2/05
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	22/10/03	1	24/2/05
Trinidad and Tobago	24/6/04	1	24/2/05
Tunisia	13/11/04	1	24/2/05
Turkmenistan	11/10/02	1	24/2/05
Uganda	5/12/01	1	24/2/05
United Kingdom	2/2/04	1–4	24/2/05
United States	10/2/04	1–5	24/2/05
Uzbekistan	27/1/03	1	24/2/05
Yemen	13/4/04	1	24/2/05

**2. Contracting States which have notified ICAO that no differences exist**

<i>State</i>	<i>Date of notification</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Date of notification</i>
Bahrain	21/7/01	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	9/7/01
Bolivia	10/7/01	Lebanon	1/7/02
Bulgaria	6/9/01	Malaysia	21/5/02
Burundi	13/8/01	Pakistan	25/2/04
Cape Verde	15/4/03	Panama	13/4/04
China		Peru	11/9/01
Hong Kong, China	20/1/04	Republic of Korea	13/7/03
Macau, China	2/4/03	Singapore	7/9/02
Costa Rica	7/12/01	Slovakia	23/11/01
Cyprus	4/7/02	Sweden	12/3/03
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	20/9/02	Switzerland	10/7/02
Denmark	21/5/03	Thailand	31/8/01
El Salvador	9/7/01	Togo	1/7/01
Eritrea	5/11/01	Ukraine	4/9/03
Georgia	16/11/01	United Arab Emirates	20/3/02
Ghana	11/6/01	United Republic of Tanzania	8/6/04
Greece	26/2/02	Viet Nam	14/1/03
Iceland	11/10/02	Zambia	1/8/01
India	8/11/01		
Indonesia	15/4/04		

**3. Contracting State from which no information has been received**

Afghanistan	Djibouti	Mauritius
Albania	Egypt	Mexico
Algeria	Equatorial Guinea	Micronesia (Federated States of)
Andorra	Estonia	Mongolia
Angola	Gabon	Morocco
Austria	Gambia	Mozambique
Azerbaijan	Guinea	Nauru
Bangladesh	Guinea-Bissau	Nepal
Bhutan	Iraq	Netherlands
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Israel	Niger
Botswana	Kazakhstan	Portugal
Brunei Darussalam	Kenya	Republic of Moldova
Cambodia	Kyrgyzstan	Rwanda
Cameroon	Lao People's Democratic Republic	San Marino
Central African Republic	Liberia	Sao Tome and Principe
Chad	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Saudi Arabia
Colombia	Madagascar	Senegal
Comoros	Malawi	Serbia and Montenegro
Congo	Mali	Sierra Leone
Côte d'Ivoire	Marshall Islands	Slovenia
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Mauritania	Solomon Islands

Somalia	Syrian Arab Republic	Vanuatu
Sudan	Tonga	Venezuela
Suriname	Turkey	Zimbabwe
Swaziland	Uruguay	

#### 4. Paragraphs with respect to which differences have been notified

<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Differences notified by</i>	<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Differences notified by</i>
General	Cook Islands Lithuania	Chapter 2	Belize Burkina Faso Guatemala Oman Trinidad and Tobago
<b>PART I</b>			
Definitions	Argentina Armenia Belarus Belgium Cook Islands Finland Ireland Myanmar New Zealand Romania United Kingdom United States Uzbekistan	2.1 2.2  2.2.3 Chapter 3, Fig. 1 3.1 3.2 3.2.1 3.2.2	Croatia Armenia Croatia Tunisia Tajikistan Armenia Croatia Croatia Kuwait Belize Ecuador Ethiopia Guyana Haiti Jordan Kiribati Namibia Palau Paraguay The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
<b>PART II</b>			
Chapter 1	Belize Guatemala Oman Trinidad and Tobago		Barbados Lesotho Luxembourg Monaco Norway Palau Yemen
1.1	Burkina Faso Seychelles		Seychelles Trinidad and Tobago Croatia
1.2	Burkina Faso Kuwait	3.2.3	
1.2.1	Seychelles		
1.2.2	Seychelles		
1.2.3	Seychelles		
1.2.4	Seychelles		
1.3.1	Seychelles		
1.3.2	Tajikistan		
1.3.3	Seychelles	3.2.4	
1.3.4	Seychelles United States	3.3	
1.4.1	Seychelles		
1.4.2	Seychelles		

<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Differences notified by</i>	<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Differences notified by</i>
3.3.1	Chile	4.2	Croatia
	Paraguay		Kiribati
	Sri Lanka	4.2.1	Seychelles
3.3.2	Belgium	4.2.2	Seychelles
	Finland	4.3	Croatia
3.4	Croatia		Dominican Republic
3.5	Croatia		Haiti
	Luxembourg	4.3.1	Belgium
	Monaco		Chile
	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		Cook Islands
3.6	Croatia		Ecuador
3.6.1	Belgium		Finland
	Cook Islands		Jordan
	Finland		New Zealand
	New Zealand		Norway
3.6.2	Bahamas		Papua New Guinea
	Ethiopia		Paraguay
	Luxembourg		Samoa
	Norway		Seychelles
	Paraguay	4.3.2	United States
	Tunisia		Cuba
3.6.3	Antigua and Barbuda		Fiji
	Australia		Guyana
	Cook Islands		Jordan
	Ecuador		Oman
	Grenada		Papua New Guinea
	Guyana		Paraguay
	Maldives		Russian Federation
	Monaco		Seychelles
	New Zealand	4.3.3	Tunisia
	Norway		Belize
	Palau		Kiribati
	Saint Kitts and Nevis		Luxembourg
	Saint Lucia		Monaco
	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		Namibia
	Samoa		Palau
	Seychelles		Papua New Guinea
	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		Seychelles
	United States		The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
3.6.4	Australia	4.3.4	Tunisia
	Cook Islands		United States
	New Zealand		Antigua and Barbuda
	Philippines		Belgium
	Samoa		Belize
	Seychelles		Chile
4.1	Croatia		Cuba
			Ecuador



<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Differences notified by</i>	<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Differences notified by</i>
	Fiji		United States
	Finland	4.3.8	Jamaica
	Grenada		Papua New Guinea
	Jordan		South Africa
	Kuwait		Tajikistan
	Papua New Guinea		The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
	Paraguay	4.3.9	Fiji
	Saint Kitts and Nevis		Jordan
	Saint Lucia		Oman
	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		Papua New Guinea
	Seychelles		Seychelles
	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		Trinidad and Tobago
	Tunisia		Tunisia
	Uganda		
4.3.5	Barbados		
	Belize	<b>PART III</b>	
	Chile	General	Croatia
	Ecuador		Lithuania
	Hungary		Nigeria
	Kiribati		Paraguay
	Kuwait		Trinidad and Tobago
	Latvia		
	Lesotho	<b>PART IIIA</b>	
	Maldives	General	Belize
	Nigeria		Benin
	Papua New Guinea		Cook Islands
	Paraguay		Guatemala
	Seychelles		Honduras
	Turkmenistan		New Zealand
	Uganda		Tunisia
	United States		
4.3.6	Fiji	Chapter 1	Burkina Faso
	Jordan		Myanmar
	Oman	1.1.3	Cook Islands
	Papua New Guinea		Jordan
	Seychelles		New Zealand
	Trinidad and Tobago		United States
	Tunisia	1.1.4	Jordan
4.3.7	China	1.2	China
	Ecuador		Jordan
	Fiji	1.3	United States
	Jordan	1.4	Jordan
	Oman	1.5.1	Cook Islands
	Papua New Guinea		New Zealand
	Trinidad and Tobago		Romania
	Tunisia		Samoa
	Uganda		United States

<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Differences notified by</i>	<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Differences notified by</i>
Chapter 2	Burkina Faso	4.1	Belgium
	Myanmar		Finland
2.2.1.2	Jordan		Ireland
2.2.2.2	Jordan		United Kingdom
2.2.3	Argentina	4.1.3	Jordan
	Belgium	4.1.4	Jordan
	Cook Islands	4.1.5	Jordan
	Cuba	4.1.6	Argentina
	Finland		Australia
	Ireland		Belgium
	New Zealand		Czech Republic
	Samoa		Finland
	United Kingdom		France
	United States		Germany
2.3.1	Turkmenistan		Ireland
2.3.1.3	Jordan		Japan
2.3.2	Jordan		Jordan
2.3.4.1	Australia		Romania
	Belgium		Russian Federation
	Cuba		United Kingdom
	Finland		United States
	France		Uzbekistan
	Germany	4.1.7	Jordan
	Ireland	4.1.7.1	Jordan
	Romania	4.1.7.2	Jordan
	Samoa	4.1.7.4	Jordan
	United Kingdom		
2.3.4.2	Jordan	Chapter 5	Burkina Faso
2.3.4.3	Jordan		Dominican Republic
2.3.5	Jordan		Myanmar
		5.1	Jordan
Chapter 3	Burkina Faso	5.2	Jordan
	Myanmar	5.3	Jordan
3.1.1	Jordan		
3.1.2	Jordan	Chapter 6	Burkina Faso
3.1.3	Jordan		Dominican Republic
3.2.1	Jordan		Myanmar
3.2.2	Jordan	6.1	Jordan
3.3	Jordan	6.2	Jordan
3.3.1	Jordan	6.3	Jordan
3.3.2	Jordan		
3.4.1	Jordan	Chapter 7	Burkina Faso
3.5	Jordan		Myanmar
3.6	Jordan	7.1.1	Jordan
3.7	Jordan	7.1.2	Jordan
		7.2.2	Jordan
Chapter 4	Burkina Faso	7.2.4	Jordan
	Myanmar		

<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Differences notified by</i>	<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Differences notified by</i>
Chapter 8	Myanmar		Romania
8.1	Jordan		Samoa
8.4	Jordan		
8.4.1	Papua New Guinea	Chapter 10	Myanmar
	United States	10.1	Kuwait
8.4.2	Japan	10.2	Kuwait
	United States	10.3	Kuwait
		10.4	Kuwait
Chapter 9	Myanmar		Tajikistan
9.2.4	Belgium	Chapter 11	Belgium
	Finland		Finland
	Ireland		Ireland
	United Kingdom		Armenia
9.2.7	Armenia	11.1	Australia
9.3.5	Antigua and Barbuda		Brazil
	Armenia		Czech Republic
	Belgium		Germany
	Brazil		Italy
	Czech Republic		Japan
	Finland		Jordan
	France		Nicaragua
	Germany		Romania
	Grenada		Spain
	Ireland		Tajikistan
	Italy		United Kingdom
	Japan		United States
	Kiribati		Uzbekistan
	Luxembourg	11.2	Australia
	Maldives		Czech Republic
	Malta		Germany
	Nicaragua		Italy
	Poland		Japan
	Qatar		Jordan
	Romania		Poland
	Saint Kitts and Nevis		Romania
	Saint Lucia		Spain
	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		Tajikistan
	Samoa		United Kingdom
	Spain		United States
	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		Uzbekistan
	United Kingdom	11.3	Australia
	United States		Brazil
9.6	Jordan		Czech Republic
9.6.2	Australia		Germany
	Germany		Italy
	Italy		Japan
			Jordan

<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Differences notified by</i>	<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Differences notified by</i>
	Poland Romania Spain Tajikistan United Kingdom United States Uzbekistan	D.5	Finland France Ireland United Kingdom United States United States
		E.3.5.5	United States
<b>PART IIIB</b>		F.1	Belgium Finland Ireland
General	Benin Cook Islands Guatemala Honduras New Zealand Tunisia	F.1.1	United Kingdom
		F.1.2	Belgium Finland Ireland
A.2.1	United States	F.4.1	United States
		F.4.2	Canada United States
A.4	United States	F.5	Belgium Finland Ireland
B.2.7	Belgium Finland France Ireland United Kingdom United States	G.2.5	Belgium Finland Ireland United Kingdom
B.4.1	United States	G.7.2	Kuwait
B.4.2	Belgium Finland France Ireland	G.7.3	Kuwait
		G.7.4	Kuwait
B.4.2.1	United Kingdom	I.1	Belgium Finland Ireland United Kingdom
C.6.1	United States	I.6	Belgium Finland Ireland
C.7	Belgium Finland Ireland		
D.1.1	Belgium Finland Ireland United Kingdom	Sub-part K	Belgium France Ireland
D.1.3	Belgium Finland Ireland	K.1	Canada Finland Nicaragua United Kingdom United States
D.2	Belgium Canada		

<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Differences notified by</i>	<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Differences notified by</i>
K.2	Canada Finland United Kingdom United States	2.2.2.1	New Zealand Russian Federation United States Australia
K.3	Canada Finland United Kingdom United States	2.2.2.2	Germany Italy Japan United Kingdom Germany Japan United Kingdom
<b>PART IV</b>		2.2.3	Germany
General	Belize Benin Cook Islands Croatia Dominican Republic Guatemala Honduras Japan Lithuania New Zealand Nigeria Trinidad and Tobago Tunisia	2.2.3.1	Argentina Belgium Cook Islands Finland Germany Ireland Japan New Zealand United Kingdom United States
Chapter 1	Argentina Myanmar	2.2.3.1.1	Argentina Germany Japan United Kingdom
1.1.2	Jordan	2.2.3.1.2	Argentina Germany
1.1.4	Jordan		Japan
1.2	Samoa		United Kingdom
1.2.2	Cook Islands New Zealand United States	2.2.3.1.3	Argentina Germany Japan
1.3	Tajikistan	2.2.3.1.4	United Kingdom Argentina Australia Germany Japan Tajikistan
Chapter 2	Belarus Myanmar		United Kingdom United States
2.2	Romania	2.2.3.2	Argentina Australia Belgium Cook Islands Finland France Germany
2.2.1	Argentina Cook Islands New Zealand		
2.2.1.2	Germany Romania		
2.2.2	Argentina Australia Cook Islands Japan		

<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Differences notified by</i>	<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Differences notified by</i>
	Ireland		United Kingdom
	Japan		Uzbekistan
	New Zealand	4.1.7	Jordan
	Romania	4.1.8	Belgium
	Russian Federation		Finland
	United Kingdom		France
	Uzbekistan		Germany
2.2.3.3	Argentina		Ireland
	Germany		Italy
	Japan		Jordan
2.2.3.3.1	Argentina		Romania
	Cook Islands		
	Germany	Chapter 5	Jordan
	Japan		Myanmar
	New Zealand		
	United Kingdom	Chapter 6	Jordan
2.2.3.3.2	Australia		Myanmar
2.3.1	Jordan	6.3.2	Italy
2.3.1.2	Jordan	6.7	Australia
			Belgium
Chapter 3	Myanmar		Czech Republic
			Finland
Chapter 4	Myanmar		France
4.1	Belgium		Ireland
	Finland		Poland
	Ireland		Samoa
	Jordan		United Kingdom
	United Kingdom		United States
4.1.1	Jordan	6.8.1	Australia
4.1.2	Jordan		United Kingdom
4.1.3	Jordan	6.8.5	Australia
4.1.4	Jordan		Belgium
4.1.5	Jordan		Finland
4.1.6	Australia		Ireland
	Belgium		Samoa
	Cook Islands		
	Czech Republic	Chapter 7	Myanmar
	Finland	7.1	Belgium
	France		Finland
	Germany		Ireland
	Ireland		United Kingdom
	Jordan	7.4	Jordan
	New Zealand	7.4.2	Argentina
	Poland		Australia
	Romania		Canada
	Russian Federation		China
	Samoa		Cook Islands
			Italy

<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Differences notified by</i>	<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Differences notified by</i>
	Japan	Chapter 8	Myanmar
	New Zealand		
	Samoa	Chapter 9	Myanmar
	United States	9.3.2	Jordan

**PART II**

**CHAPTER 3**

3.6.3 Antigua and Barbuda issues a private category Certificate of Airworthiness.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.3.4 Mandatory continuing airworthiness information issued by Antigua and Barbuda is not transmitted to the State of Design.

**PART IIIA**

**CHAPTER 9**

9.3.5 Antigua and Barbuda does not require its operators to acquire information concerning a least-risk bomb location.

---



**PART I****Definitions**

*Maintenance.* A modification is not considered a maintenance task in Argentina.

*Performance Class 1, 2 and 3 helicopters.* Large helicopters (over 2 730 kg) are classified in Category A or B according to their weight, passenger capacity, auxiliary systems and performance. No classification has been established for all other helicopters (2 730 kg or less).

**PART IIIA****CHAPTER 2**

2.2.3 For landplanes, Argentina requires that the landing distance be determined only at the runway level. For seaplanes, Argentina requires that the landing distance be determined only for calm water.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.1.6 g), h) and i) The effects caused by explosive or incendiary devices are not considered as design requirements in Argentina.

**PART IV****CHAPTER 1**

Argentina does not allow the weight and centre of gravity limits to vary as a function of altitude or phase of flight (take-off, en-route, landing).

**CHAPTER 2**

2.2.1 As mentioned in the difference indicated with respect to the definitions of helicopter classes in  
2.2.2 Part I, the classification in Argentina is based on their weight, passenger capacity, auxiliary systems and performance.

2.2.3.1 With regard to Category B helicopters, it is only necessary to include the take-off distance in the  
2.2.3.1.1 performance data, while for Category A helicopters, it is necessary to provide data on take-off  
2.2.3.1.2 distance, path and rejected take-off distance. There are no comparable requirements for  
2.2.3.1.3 helicopters weighing less than 2 730 kg.  
2.2.3.1.4

2.2.3.2 The en-route performance is based only on the climb performance, both in situations where all engines are operative and when there is one engine inoperative (applicable to Categories A and B). There are no comparable requirements for helicopters weighing less than 2 730 kg.

2.2.3.3 The specification of the landing decision point (LDP) is only necessary for Category A  
2.2.3.3.1 helicopters.

**CHAPTER 7**

- 7.4.2 Minimum acceptable intensities have been established for navigation and anti-collision lights. This means that there are no means to reduce the intensity of the lights below the prescribed limits.

---

**PART I**

**Definitions**            The classification of helicopters is based on performance as well as other factors.

**PART II****CHAPTER 2**

2.2                        Not implemented.

**CHAPTER 3**

**Figure 1**                The Certificate of Airworthiness does not contain information regarding the appropriate airworthiness code.

**PART IIIA****CHAPTER 9**

9.2.7                     Not implemented.

9.3.5                     Not implemented.

**CHAPTER 11**

11.1                      Not implemented.

---

**PART II****CHAPTER 3**

- 3.6.3 Australia will not permit the ferry flight if it considers it would be detrimental to the safety of air  
3.6.4 navigation to do so.

*Remark:* Australia reserves the right to refuse permission in such circumstances.

**PART IIIA****CHAPTER 2**

- 2.3.4.1 The Standards for stall testing do not require demonstration with one power unit inoperative, and  
hence the stall warning is not demonstrated for that configuration.

**CHAPTER 4**

- 4.1.6 g) The Standards for the design of cargo compartment fire suppression systems and extinguishing  
agents do not explicitly refer to explosive or incendiary devices.
- 4.1.6 h) and i) Design standards to protect against cabin depressurization or the presence of smoke, toxic gases or  
fumes in the cabin and flight crew compartment do not explicitly refer to explosive or incendiary  
devices.

**CHAPTER 9**

- 9.6.2 Australian requirements for markings and placards to assist ground personnel are limited and do  
not address ground operations such as towing.

**CHAPTER 11**

- 11.1 There is no requirement in Australian legislation for consideration to be given during the design of  
the aeroplane to the provision of a least-risk bomb location.
- 11.2 There is no provision in Australian legislation for design specifications that address security  
11.3 aspects.

**PART IV****CHAPTER 2**

- 2.2.2 Australian design requirements for helicopters are not based on operational performance Classes I,  
II and III. Helicopters with a maximum weight in excess of 3 180 kg are classified in Categories A  
or B, based on weight, passenger carrying capacity, auxiliary systems and performance.

- 2.2.2.1 b) For helicopters with a maximum weight of 3 180 kg or less, there are no specific requirements for minimum performance at all stages of take-off and climb.
- 2.2.3.1.4 For helicopters with a maximum weight of 3 180 kg or less, there are no requirements for take-off distance to be established.
- 2.2.3.2 b) En-route performance is based on climb performance where all engines are operating and in a situation where one engine is inoperative. The case where two critical power-units are inoperative is not addressed. There are no comparable requirements for helicopters weighing less than 3 180 kg.
- 2.2.3.3.2 For helicopters with a maximum weight of 3 180 kg or less, there are no requirements for landing distance to be established.

#### CHAPTER 4

- 4.1.6 e) The Australian requirements do not specify fire protection/prevention criteria for cabin interior furnishing materials used during major refurbishing. Fire protection is dependent on the original certification basis.

#### CHAPTER 6

- 6.7 For helicopters with a maximum weight of 3 180 kg or less, engine restart capabilities are only required for Category A certification.
- 6.8.1 There are no requirements that address the independence of power-units in helicopters having a maximum weight of 3 180 kg or less.
- 6.8.5 There are no requirements for fire extinguisher systems in piston engine helicopters having a maximum weight of 3 180 kg or less.

#### CHAPTER 7

- 7.4.2 b) There are no requirements in Australian legislation for the effects of helicopter navigation and anti-collision lights on outside observers to be addressed.

## **PART II**

### **CHAPTER 3**

- 3.6.2            A procedural practice is in place. There are no requirements to advise States of Registry when a foreign-registered aircraft is damaged. However, the Bahamas Flight Standards Inspectorate routinely works with other States of Registry regarding the airworthiness of their aircraft located or flying in the Bahamas.

---

**PART II**

**CHAPTER 3**

3.2.3                      Not implemented.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.3.5                      Not implemented.

---

**PART I**

**Definitions**            The classification of helicopters is based on other factors as well as performance.

**PART IV**

**CHAPTER 2**            The classification of helicopters is based on other factors as well as performance.

---



**PART I**

**Definitions**      *Performance Class 1, 2 and 3 helicopters.* Large helicopters are classified as either Category A or B on the basis of weight, passenger-carrying capacity and auxiliary systems as well as performance capabilities. There is no classification scheme for small helicopters.

**PART II****CHAPTER 3**

3.3.2              Part 21 only requires the language of the Member State and does not impose the use of the English language.

3.6.1              Under Part 21, the assessment of the damage is also allowed by a design organization approved in accordance with Sub-part J, under a procedure agreed with the agency. This can be seen as indirect State judgement.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.3.1              There is no requirement in Commission Regulation EC-1702/2003 for Member States to do this.

4.3.4              There is neither a requirement in Commission Regulation EC-1702/2003 for Member States to do this, nor an EASA procedure addressing this.

**PART IIIA****CHAPTER 2**

2.2.3              In the airworthiness codes, scheduling of landing distance with runway slope is not mandated, but factors on landing distance are applied by operational rules, where appropriate. In the airworthiness codes, performance scheduling for variations in water surface conditions, density of water and strength of current is not mandated, but factors on landing distance are applied by operational rules, where appropriate.

2.3.4.1            In the airworthiness codes, stall testing with one power-unit inoperative is not mandated, but issues with stall warning with one engine inoperative are considered in individual certification activities.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.1                At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically require the observing of Human Factors principles, but these principles are considered during certification activities for those areas which affect the safety of the aircraft.

4.1.6              At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically require protection against explosive and incendiary devices.

**CHAPTER 9**

9.2.4 The airworthiness codes do not specifically address the issue of limitations on equipment and systems, but in practice Belgium complies with the Standard.

9.3.5 At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically require the identification of the least-risk bomb location.

**CHAPTER 11**

At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically address this security Standard except for pilot compartment doors.

**PART IIIB****SUB-PART B**

B.2.7 In the airworthiness codes, scheduling of landing distance with runway slope is not mandated, but factors on landing distance are applied by operational rules, where appropriate. In the airworthiness codes, performance scheduling for variations in water surface conditions, density of water and strength of current is not mandated, but factors on landing distance are applied by operational rules, where appropriate.

B.2.7 b), e) The airworthiness codes ensure compliance with this Standard except for accountability for worn brakes in case of commuter category aeroplanes.

B.4.2 In the airworthiness codes, stall testing with one power-unit inoperative is not mandated, but issues with stall warning with one engine inoperative are considered in individual certification activities.

**SUB-PART C**

C.7 a), c) In general, the consideration of likely impact with birds is not mandated in the airworthiness codes for small aeroplanes and commuter category aeroplanes except for bird impact on windshield for commuter category. Consideration of the probable behaviour of the aeroplane in ditching is only required for type certification where ditching certification is required by operating rules.

**SUB-PART D**

D.1.1 At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically require the observing of Human Factors principles, but these principles are considered during certification activities for those areas which affect the safety of the aircraft.

D.1.3 The effect of the materials on the occupants of the aeroplane and other persons on the ground, and the environment in general, in normal and emergency situations, are not specifically addressed in the airworthiness codes.

- D.2 a) The airworthiness codes ensure compliance with subparagraph a) except for prevention of mis-assembly.
- D.2 b), g) 3), h), i) At this time, the airworthiness codes do not mandate protection against explosive and incendiary devices.

**SUB-PART F**

- F.1 At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically require the observing of Human Factors principles, but these principles are considered during certification activities for those areas which affect the safety of the aircraft.
- F.1.2 c) At this time, protection against electromagnetic interference is not mandated by the airworthiness codes but is considered during individual certification exercises.
- F.5

**SUB-PART G**

- G.2.5 The airworthiness codes do not specifically address the issue of limitations on equipment and systems, but in practice Belgium complies with the Standard.

**SUB-PART I**

- I.1 This provision is not included in the airworthiness codes, but in the case of new design, special conditions can be used during certification to address cases where the related airworthiness code does not contain adequate or appropriate safety standards.
- I.6 The airworthiness codes do not address this Standard except for the installation requirement. The rest is covered by the operating rules.

- SUB-PART K** At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically address these security Standards except for pilot compartment doors.

**PART IV****CHAPTER 2**

- 2.2.3.1 For Category B helicopters, the airworthiness code only requires take-off distance to be included in the performance data.
- 2.2.3.2 The concept of two power-units inoperative is not included in the airworthiness codes, but in the case of new design, special conditions can be used during certification to address cases where the related airworthiness code does not contain adequate or appropriate safety Standards.

**CHAPTER 4**

- 4.1 At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically require the observing of Human Factors principles, but these principles are considered during certification activities for those areas which affect the safety of the aircraft.
- 4.1.6 The airworthiness codes ensure compliance with this Standard except for the consideration of depressurization, but this issue may be addressed during certification if appropriate using the Special Condition procedure.
- 4.1.8 The airworthiness codes do not specifically address the risk that ground-handling operations may cause damage.

**CHAPTER 6**

- 6.7 At this time, the airworthiness codes do not ensure compliance with the engine-restarting Standard for small helicopters.
- 6.8.5 The airworthiness codes ensure compliance with this Standard except for fire extinguishment for small helicopters and for fire detection for small helicopters equipped with piston engine.

**CHAPTER 7**

- 7.1 At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically require the observing of Human Factors principles, but these principles are considered during certification activities for those areas which affect the safety of the aircraft.
-

**PART II**

**CHAPTER 1** Chapters related to the issuance of Type Certificates or Manufacture have not been implemented.

**CHAPTER 2** Chapters related to the issuance of Type Certificates or Manufacture have not been implemented.

**CHAPTER 3**

3.2.2 Belize has not formally adopted a comprehensive airworthiness code or complete airworthiness regulations in conformance with international SARPs.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.3.3 There is no requirement to assess and adopt mandatory continuing airworthiness information such as Airworthiness Directives (ADs).

4.3.4 The DCA has not established a system for the interchange of data with States of Design and  
4.3.5 design organizations, including the reception, adoption and emission of mandatory continuing airworthiness information.

**PART IIIA** Not implemented. Belize is not a State of Design.

**PART IV** Not implemented. Belize is not a State of Design.

---

**PART IIIA & B** Not implemented. Benin is not a State of Manufacture.

**PART IV** Not implemented. Benin is not a State of Manufacture.

---

**PART IIIA**

**CHAPTER 9**

- 9.3.5 No requirement in the regulations concerning the identification of a least-risk bomb location on aeroplanes.

**CHAPTER 11**

- 11.1 No requirement in the regulations concerning the provision of a least-risk bomb location during the design of an aeroplane.
- 11.3 No requirement in the regulations that consideration shall be given to design features that will deter the easy concealment of weapons, explosives and other dangerous objects on board aircraft and that will facilitate the search procedures for such objects.
-

**PART II**

**CHAPTER 1**

- 1.1 No provision is made in the regulations for aircraft design.  
1.2

**CHAPTER 2** Burkina Faso is not an aircraft manufacturing country. No provision is made in the regulations for Chapter 2, Production.

**PART IIIA**

**CHAPTERS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7** The regulations do not provide for certification, design and construction of heavy aircraft.

---



**PART IIIB****SUB-PART D**

- D.2 f) Partially compliant. Canadian standards do not address delay in the occurrence of flashover in the cabin.
- D.2 g) Partially compliant. Canadian standards do not address a sudden and extensive fire such as the one caused by explosive or incendiary devices.
- D.2 h) Partially compliant. Canadian standards do not address smoke or other toxic gases especially caused by explosive or incendiary devices.

**SUB-PART F**

- F.4.2 Partially compliant. Canadian standards do not address harmful dazzle to persons outside the aeroplane.

**SUB-PART K**

- K.1 Non-compliant with this provision.
- K.2 Partially compliant. Canadian standards do not address protection of the flight crew compartment bulkhead.
- K.3 Non-compliant with this provision.

**PART IV****CHAPTER 7**

- 7.4.2 Partially compliant. Canadian standards do not address harmful dazzle to persons outside the helicopter.
-

## **PART II**

### **CHAPTER 3**

- 3.3.1 The format of the Certificate of Airworthiness differs from that required by Annex 8.

### **CHAPTER 4**

- 4.3.1 No system has been established to inform the State of Design when an aircraft is registered in Chile.
- 4.3.4 Chile does not have a system to transmit to the State of Design all mandatory continuing information originated in Chile.
- 4.3.5 Chile has not established a system for transmitting information on faults, malfunctions, defects and other occurrences to the organization responsible for the type design.
-

**PART II**

**CHAPTER 4**

- 4.3.7                    There are no provisions to require the organization responsible for the type design of aircraft to provide a continuing structural integrity programme.

**PART IIIA**

**CHAPTER 1**

- 1.2                      There are no provisions in the CAAC regulations requiring aeroplanes of over 5 700 kg maximum certificated take-off mass to have no less than two engines.

**PART IV**

**CHAPTER 7**

- 7.4.2 b)                The CAAC regulations do not address the effect of helicopter lights on outside observers. However, visibility to other pilots and the lights' effect on the flight crew are addressed.

---

**General** Cook Islands adopted the New Zealand regulations (CAR); accordingly, the following differences of New Zealand CAR apply.

## **PART I**

**Definitions** *Design take-off mass.* Design take-off mass is referred to as “maximum certified take-off weight”.

*Performance Class 1, 2 and 3 helicopters.* Large helicopters (heavier than 6 000 lb) are classified as either Category A or B on the basis of weight, passenger-carrying capacity and auxiliary systems as well as performance capabilities. There is no classification scheme for all other helicopters (6 000 lb or less).

## **PART II**

### **CHAPTER 3**

3.6.1 Cook Islands Civil Aviation Rules (CAR) place responsibility for judgement of aircraft damage, to ensure an aircraft’s airworthiness, on licensed pilots and maintenance engineers based on provisions in CAR 91.201 and CAR 43.53. Cook Islands, as the State of Registry, does not directly judge whether the damage is of a nature such that the aircraft is no longer airworthy. Irrespective of aircraft damage, the Certificate of Airworthiness is valid unless the Director uses provisions in section 17 (2) of the Civil Aviation Act 1990 (CAA Act 17 (2)) to revoke the certificate.

3.6.3 As in Standard 3.6.1, Cook Islands Civil Aviation Rules (CAR) do not place direct responsibility on the State of Registry to determine if the damage sustained is of a nature such that the aircraft is no longer airworthy.

3.6.4 As in Standard 3.6.1, Cook Islands Civil Aviation Rules (CAR) do not place direct responsibility on the State of Registry to determine if the damage sustained is of a nature such that the aircraft is no longer airworthy. In this situation, if the pilot determines that the aircraft is airworthy as per CAR 91.201, the aircraft shall be allowed to resume its flight. CAR 12.55 requires all serious incidents, or immediate hazards to the safety of aircraft operations, to be reported. This gives the CAA a tool to monitor if the pilot complied with CAR 91.201.

### **CHAPTER 4**

4.3.1 The Civil Aviation Authority Aircraft Certification Unit (ACU) procedures have no formal procedure to advise the State of Design that it has entered such an aircraft on its register.

**PART IIIA** Compliance with Part IIIA is by incorporation by reference in the Cook Islands Civil Aviation Rules of appropriate United States Federal Aviation Regulations.

**CHAPTER 1**

- 1.1.3 Effective 17 October 1979, the United States certificated certain aeroplanes at weights in excess of 5 700 kg (12 566 lb) that do not fully meet the ICAO Airworthiness Standards of Part IIIA. The Airworthiness Certificate of aeroplanes that do not meet ICAO Standards will be endorsed as follows:

“This aeroplane at weights in excess of 5 700 kg does not meet the airworthiness requirements of ICAO, as prescribed by Annex 8 to the Convention on International Civil Aviation.”

- 1.5.1 The United States also uses service experience and equivalent safety findings as a basis for finding compliance with the appropriate airworthiness requirements.

**CHAPTER 2**

- 2.2.3 This ICAO provision requires performance data to be scheduled for ranges of gradient of the landing surface for landplanes and ranges of water surface conditions, water density and strength of current for seaplanes. For landplanes, the United States requires the landing distance to be determined only on a level runway. For seaplanes, the United States requires the landing distance on water to be determined only on smooth water. Operational take-off and landing distance margins are applied where appropriate by United States operational regulations and guidance.

**PART IIIB** Compliance with Part IIIB is by incorporation by reference in the Cook Islands Civil Aviation Rules of appropriate United States Federal Aviation Regulations.

**PART IV** Compliance with Part IV is by incorporation by reference in the Cook Islands Civil Aviation Rules of appropriate United States Federal Aviation Regulations.

**CHAPTER 1**

- 1.2.2, Note 1 The United States does not allow the weight and centre of gravity limitations to vary as a function of altitude or phase of flight (take-off, cruise, landing, etc.).

**CHAPTER 2**

- 2.2.1 As stated in the difference with respect to the definitions of classes of helicopters in Part I, United States classifications are based on other factors as well as performance.
- 2.2.2 As stated in the difference with respect to the definitions of classes of helicopters in Part I, United States classifications are based on other factors as well as performance.
- 2.2.3.1 For Category B helicopters, only take-off distance is required to be included in the performance data, while take-off distance, path and rejected take-off distance information is required for Category A helicopters. There are no comparable requirements for helicopters weighing less than 6 000 pounds.

2.2.3.2 En-route performance is based solely on climb performance for both all-engines operating and one engine inoperative situations (Categories A and B). There is no comparable requirement for helicopters weighing less than 6 000 pounds.

2.2.3.3.1 The landing decision point (LDP) is required for Category A helicopters only.

#### **CHAPTER 4**

4.1.6 e) The United States does not provide criteria relative to fire protection/prevention for interior furnishing materials replaced during major refurbishment. The fire protection levied is dependent on the original certification basis.

#### **CHAPTER 7**

7.4.2 Minimum acceptable intensities are prescribed for navigation lights and anti-collision lights, i.e. no reduction below these levels is possible.

---

**PART II****CHAPTER 2**

- 2.1 Croatia does not have its own production of aircraft and aircraft devices, and the minor parts  
2.2 required in case of repairs are manufactured in the framework of the Approval Certificate.

**CHAPTER 3**

- 3.1 The requirements regulated exceed the requirements in Annex 8, having regard that the  
3.2 commercial aircraft are not distinguished from the non-commercial ones and the same Standards  
3.3 are used for both commercial and non-commercial aircraft.  
3.4  
3.5  
3.6

**CHAPTER 4**

- 4.1 There exists the legal approval for certification of continued airworthiness; however, the CAA of  
4.2 Croatia issues the certification of continued airworthiness for a period of one year since the  
4.3 Operators have not proved the ability to maintain the aircraft in unlimited continued airworthiness.

**PART III**

The regulations on certification of aircraft, engines, propellers, parachutes, balloons, hang-gliders and aircraft equipment are complied with, with one exception: the regulations in Croatia do not include the division into large and small aircraft. The same Standards are applied to both small and large aircraft.

The regulations on requirements to be complied with by legal person performing construction work and modifications of the aircraft and aircraft devices are complied with, with one exception: the regulations in Croatia do not include the division into large and small aircraft. The same Standards are applied to both small and large aircraft.

The regulations on procedures for issuing Airworthiness Certificates are complied with, with one exception: the regulations in Croatia do not include the division into large and small aircraft. The same Standards are applied to both small and large aircraft

**PART IV**

The regulations on certification of aircraft, engines, propellers, parachutes, balloons, hang-gliders and aircraft equipment are complied with, with one exception: the regulations in Croatia do not include the division into large and small aircraft. The same Standards are applied to both small and large aircraft.

The regulations on requirements to be complied with by legal person performing construction work and modifications of the aircraft and aircraft devices are complied with, with one exception: the regulations in Croatia do not include the division into large and small aircraft. The same Standards are applied to both small and large aircraft

The regulations on procedures for issuing Airworthiness Certificates are complied with, with one exception: the regulations in Croatia do not include the division into large and small aircraft. The same Standards are applied to both small and large aircraft.

---



**PART II****CHAPTER 4**

- 4.3.2 Not specified in the existing regulations. Done through a direct request to the State of Design and manufacturer.
- 4.3.4 Not specified in the existing regulations. Done through the airline operators, who send the information directly to the manufacturer. The State only intervenes in major cases.

**PART IIIA****CHAPTER 2**

- 2.2.3 Not regulated.
- 2.3.4.1 The stall warning characteristics with one power-unit in operation is not specified.
-

**PART IIIA****CHAPTER 4**

- 4.1.6 b), g), h) and i)      The Czech Republic does not have similar requirements. However, the CAA, in conjunction with the JAA Member States and the United States, is working towards meeting the intent of these provisions.

**CHAPTER 9**

- 9.3.5      The Czech Republic does not have similar requirements. However, the CAA, in conjunction with the JAA Member States and the United States, is working towards meeting the intent of these provisions.

**CHAPTER 11**

- 11.1      The Czech Republic does not have similar requirements. However, the CAA, in conjunction with the JAA Member States and the United States, is working towards meeting the intent of these provisions.  
11.2  
11.3

**PART IV****CHAPTER 4**

- 4.1.6 f)      There is no requirement for design precautions to be taken to protect against instances of cabin depressurization. The Czech Republic does not have any pressurized helicopters at this time.

**CHAPTER 6**

- 6.7      The Czech Republic does not have a similar requirement. However, the CAA, in conjunction with the JAA Member States and the United States, is working towards meeting the intent of this provision.
-

**PART II**

**CHAPTER 4**

- 4.3                      A system has not been established for the exchange of information on continuing airworthiness between operators, the DGCA, States and the organizations responsible for aircraft design.

**PART IIIA**

**CHAPTER 5**            A comprehensive and detailed airworthiness code has not been adopted.

**CHAPTER 6**            A comprehensive and detailed airworthiness code has not been adopted.

**PART IV**                A comprehensive and detailed airworthiness code has not been adopted.

---

**PART II****CHAPTER 3**

- 3.2.2            The regulations of the DGCA of Ecuador do not cover methods of rendering certificates of airworthiness valid. The regulations cover only their issuance and renewal, through its own requirements.
- 3.6.3            The regulations of the DGCA of Ecuador do not provide for the ability to prohibit aircraft registered in other States from continuing their flights.

**CHAPTER 4**

- 4.3.1            In its regulations, the DGCA of Ecuador does not specify the requirement to advise the State of Design that an aircraft has been entered on its register.
- 4.3.4            The national regulations do not require that there should be transmission to the State of Design of all mandatory continuing airworthiness information.
- 4.3.5            The national regulations do not require that there should be transmission of information to the organizations responsible for the design on cases of malfunctions or defects which might cause adverse effects on the airworthiness of the aircraft.
- 4.3.7            The DGCA of Ecuador does not require that the structural integrity programme include information on corrosion prevention and control.
-

**PART II**

**CHAPTER 3**

3.2.2 No procedures for rendering valid a Certificate of Airworthiness.

3.6.2 Not implemented.

---

## **PART II**

### **CHAPTER 4**

- 4.3.2 Not applicable as Fiji is not a State of Design.
- 4.3.4 Fiji does not promulgate Airworthiness Directives (ADs) but validates ADs issued by the State of Manufacture and/or the State of Design, including UK CAA mandatory requirements, where applicable.
- 4.3.6 Not applicable as Fiji is not a State of Design.
- 4.3.7
- 4.3.9
-

**PART I**

**Definitions**      *Performance Class 1, 2 and 3 helicopters.* Large helicopters are classified as either Category A or B on the basis of weight, passenger-carrying capacity and auxiliary systems as well as performance capabilities. There is no classification scheme for small helicopters.

**PART II****CHAPTER 3**

3.3.2      Part 21 only requires the language of the European Commission Member State and does not impose the use of the English language. However, the Finnish version does include an English translation.

3.6.1      Under Part 21, the assessment of the damage is also allowed by a design organization approved in accordance with Sub-part J, under a procedure agreed with EASA. This can be seen as indirect State judgement.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.3.1      There is no requirement in the European Commission Regulation 1702/2003 for Member States to do this. Notification to the State of Design is not made if mandatory continuing airworthiness information (MCAI) from that State is readily available.

4.3.4      There is neither a requirement in the European Commission Regulation 1702/2003 for Member States to do this, nor an EASA procedure addressing this.

**PART IIIA****CHAPTER 2**

2.2.3      In the airworthiness codes, scheduling of landing distance with runway slope is not mandated, but factors on landing distance are applied by operational rules, where appropriate.

In the airworthiness codes, performance scheduling for variations in water surface conditions, density of water and strength of current is not mandated, but factors on landing distance are applied by operational rules, where appropriate.

2.3.4.1      In the airworthiness codes, stall testing with one power-unit inoperative is not mandated, but issues with stall warning with one engine inoperative are considered in individual certification activities.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.1      At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically require the observing of Human Factors principles, but these principles are considered during certification activities for those areas which affect the safety of the aircraft.

- 4.1.6 At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically require protection against explosive and incendiary devices.

## CHAPTER 9

- 9.2.4 The airworthiness codes do not specifically address the issue of limitations on equipment and systems but in practice the Standard is complied with.
- 9.3.5 At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically require the identification of the least-risk bomb location.

- CHAPTER 11** At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically address this security Standard except for pilot compartment doors.

## PART IIIB

### SUB-PART B

- B.2.7 In the airworthiness codes, scheduling of landing distance with runway slope is not mandated, but factors on landing distance are applied by operational rules, where appropriate.
- In the airworthiness codes, performance scheduling for variations in water surface conditions, density of water and strength of current is not mandated, but factors on landing distance are applied by operational rules, where appropriate.
- B.2.7 b), e) The airworthiness codes ensure compliance with this Standard except for accountability for worn brakes in case of commuter category aeroplanes.
- B.4.2 In the airworthiness codes, stall testing with one power-unit inoperative is not mandated, but issues with stall warning with one engine inoperative are considered in individual certification activities.

### SUB-PART C

- C.7 a) In general, the consideration of likely impact with birds is not mandated in the airworthiness codes for small aeroplanes and commuter category aeroplanes except for bird impact on windshield for commuter category.
- C.7 c) Consideration of the probable behaviour of the aeroplane in ditching is only required for type certification where ditching certification is required by operating rules.

### SUB-PART D

- D.1.1 At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically require the observing of Human Factors principles, but these principles are considered during certification activities for those areas which affect the safety of the aircraft.



- D.1.3 The effect of the materials on the occupants of the aeroplane and other persons on the ground, and the environment in general, in normal and emergency situations, is not specifically addressed in the airworthiness codes.
- D.2 a) The airworthiness codes ensure compliance with subparagraph a) except for prevention of mis-assembly.
- D.2 b), g) 3), h) and i) At this time, the airworthiness codes do not mandate protection against explosive and incendiary devices.

#### **SUB-PART F**

- F.1 At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically require the observing of Human Factors principles, but these principles are considered during certification activities for those areas which affect the safety of the aircraft.
- F.1.2 c) At this time, protection against electromagnetic interference is not mandated by the airworthiness codes but is considered during individual certification exercises.
- F.5

#### **SUB-PART G**

- G.2.5 The airworthiness codes do not specifically address the issue of limitations on equipment and systems, but in practice Finland complies with the Standard.

#### **SUB-PART I**

- I.1 This provision is not included in the airworthiness codes, but in the case of new design, special conditions can be used during certification to address cases where the related airworthiness code does not contain adequate or appropriate safety standards.
- I.6 The airworthiness codes do not address this Standard except for the installation requirement. The rest is covered by the operating rules.

#### **SUB-PART K**

- K.1 At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically address these security Standards except for pilot compartment doors.
- K.2
- K.3

### **PART IV**

#### **CHAPTER 2**

- 2.2.3.1 For Category B helicopters, the airworthiness code only requires take-off distance to be included in the performance data.

- 2.2.3.2            The concept of two power-units inoperative is not included in the airworthiness codes, but in the case of new design, special conditions can be used during certification to address cases where the related airworthiness code does not contain adequate or appropriate safety standards.

**CHAPTER 4**

- 4.1                At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically require the observing of Human Factors principles, but these principles are considered during certification activities for those areas which affect the safety of the aircraft.
- 4.1.6             The airworthiness codes ensure compliance with this Standard except for the consideration of depressurization, but this issue may be addressed during certification, if appropriate, using the Special Condition procedure.
- 4.1.8             The airworthiness codes do not specifically address the risk that ground-handling operations may cause damage.

**CHAPTER 6**

- 6.7                At this time, the airworthiness codes do not ensure compliance with the engine restarting Standard for small helicopters.
- 6.8.5             The airworthiness codes ensure compliance with this Standard except for fire extinguishment for small helicopters and for fire detection for small helicopters equipped with piston engine.

**CHAPTER 7**

- 7.1                At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically require the observing of Human Factors principles, but these principles are considered during certification activities for those areas which affect the safety of the aircraft.
-

**PART IIIA****CHAPTER 2**

2.3.4.1            Testing the stall with one engine inoperative is not required.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.1.6            Protection against explosive or incendiary devices is not required for aeroplanes for which application for certification was submitted before 12 March 2000.

**CHAPTER 9**

9.3.5            The identification of a least-risk bomb location is not required for aeroplanes for which application for certification was submitted before 12 March 2000.

**PART IIIB****SUB-PART B**

B.2.7 b) and e)    For aeroplanes of the “Commuter” category, worn brakes need not be considered.

B.4.2            Testing the stall with one engine inoperative is not required.

**SUB-PART D**

D.2 g) and h)    Current airworthiness codes do not provide for protection against explosive or incendiary devices.

**SUB-PART K**    Current airworthiness codes do not include specific security provisions.

**PART IV****CHAPTER 2**

2.2.3.2 b)        This point only concerns helicopters equipped with three or more engines. Since this type of helicopter does not exist in France, this point is not covered in the regulations.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.1.6 f)        Requirements related to instances of cabin depressurization are not needed since pressurized helicopters do not exist in France.

- 4.1.8            Airworthiness codes do not include a specific provision to minimize the risks of damage during ground-handling operations.

## **CHAPTER 6**

- 6.7            Means for restarting an engine are not required for light helicopters.

---

**PART IIIA****CHAPTER 2**

- 2.3.4.1            There is no requirement for a clear and distinctive stall warning to be apparent to the pilot with one power-unit inoperative.

**CHAPTER 4**

- 4.1.6 g)            There is no requirement for cargo compartment fire suppression systems to be designed so as to take into account a sudden and extensive fire such as could be caused by an explosive or incendiary device.
- 4.1.6 h)            There is no requirement for design precautions to be taken to protect against possible instances of cabin depressurization and against the presence of smoke or other toxic gases, including those caused by explosives or incendiary devices, which could incapacitate the occupants of the aeroplane.

**CHAPTER 9**

- 9.3.5              There is no requirement for the identification of a least-risk bomb location on the aeroplane.
- 9.6.2              There is no requirement for markings and placards or instructions to be provided to give any information that is essential to the ground crew in order to preclude the possibility of mistakes in ground servicing.

**CHAPTER 11**

- 11.1                There is no requirement for consideration to be given during the design of the aeroplane to the provision of a least-risk bomb location.
- 11.2                There is no requirement for the flight crew compartment door and the flight crew compartment bulkhead to be designed to minimize penetration by small arms fire and grenade shrapnel.
- 11.3                There is no requirement for consideration to be given to design features that will deter the easy concealment of weapons, explosives or other dangerous objects.

**PART IV****CHAPTER 2**

- 2.2.1.2            There is no such requirement for small helicopters other than for take-off and landing.

2.2.2.1            There is no reference to performance Class 1, 2 or 3, but only to Categories A and B.  
2.2.2.2  
2.2.3  
2.2.3.1  
2.2.3.1.1  
2.2.3.1.2  
2.2.3.1.3  
2.2.3.1.4

2.2.3.2            There is no reference to performance Class 1, 2 or 3, but only to Categories A and B. There is no such requirement for climb, cruise or descent performance to be taken into account with the critical two power-units inoperative for helicopters having three or more power-units.

2.2.3.3            There is no reference to performance Class 1, 2 or 3, but only to Categories A and B.  
2.2.3.3.1

#### **CHAPTER 4**

4.1.6 f)           There is no requirement for design precautions to be taken to protect against instances of cabin depressurization and against the presence of smoke or other toxic gases that could incapacitate the occupants of the helicopter.

4.1.8              There is no requirement for design provisions to minimize the risk that ground-handling operations may cause damage, which could pass unnoticed, to the parts of the helicopter essential for its safe operation.

---

**PART II**

**CHAPTER 3**

3.6.3 Grenada issues a private category Certificate of Airworthiness.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.3.4 Mandatory continuing airworthiness information issued by Grenada is not transmitted to the State of Design.

**PART IIIA**

**CHAPTER 9**

9.3.5 No requirements exist for operators to acquire information concerning a least-risk bomb location.

---

**PART II**

**CHAPTER 1** Guatemala does not issue Type Certificates. Guatemala accepts the FAA and JAA type certification, contained in the airworthiness codes of the FAR and JAR standards, respectively. Guatemala, therefore, associates itself with the differences notified by the United States and any JAA Member State.

**CHAPTER 2** Guatemala does not issue Type Certificates. Guatemala accepts the FAA and JAA type certification, contained in the airworthiness codes of the FAR and JAR standards, respectively. Guatemala, therefore, associates itself with the differences notified by the United States and any JAA Member State.

**PARTS IIIA and IIIB** Guatemala does not issue Type Certificates. Guatemala accepts the FAA and JAA type certification, contained in the airworthiness codes of the FAR and JAR standards, respectively. Guatemala, therefore, associates itself with the differences notified by the United States and any JAA Member State.

**PART IV** Guatemala does not issue Type Certificates. Guatemala accepts the FAA and JAA type certification, contained in the airworthiness codes of the FAR and JAR standards, respectively. Guatemala, therefore, associates itself with the differences notified by the United States and any JAA Member State.

---



**PART II**

**CHAPTER 3**

3.2.2 No airworthiness code adopted.

3.6.3 No systems/procedures to permit/prohibit a damaged foreign aircraft from flying to an aerodrome where it can be restored to an airworthy condition.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.3.2 No transmission of information that Guyana has found necessary for the mandatory continuing airworthiness of aircraft to State of Design or to any other State upon request .

---

**PART II**

**CHAPTER 3**

3.2.2                      Not implemented.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.3                         Not implemented.

---

**PART IIIA** Not applicable. Honduras does not issue type certificates. It accepts type certificates issued by the FAA and JAA.

**PART IIIB** Not applicable. Honduras does not issue type certificates. It accepts type certificates issued by the FAA and JAA.

**PART IV** Not applicable. Honduras does not issue type certificates. It accepts type certificates issued by the FAA and JAA.

---

## **PART II**

### **CHAPTER 4**

- 4.3.5 No system exists by which information on faults, malfunctions, defects and other occurrences that cause or may cause adverse effects on the continuing airworthiness of aircraft is transmitted to the organizations responsible for the type design of aircraft.

---

**PART I**

**Definitions**      *Performance Class 1, 2 and 3 helicopters.* Large helicopters are classified as either Category A or B on the basis of weight, passenger-carrying capacity and auxiliary systems as well as performance capabilities. There is no classification scheme for small helicopters.

**PART IIIA****CHAPTER 2**

2.2.3      In the airworthiness codes, scheduling of landing distance with runway slope is not mandated, but factors on landing distance are applied by operational rules, where appropriate.

In the airworthiness codes, performance scheduling for variations in water surface conditions, density of water and strength of current is not mandated, but factors on landing distance are applied by operational rules, where appropriate.

2.3.4.1      In the airworthiness codes, stall testing with one power-unit inoperative is not mandated, but issues with stall warning with one engine inoperative are considered in individual certification activities.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.1      At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically require the observing of Human Factors principles, but these principles are considered during certification activities for those areas which affect the safety of the aircraft.

4.1.6      At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically require protection against explosive and incendiary devices.

**CHAPTER 9**

9.2.4      The airworthiness codes do not specifically address the issue of limitations on equipment and systems, but in practice Ireland complies with the Standard.

9.3.5      At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically require the identification of the least-risk bomb location.

**CHAPTER 11**      At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically address this security Standard except for pilot compartment doors.

**PART IIIB****SUB-PART B**

B.2.7 In the airworthiness codes, scheduling of landing distance with runway slope is not mandated, but factors on landing distance are applied by operational rules, where appropriate.

In the airworthiness codes, performance scheduling for variations in water surface conditions, density of water and strength of current is not mandated, but factors on landing distance are applied by operational rules, where appropriate.

B.2.7 b) and e) The airworthiness codes ensure compliance with this Standard except for accountability for worn brakes in case of commuter category aeroplanes.

B.4.2 In the airworthiness codes, stall testing with one power-unit inoperative is not mandated, but issues with stall warning with one engine inoperative are considered in individual certification activities.

**SUB-PART C**

C.7 a) In general, the consideration of likely impact with birds is not mandated in the airworthiness codes for small aeroplanes and commuter category aeroplanes except for bird impact on windshield for commuter category.

C.7 c) Consideration of the probable behaviour of the aeroplane in ditching is only required for type certification where ditching certification is required by operating rules.

**SUB-PART D**

D.1.1 At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically require the observing of Human Factors principles, but these principles are considered during certification activities for those areas which affect the safety of the aircraft.

D.1.3 The effect of the materials on the occupants of the aeroplane and other persons on the ground, and the environment in general, in normal and emergency situations, is not specifically addressed in the airworthiness codes.

D.2 a) The airworthiness codes ensure compliance with subparagraph a) except for prevention of mis-assembly.

D.2 b), g) 3), h) and i) At this time, the airworthiness codes do not mandate protection against explosive and incendiary devices.

**SUB-PART F**

F.1 At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically require the observing of Human Factors principles, but these principles are considered during certification activities for those areas which affect the safety of the aircraft.

- F.1.2 c) At this time, protection against electromagnetic interference is not mandated by the airworthiness codes but is considered during individual certification exercises.
- F.5

## **SUB-PART G**

- G.2.5 The airworthiness codes do not specifically address the issue of limitations on equipment and systems, but in practice Ireland complies with the Standard.

## **SUB-PART I**

- I.1 This provision is not included in the airworthiness codes, but in the case of new design, special conditions can be used during certification to address cases where the related airworthiness code does not contain adequate or appropriate safety Standards.
- I.6 The airworthiness codes do not address this Standard except for the installation requirement of survival equipment. The rest is covered by the operating rules.

- SUB-PART K** At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically address these security Standards except for pilot compartment doors.

## **PART IV**

### **CHAPTER 2**

- 2.2.3.1 For Category B helicopters, the airworthiness code only requires take-off distance to be included in the performance data.
- 2.2.3.2 The concept of two power-units inoperative is not included in the airworthiness codes, but in the case of new design, special conditions can be used during certification to address cases where the related airworthiness code does not contain adequate or appropriate safety standards.

### **CHAPTER 4**

- 4.1 At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically require the observing of Human Factors principles, but these principles are considered during certification activities for those areas which affect the safety of the aircraft.
- 4.1.6 The airworthiness codes ensure compliance with this Standard except for the consideration of depressurization, but this issue may be addressed during certification if appropriate using the special condition procedure.
- 4.1.8 The airworthiness codes do not specifically address the risk that ground-handling operations may cause damage.

**CHAPTER 6**

- 6.7 At this time, the airworthiness codes do not ensure compliance with the engine restarting Standard for small helicopters.
- 6.8.5 The airworthiness codes ensure compliance with this Standard except for the extinguishment for small helicopters and for fire detection for small helicopters equipped with piston engine.

**CHAPTER 7**

- 7.1 At this time, the airworthiness codes do not specifically require the observing of Human Factors principles, but these principles are considered during certification activities for those areas which affect the safety of the aircraft.
-



**PART IIIA****CHAPTER 9**

- 9.3.5            There is no reference in JAR-25 for the need of a least-risk bomb location identification. See Note 1.
- 9.6.2            No placards are required in JAR-25 for towing loads. JAR-25.509 prescribes the design towing loads. See Note 2.

**CHAPTER 11**

- 11.1            No provision for a least-risk location identification. See Note 3.
- 11.2            No such requirement in JAR-25. See Note 3.
- 11.3

**PART IV****CHAPTER 2**

- 2.2.2.1        There is no requirement in JAR-29 for a demonstration of compliance in case of departure from the idealized condition. See Note 4.

**CHAPTER 4**

- 4.1.8            No specific provisions are requested in JAR-27/29 for risk associated with handling operations. See Note 5.

**CHAPTER 6**

- 6.3.2            No warning requested for overspeed. See Note 6.

**CHAPTER 7**

- 7.4.2            No requirements concerning possible effects on an outside observer. See Note 7.

*Note 1:* Part IIIA, Chapter 9, 9.3.5: appropriate rule-making JAA-FAA harmonized initiatives are in progress.

*Note 2:* Part IIIA, Chapter 9, 9.6.2: appropriate rule-making JAA-FAA harmonized initiatives are in progress.

*Note 3:* Part IIIA, Chapter 11, 11.1, 11.2 and 11.3: appropriate rule-making JAA-FAA harmonized initiatives are in progress.

*Note 4:* Part IV, Chapter 2, 2.2.2.1: appropriate coordination initiatives between JAA-FAA and ICAO AIRP are in progress. The JAA-FAA Joint Harmonization Working Group has determined that JAR/FAR 29.45(a)(2) does cope with the ICAO Standard.

*Note 5:* Part IV, Chapter 4, 4.1.8: appropriate coordination initiatives between JAA-FAA and ICAO AIRP are in progress. The JAA-FAA Joint Harmonization Working Group has determined that, as written, this ICAO Standard covers damage to the helicopter from any ground-handling activity. This goes beyond FAR/JAR, although Damage Tolerance work currently ongoing addresses this issue.

*Note 6:* Part IV, Chapter 6, 6.3.2: appropriate coordination initiatives between JAA-FAA and ICAO AIRP are in progress. The JAA-FAA Joint Harmonization Working Group has determined that no overspeed warning is required for JAA/JAR. This is normally obvious to the pilot due to changes in noise characteristics. FAR/JAR require under-speed warning only for single engine helicopters or multi-engine helicopters not having a device to automatically increase power following engine failure. FAA/JAR allow the inherent aerodynamic qualities to be used for low rotor speed warning instead of a device. The intent of the Standard is met.

*Note 7:* Part IV, Chapter 7, 7.4.2: appropriate coordination initiatives between JAA-FAA and ICAO AIRP are in progress. The JAA-FAA Joint Harmonization Working Group has determined that FAA/JAA have no standards for harmful dazzle; however, since no history of unsafe condition exists, Italy recommends deletion of this Standard.

---

**PART II**

**CHAPTER 4**

- 4.3.8 Jamaica has not established the procedures and the type of service information that is to be reported to its airworthiness authority by operators, organizations responsible for type design, and maintenance organizations.

---

**PART IIIA****CHAPTER 4**

- 4.1.6 g) No requirement for fires caused by explosive or incendiary devices.
- 4.1.6 h) Design precautions are taken to protect against cabin depressurization and against the presence of smoke and toxic gases, except those caused by explosive or incendiary devices.

**CHAPTER 8**

- 8.4.2 Japanese regulations do not address the effects of aircraft lights on outside observers.

**CHAPTER 9**

- 9.3.5 Identification of a least-risk bomb location is not required.

**CHAPTER 11**

- 11.1 Japan has no requirement for the provision of a least-risk bomb location.
- 11.2 Japan has no requirement for the flight crew compartment doors and bulkhead to be designed to minimize penetration by small arms fire and grenade shrapnel.
- 11.3 Japan has no requirement for design features to deter the easy concealment of weapons, explosives or other dangerous objects and to facilitate search procedures for such objects.

- PART IV** Japanese airworthiness code for helicopters is established based on US FAR Parts 27 and 29.

**CHAPTER 2**

- 2.2.2 ICAO bases its helicopter classification (Class I, Class II and Class III) on performance. Japan bases the classification (Category T Class A and Class B) on weight and performance.
- 2.2.2.1
- 2.2.2.2
- 2.2.3.1 Take-off distance, path and rejected take-off distance information are required for Category T Class A helicopters.
- 2.2.3.1.1
- 2.2.3.1.2
- 2.2.3.1.3
- 2.2.3.1.4
- 2.2.3.2 En-route performance is based solely on climb performance for both all-engines operating and one engine inoperative situations (Category T Class A/B).
- 2.2.3.3 The landing decision point (LDP) is required for Category T Class A helicopters.
- 2.2.3.3.1

## CHAPTER 7

7.4.2 b) Japanese regulations do not address the effects of aircraft lights on outside observers.

---

**PART II****CHAPTER 3**

3.2.2 Not implemented.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.3.1 Not implemented.

4.3.2

4.3.4

4.3.6

4.3.7

4.3.9

**PART IIIA****CHAPTER 1**

1.1.3 Not implemented.

1.1.4

1.2

1.4

**CHAPTER 2**

2.2.1.2 Not implemented.

2.2.2.2

2.3.1.3

2.3.2

2.3.4.2

2.3.4.3

2.3.5

**CHAPTER 3**

3.1.1 Partially implemented.

3.1.2 Not implemented.

3.1.3

3.2.1

3.2.2 Partially implemented.

3.3

3.3.1 Not implemented.  
3.3.2  
3.4.1  
3.5  
3.6  
3.7

#### CHAPTER 4

4.1.3 Partially implemented.  
4.1.4  
4.1.5  
4.1.6  
4.1.7  
4.1.7.1  
4.1.7.2  
4.1.7.4

#### CHAPTER 5

5.1 Not implemented.  
5.2  
5.3

#### CHAPTER 6

6.1 Not implemented.  
6.2  
6.3

#### CHAPTER 7

7.1.1 Not implemented.  
7.1.2  
7.2.2  
  
7.2.4 Partially implemented.

#### CHAPTER 8

8.1 Partially implemented.  
8.4

**CHAPTER 9**

9.6 Partially implemented.

**CHAPTER 11**

11.1 Not implemented.

11.2

11.3

**PART IV****CHAPTER 1**

1.1.2 Not implemented.

1.1.4 Not implemented.

**CHAPTER 2**

2.3.1 Not implemented.

2.3.1.2

**CHAPTER 4**

4.1 Not implemented.

4.1.1

4.1.2

4.1.3

4.1.4

4.1.5

4.1.6

4.1.7 Partially implemented.

4.1.8 Not implemented.

**CHAPTER 5** Not implemented.

**CHAPTER 6** Not implemented.



**CHAPTER 7**

7.4                      Not implemented.

**CHAPTER 9**

9.3.2                    Not implemented.

---

**PART II****CHAPTER 3**

- 3.2.2 The Directorate of Civil Aviation (DCA) of Kiribati has not adopted an airworthiness code.

**CHAPTER 4**

- 4.2 Kiribati has not established a system for regularly receiving mandatory continuing airworthiness information such as Airworthiness Directives. Kiribati has not established a system for receiving information on faults, malfunctions and defects and for reporting to the manufacturer its operational experience.
- 4.3.3 Kiribati has not established a system for regularly receiving mandatory continuing airworthiness information such as Airworthiness Directives.
- 4.3.5 Kiribati has not established a system for receiving information on faults, malfunctions and defects and for reporting to the manufacturer its operational experience.

**PART IIIA****CHAPTER 9**

- 9.3.5 No provision exists for identifying a least-risk bomb location.
-

**PART II****CHAPTER 1**

- 1.2 Kuwait does not have a design and manufacturing code and therefore adopts the applicable airworthiness codes for the State of Design (the Joint Aviation Regulations (JARs), the U.S. Federal Aviation Regulations (FARs), and British Civil Aviation Requirements (BCARs)) specifically taking into consideration all the differences reported to ICAO by those States.

**CHAPTER 3**

- 3.2.1 There are no design aspects of appropriate airworthiness requirements for the issue of a Certificate of Airworthiness, instead Kuwait initially accepts an aircraft based on the applicable airworthiness requirements for the State of Design with due consideration to any special requirement that Kuwait may add.

**CHAPTER 4**

- 4.3.4 Kuwait does not have provisions for reporting to the State of Design any mandatory continuing airworthiness information issued by Kuwait.
- 4.3.5 Kuwait does not have a system whereby information on faults, malfunctions, defects and other occurrences that cause or might cause adverse effects on the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft is transmitted to the organization responsible for the type design of that aircraft.

**PART IIIA****CHAPTER 10**

- 10.1 Due to non-availability of a fully comprehensive airworthiness code, Kuwait adopts the  
10.2 information issued by the States of Design regarding the procedures mentioned in 10.2, 10.3 and  
10.3 10.4 for maintaining the aeroplane in an airworthy condition.  
10.4

**PART IIIB****SUB-PART G**

- G.7.2 Due to non-availability of a fully comprehensive airworthiness code, Kuwait adopts the  
G.7.3 information issued by the States of Design regarding the procedures mentioned in G.7.2, G.7.3 and  
G.7.4 G.7.4 for maintaining the aeroplane in an airworthy condition.

## **PART II**

### **CHAPTER 4**

- 4.3.5 No requirement for general aviation (non-commercial) for a system for transmitting information on faults, malfunctions, defects and other occurrences that cause or might cause adverse effects on continuing airworthiness of aircraft to the organizations responsible for the type design of that aircraft.

---

## **PART II**

### **CHAPTER 3**

- 3.2.3 Not implemented. No requirement for determining continuing airworthiness of aircraft by a periodical inspection at appropriate intervals.

### **CHAPTER 4**

- 4.3.5 Not implemented. No requirement for transmitting information on faults, malfunctions, defects and other occurrences that cause or might cause adverse effects on continuing airworthiness of aircraft to the organizations responsible for the type design of that aircraft.

---

**General** Lithuania is in a transitional phase into JAR systems.

**PART III** JAR-25 regulations are used.

**PART IV** JAR-27 and JAR-29 regulations are used.

---

## **PART II**

### **CHAPTER 3**

3.2.3                    No regulations have been developed.  
3.5  
3.6.2

### **CHAPTER 4**

4.3.3                    No regulations have been developed.

## **PART IIIA**

### **CHAPTER 9**

9.3.5                    No regulations have been developed.

---

**PART II**

**CHAPTER 3**

3.6.3 No ferry flight provisions for aircraft no longer airworthy.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.3.5 No requirement for reporting information on faults, defects and malfunctions.

**PART IIIA**

**CHAPTER 9**

9.3.5 No provision for identifying a least-risk bomb location.

---



**PART IIIA**

**CHAPTER 9**

9.3.5                      No requirement.

---

## **PART II**

### **CHAPTER 3**

3.2.3                    No regulations have been developed.  
3.5  
3.6.3

### **CHAPTER 4**

4.3.3                    No regulations have been developed.

---

**PART I**

**Definitions** Except for the definitions of *Aeroplane* and *Aircraft*, other definitions described in Part I have not yet been introduced into the national regulations.

**PART IIIA**

**CHAPTERS 1 to 10** Not implemented. Myanmar is not a State of Manufacture but only accepts any flying machine that complies with minimum Standards of airworthiness prescribed in the United Kingdom and the competent authorities of any foreign country.

**PART IV**

**CHAPTERS 1 to 9** Not implemented. Myanmar is not a State of Manufacture.

---

**PART II**

**CHAPTER 3**

3.2.2 Not complied with.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.3.3 Namibia uses both the adoption and assessment of mandatory continuing airworthiness information (Airworthiness Directives).

---

**PART I**

**Definitions**      *Design take-off mass.* Design take-off mass is referred to as “maximum certified take-off weight”.

*Performance Class 1, 2 and 3 helicopters.* Large helicopters (heavier than 6 000 lb) are classified as either Category A or B on the basis of weight, passenger-carrying capacity and auxiliary systems as well as performance capabilities. There is no classification scheme for all other helicopters (6 000 lb or less).

**PART II****CHAPTER 3**

3.6.1      New Zealand Civil Aviation Rules (CAR) place responsibility for judgement of aircraft damage, to ensure an aircraft’s airworthiness, on licensed pilots and maintenance engineers based on provisions in CAR 91.201 and CAR 43.53. New Zealand, as the State of Registry, does not directly judge whether the damage is of a nature such that the aircraft is no longer airworthy. Irrespective of aircraft damage, the Certificate of Airworthiness is valid unless the Director uses provisions in section 17 (2) of the Civil Aviation Act 1990 (CAA Act 17 (2)) to revoke the certificate.

3.6.3      As in Standard 3.6.1, New Zealand Civil Aviation Rules (CAR) do not place direct responsibility on the State of Registry to determine if the damage sustained is of a nature such that the aircraft is no longer airworthy.

3.6.4      As in Standard 3.6.1, New Zealand Civil Aviation Rules (CAR) do not place direct responsibility on the State of Registry to determine if the damage sustained is of a nature such that the aircraft is no longer airworthy. In this situation, if the pilot determines that the aircraft is airworthy as per CAR 91.201, the aircraft shall be allowed to resume its flight. CAR 12.55 requires all serious incidents, or immediate hazards to the safety of aircraft operations, to be reported. This gives the CAA a tool to monitor if the pilot complied with CAR 91.201.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.3.1      The Civil Aviation Authority Aircraft Certification Unit (ACU) procedures have no formal procedure to advise the State of Design that it has entered such an aircraft on its register.

**PART IIIA**      Compliance with Part IIIA is by incorporation by reference in the New Zealand Civil Aviation Rules of appropriate United States Federal Aviation Regulations.

**CHAPTER 1**

1.1.3      Effective 17 October 1979, the United States certificated certain aeroplanes at weights in excess of 5 700 kg (12 566 lb) that do not fully meet the ICAO Airworthiness Standards of Part IIIA. The Airworthiness Certificate of aeroplanes that do not meet ICAO Standards will be endorsed as follows:

“This aeroplane at weights in excess of 5 700 kg does not meet the airworthiness requirements of ICAO, as prescribed by Annex 8 to the Convention on International Civil Aviation.”

- 1.5.1 The United States also uses service experience and equivalent safety findings as a basis for finding compliance with the appropriate airworthiness requirements.

## CHAPTER 2

- 2.2.3 This ICAO provision requires performance data to be scheduled for ranges of gradient of the landing surface for landplanes and ranges of water surface conditions, water density and strength of current for seaplanes. For landplanes, the United States requires the landing distance to be determined only on a level runway. For seaplanes, the United States requires the landing distance on water to be determined only on smooth water. Operational take-off and landing distance margins are applied where appropriate by United States operational regulations and guidance.

**PART IIIB** Compliance with Part IIIB is by incorporation by reference in the New Zealand Civil Aviation Rules of appropriate United States Federal Aviation Regulations.

**PART IV** Compliance with Part IV is by incorporation by reference in the New Zealand Civil Aviation Rules of appropriate United States Federal Aviation Regulations.

## CHAPTER 1

- 1.2.2, Note 1 The United States does not allow the weight and centre of gravity limitations to vary as a function of altitude or phase of flight (take-off, cruise, landing, etc.).

## CHAPTER 2

- 2.2.1 As stated in the difference with respect to the definitions of classes of helicopters in Part I, United  
2.2.2 States classifications are based on other factors as well as performance.
- 2.2.3.1 For Category B helicopters, only take-off distance is required to be included in the performance data, while take-off distance, path and rejected take-off distance information is required for Category A helicopters. There are no comparable requirements for helicopters weighing less than 6 000 pounds.
- 2.2.3.2 En-route performance is based solely on climb performance for both all-engines operating and one engine inoperative situations (Categories A and B). There is no comparable requirement for helicopters weighing less than 6 000 pounds.
- 2.2.3.3.1 The landing decision point (LDP) is required for Category A helicopters only.

#### **CHAPTER 4**

- 4.1.6 e)            The United States does not provide criteria relative to fire protection/prevention for interior furnishing materials replaced during major refurbishment. The fire protection levied is dependent on the original certification basis.

#### **CHAPTER 7**

- 7.4.2              Minimum acceptable intensities are prescribed for navigation lights and anti-collision lights, i.e. no reduction below these levels is possible.

---

**PART IIIA**

**CHAPTER 9**

9.3.5 Nicaragua has not required identification of a least-risk bomb or explosive device location.

**CHAPTER 11**

11.1 The civil aviation regulations of Nicaragua do not establish the requirement for a least-risk bomb location.

**PART IIIB**

**SUB-PART K**

K.1 The civil aviation regulations of Nicaragua do not establish the requirement of a least-risk bomb location.

---



**PART II****CHAPTER 4**

- 4.3.5            The Nigerian Civil Aviation Authority shares information on in-service difficulties for foreign products with the State of Design but not with the organization responsible for the type design directly.

**PART III**            Nigeria has developed a comprehensive airworthiness code based on the JARs that includes all the design standards. However, Nigeria at this time is not a State of Design or State of Manufacture.

**PART IV**            Nigeria has developed a comprehensive airworthiness code based on the JARs that includes all the design standards. However, Nigeria at this time is not a State of Design or State of Manufacture.

---

**PART II****CHAPTER 3**

- 3.2.3 Design/certification of new aircraft is dealt with by JAR 21. JAR maintenance codes do not specify details for validating Certificates of Airworthiness.
- 3.6.2 Not covered in JAA Maintenance codes. No JAA Reference to State of Registry. JARs refer to the
- 3.6.3 responsibility of State of Operation.

**CHAPTER 4**

- 4.3.1 Not implemented.
-

**PART II**

**CHAPTER 1**      The codes of the State of Design are adopted.

**CHAPTER 2**      The codes of the State of Design are adopted.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.3.2              Not implemented. Oman is neither a State of Design nor State of Manufacture.

4.3.6

4.3.7

4.3.9

---

## **PART II**

### **CHAPTER 3**

3.2.2 Not implemented.

3.2.3 Partially implemented.

3.6.3

### **CHAPTER 4**

4.3.3 A system for adopting Airworthiness Directives has not been established.

---

**PART II****CHAPTER 4**

- 4.3.1 Papua New Guinea does not advise the State of Design that an aircraft type is being placed on the Papua New Guinea register.
- 4.3.2 There is no airworthiness control impact as Papua New Guinea is not a State of Design of an aircraft.
- 4.3.3 Only informal arrangements exist. The problem is exacerbated by 4.3.1.
- 4.3.4 Papua New Guinea does not provide information to the State of Design. No formalized arrangement exists.
- 4.3.5 Papua New Guinea does not give information to organizations responsible for the type design.
- 4.3.6 There is no airworthiness control impact as Papua New Guinea is not a State of Design of an aircraft.
- 4.3.7
- 4.3.8 Procedures for reporting this information is not established in Papua New Guinea.
- 4.3.9 There is no airworthiness control impact as Papua New Guinea is not a State of Design of an aircraft.

**PART IIIA****CHAPTER 8**

- 8.4.1 Papua New Guinea allows the use of either flashing aviation red or flashing aviation white anti-collision lights for flights at night.
-

**PART II****CHAPTER 3**

- 3.2.2 A comprehensive and detailed airworthiness code has not been developed and there has been no recognition of another Contracting State's airworthiness code. Since Federal Aviation Regulations (FARs) 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33 and 35 corresponding to Parts III and IV of Annex 8 have been adopted as airworthiness codes, reference will need to be made to the differences notified by the United States.
- 3.3.1 The Certificate of Airworthiness does not provide information concerning the airworthiness code under which it is issued.
- 3.6.2 Not communicated to other States.

**CHAPTER 4**

- 4.3.1 The State of Design is not notified of aircraft which are registered.
- 4.3.2, Note 2 Information is not sent for ICAO Circular 95.
- 4.3.4 Mandatory information is not transmitted to the State of Design.
- 4.3.5 No such system has been implemented.

**PART III** Not implemented.

---

## **PART II**

### **CHAPTER 3**

- 3.6.4 In the case of damage to an aircraft and permission given by the State of Registry for ferry flight, the Aviation Order provides that the Philippines Air Transportation Office will not permit a flight if it considers that it would be detrimental to the safety of air navigation to do so. Not implemented.

---

**PART IIIA**

**CHAPTER 9**

9.3.5                      Poland does not have similar requirements.

**CHAPTER 11**

11.2                      Poland does not have similar requirements.  
11.3

**PART IV**

**CHAPTER 4**

4.1.6 f)                      There is no requirement for design precautions to be taken to protect against instances of cabin depressurization.

**CHAPTER 6**

6.7                      There are no comparable requirements for helicopters. In conjunction with the JAA Member States and the United States, Poland works with the purpose of meeting the intent of this ICAO provision.

---



**PART IIIA**

**CHAPTER 9**

9.3.5                      Not implemented.

---

**PART I**

**Definitions**      *Performance Class 1, 2 and 3 helicopters.* Small helicopters (7 000 lb or less) and large helicopters are classified/certified as either Category A or B on the basis of engine and system isolation features as well as performance capabilities.

**PART IIIA****CHAPTER 1**

1.5.1      Romania also uses service experience and equivalent safety findings as a basis for finding compliance with the appropriate airworthiness requirements.

**CHAPTER 2**

2.3.4.1      There is no specific requirement for the stall warning characteristics with one power-unit inoperative.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.1.6 g)      Design features were not imposed for the cargo compartment fire suppression systems to take into account a sudden and extensive fire such as that caused by an explosive or incendiary device.

4.1.6 h)      Design precautions were not imposed against cabin depressurization and the presence of smoke due to explosive and incendiary device.

**CHAPTER 9**

9.3.5      There is no specific requirement for the identification, in the aeroplane, of a least-risk location for a bomb.

9.6.2      Placards are not required for all ground servicing operations, only for fluid filler openings.

**CHAPTER 11**

11.1      No design requirements for least-risk bomb location.

11.2      No requirements for minimizing penetration of the flight crew compartment door.

11.3      No requirements for design features that will deter the easy concealment of weapons, explosives or other dangerous objects on board aeroplanes.

**PART IV****CHAPTER 2**

- 2.2 As stated in the difference with respect to the definitions of classes of helicopters in Part I.
- 2.2.1.2 For small helicopters, the references to pilot skills are made only for take-off and landing performance, not for all flight performance.
- 2.2.3.2 There are no requirements to establish en-route performance with the two critical power-units inoperative for helicopters having three or more power units.

**CHAPTER 4**

- 4.1.6 f) There are no specific requirements for pressurized cabins.
- 4.1.8 There are no requirements for design provisions to minimize the risk of damage caused by ground-handling operations.
-

**PART II****CHAPTER 4**

- 4.3.2 For the aircraft for which it is the State of Design, the Russian Federation does not have a system to transmit any generally applicable information necessary for the continuing airworthiness of the aircraft and for the safe operation of the aircraft (mandatory continuing airworthiness information) to every Contracting State, which has advised the State that it has entered the aircraft on its register, and to any other Contracting State upon request.

**PART IIIA****CHAPTER 4**

- 4.1.6 g), h) and i) Provisions concerning the security aspects of aircraft design have not yet been introduced in airworthiness regulations. A working group has been established with the industry to define detailed requirements.

**PART IV****CHAPTER 2**

- 2.2.2 The Russian Federation does not certify its helicopters according to Performance Classes 1, 2 and 3 but according to certification Categories A and B as in FAR-29 and JAR-29.
- 2.2.3.2 b) There are no Russian helicopters with more than two engines.

**CHAPTER 4**

- 4.1.6 f) There are no pressurized helicopters operating in the Russian Federation.
-

**PART II**

**CHAPTER 3**

3.6.3 Saint Kitts and Nevis issues a private category Certificate of Airworthiness.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.3.4 Mandatory continuing airworthiness information issued by Saint Kitts and Nevis is not transmitted to the State of Design.

**PART IIIA**

**CHAPTER 9**

9.3.5 There are no requirements for operators to acquire information concerning a least-risk bomb location.

---

**PART II**

**CHAPTER 3**

3.6.3 Saint Lucia issues a private category Certificate of Airworthiness.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.3.4 Mandatory continuing airworthiness information issued by Saint Lucia is not transmitted to the State of Design.

**PART IIIA**

**CHAPTER 9**

9.3.5 There are no requirements for operators to acquire information concerning a least-risk bomb location.

---

**PART II**

**CHAPTER 3**

3.6.3 Saint Vincent and the Grenadines issues a private category Certificate of Airworthiness.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.3.4 Mandatory continuing airworthiness information issued by Saint Vincent and the Grenadines is not transmitted to the State of Design.

**PART IIIA**

**CHAPTER 9**

9.3.5 There are no requirements for operators to acquire information concerning a least-risk bomb location.

---

**PART II****CHAPTER 3**

- 3.6.3 Not implemented in the case of damage to an aircraft and permission given by the State of  
3.6.4 Registry for ferry flight. Regulations provide that the Samoa CAA will not permit flight if it  
considers that it would be detrimental to the safety of air navigation to do so.

**CHAPTER 4**

- 4.3.1 Partially implemented. Samoa does not always inform the State of Design when it enters a specific  
type for which it is not the State of Design on its aircraft register.

**PART IIIA****CHAPTER 1**

- 1.5.1 Not implemented. The Samoa CAR incorporates the FAA requirement for service experience and  
equivalent safety findings to be used as a basis for finding compliance with the appropriate  
airworthiness requirements.

**CHAPTER 2**

- 2.2.3 The ICAO provision requires performance data to be scheduled for ranges of gradient of the  
landing surface for landplanes and ranges of water surface conditions, water density and strength  
of current for seaplanes. For landplanes, Samoa requires the landing distance to be determined  
only on a level runway. For seaplanes, Samoa requires the landing distance on water to be  
determined only on smooth water.
- 2.3.4.1 Not implemented. Samoa rules regarding stall warning do not explicitly refer to alarms with one  
power-unit inoperative.

**CHAPTER 9**

- 9.3.5 Not implemented.
- 9.6.2 Not implemented.

**PART IV****CHAPTER 1**

- 1.2, Note 1 Weight and centre of gravity limitations not varied as a function of altitude or phase of flight  
(take-off, cruise, landing, etc.).



**CHAPTER 4**

- 4.1.6 e) Not implemented. Criteria relative to the fire protection/prevention for interior furnishing materials replaced during major refurbishment is not provided in the Samoa rules. The fire protection levied is dependent on the original certification basis.

**CHAPTER 6**

- 6.7 Not implemented.
- 6.8.5 Not implemented. Policy on designated fire zones on the aircraft is not outlined and Samoa has incorporated the FAA rules on this subject.

**CHAPTER 7**

- 7.4.2 Not implemented. Minimum acceptable intensities are not prescribed for navigation lights and anti-collision lights.
-

**PART II****CHAPTER 1**

- 1.1 Type Certification activity is limited to validation of State of Design Type Certificate.
- 1.2.1
- 1.2.2
- 1.2.3
- 1.2.4
- 1.3.1 Not implemented.
- 1.3.3
- 1.3.4
- 1.4.1
- 1.4.2

**CHAPTER 3**

- 3.2.4 Not implemented.
- 3.6.3
- 3.6.4

**CHAPTER 4**

- 4.2.1 Not implemented.
  - 4.2.2
  - 4.3.1 Enforced but not formalized by regulations.
  - 4.3.2 Not implemented. Seychelles is not a State of Design.
  - 4.3.3 Enforced but not formalized by regulation.
  - 4.3.4
  - 4.3.5 No mandatory reporting to Type Certificate holder.
  - 4.3.6 Seychelles is not a State of Design.
  - 4.3.9 Seychelles is not a State of Manufacture.
-

**PART II**

**CHAPTER 4**

4.3.8 South Africa does not require the submission of service information to the authority.

---

**PART IIIA****CHAPTER 9**

9.3.5                      Not complied with.

**CHAPTER 11**

11.1                      Not complied with.

11.2                      Partially complied with.

11.3                      Not complied with.

---

## **PART II**

### **CHAPTER 3**

- 3.3.1            Figure 1 included additional field for sub-divisions to meet air navigation regulations (ANR) requirements.

---

**PART II****CHAPTER 1**

- 1.3.2 No requirements of the State for flight tests to show compliance with their airworthiness regulations.

**CHAPTER 2**

- 2.2.3 The system of inspection is not approved by the State.

**CHAPTER 4**

- 4.3.8 Not implemented.

**PART IIIA****CHAPTER 10**

- 10.4 Not implemented. Maintenance tasks and frequencies that have been specified as mandatory by the State of Design in approval of the type design do not need to be identified as such.

**CHAPTER 11**

- 11.1 Not implemented.  
11.2  
11.3

**PART IV****CHAPTER 1**

- 1.3 Not implemented.

**CHAPTER 2**

- 2.2.3.1.4 Not implemented. Take-off distance required.
-

**PART II**

**CHAPTER 3**

3.2.2                      Not implemented.  
3.5  
3.6.3

**CHAPTER 4**

4.3.3                      Not implemented.  
4.3.4  
4.3.8

**PART IIIA**

**CHAPTER 9**

9.3.5                      Not implemented.

---

**PART II****CHAPTER 1**      Not applicable.**CHAPTER 2**      Not applicable.**CHAPTER 3**

3.2.4              Not applicable. Trinidad and Tobago issues Certificates of Airworthiness on the basis of a Type Certificate issued by the United States, United Kingdom, Canada and JAA countries.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.3.6              Not applicable. Trinidad and Tobago is not a State of Design.  
4.3.7  
4.3.9

**PART III**              Not applicable. Trinidad and Tobago is not a State of Design.**PART IV**              Not applicable. Trinidad and Tobago is not a State of Design.

---



**PART II****CHAPTER 2**

2.2 Not implemented. Tunisia is not a State of Manufacture.

**CHAPTER 3**

3.6.2 No requirement; however, it is a practice.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.3.2 Not implemented. Tunisia is not a State of Design.

4.3.3 Tunisia directly adopts the mandatory information provided by the State of Design.

4.3.4 Tunisia applies, directly and without amendment, all the mandatory continuing airworthiness information issued by the State of Design, without making any changes or additions.

4.3.6 Not implemented. Tunisia is not a State of Design.

4.3.7

4.3.9

**PART IIIA** Not implemented. Tunisia is not a State of Design.

**PART IIIB** Not implemented. Tunisia is not a State of Design.

**PART IV** Not implemented. Tunisia is not a State of Design.

**PART II**

**CHAPTER 4**

- 4.3.5 Information on faults, malfunctions, defects and other occurrences is sent to the organization responsible for the type design of the aircraft regardless of the take-off mass of that aircraft (for all aircraft types registered in Turkmenistan).

**PART IIIA**

**CHAPTER 2**

- 2.3.1 The Aviation Regulations of Turkmenistan require that aeroplanes with three or more power-units remain safely controllable and manoeuvrable following sudden failure of a second critical power-unit when the aeroplane is configured for cruise, approach or landing.

---

**PART II**

**CHAPTER 4**

- 4.3.4            Uganda does not transmit to the State of Design mandatory continuing airworthiness information that it has originated.
- 4.3.5            Uganda has other means of compliance with the mandatory system for reporting faults, malfunctions and defects to the organization responsible for the type design.
- 4.3.7            Not applicable and not implemented. Uganda is not a State of Design.

---

**PART I**

**Definitions**      *Performance Class 1, 2 and 3 helicopters.* The United Kingdom classifies helicopters as either Category A or B for certification.

**PART IIIA****CHAPTER 2**

2.2.3              The United Kingdom complies except that it does not require the scheduling of landing distance with runway slope. The United Kingdom complies except performance is not scheduled for variations in water surface conditions, density of water and strength of current.

2.3.4.1           Stall testing with one engine inoperative is not required.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.1                For design of the flight deck, the United Kingdom has a means of compliance other than legislation for Human Factor principles. For the design of other parts of the aeroplane, the United Kingdom has no requirement or guidance material for Human Factor principles.

4.1.6 b), g), h), i)      Part of these provisions implement ICAO's initiative to incorporate security into aircraft design. At this time, the United Kingdom has not implemented these requirements. Differences are associated with explosives and incendiary devices being the causal factor.

**CHAPTER 9**

9.2.4              Not implemented.

9.3.5              These provisions implement ICAO's initiative to incorporate security into aircraft design. At this time, the United Kingdom has not implemented these requirements.

**CHAPTER 11**

11.1              These provisions implement ICAO's initiative to incorporate security into aircraft design. At this  
11.2              time, the United Kingdom has not implemented these requirements.  
11.3

**PART IIIB****SUB-PART B**

B.2.7              The United Kingdom complies except that it does not require the scheduling of landing distance with runway slope. The United Kingdom complies except performance is not scheduled for variations in water surface conditions, density of water and strength of current.

- B.2.7 b) The United Kingdom does not require accelerate-stop distance to be determined with worn brakes for commuter category aeroplanes.
- B.2.7 e) The United Kingdom does not require landing distance to be determined with fully worn brakes for commuter category aeroplanes. However, it does require the landings to be measured over six landings using the same tires, wheels and brakes so some brake wear is accounted for. Additionally, factors on landing distance are applied by operational rules, where appropriate.
- B.4.2.1 Stall testing with one engine inoperative is not required.

**SUB-PART D**

- D.1.1 For design of the flight deck, the United Kingdom has a means of compliance other than legislation for Human Factor principles. For the design of other parts of the aeroplane, the United Kingdom has no requirement or guidance material for Human Factor principles.
- D.2 a) The prevention of mis-assembly is not implemented in the United Kingdom.
- D.2 b), g) 3), h) and i) Part of these provisions implement ICAO's initiative to incorporate security into aircraft design. At this time, the United Kingdom has not implemented these requirements. Differences are associated with explosives and incendiary devices being the causal factor.

**SUB-PART F**

- F.1.1 The United Kingdom does not comply with the Human Factors element.

**SUB-PART G**

- G.2.5 Not implemented.

**SUB-PART I**

- I.1 The United Kingdom does not require account to be taken of developments in the subject of crashworthiness in the design of aeroplanes.

**SUB-PART K**

- K.1 These provisions implement ICAO's initiative to incorporate security into aircraft design. At this time, the United Kingdom has not implemented these requirements.
- K.2
- K.3

**PART IV****CHAPTER 2**

2.2.2.1 *Performance Class 1, 2 and 3 helicopters.* The United Kingdom classifies helicopters as either  
2.2.2.2 Category A or B for certification.

2.2.3.1 *Performance Class 1, 2 and 3 helicopters.* The United Kingdom classifies helicopters as either  
Category A or B for certification.

In the United Kingdom for Category B helicopters, only take-off distance is required to be included in the performance data, while take-off distance, path and rejected take-off distance information is required for Category A helicopters.

2.2.3.1.1 *Performance Class 1, 2 and 3 helicopters.* The United Kingdom classifies helicopters as either  
2.2.3.1.2 Category A or B for certification.

2.2.3.1.3

2.2.3.1.4

2.2.3.2 b) In the United Kingdom, en-route performance is based on climb performance for both all engines operating and one engine inoperative situations. The case of the two critical power-units inoperative for helicopters having three or more engines is not addressed.

2.2.3.3.1 *Performance Class 1, 2 and 3 helicopters.* The United Kingdom classifies helicopters as either  
Category A or B for certification.

**CHAPTER 4**

4.1 For design of the flight deck, the United Kingdom has a means of compliance other than legislation for Human Factor principles. For the design of other parts of the aeroplane, the United Kingdom has no requirement or guidance material for Human Factor principles.

4.1.6 f) There are no requirements in the United Kingdom for design precautions to be taken to protect against instances of cabin depressurization.

Unpressurized cabins and compliance with JAR 27/29.831 ensure compliance with the Standard relating to incapacitation from “smoke or other toxic gases”.

**CHAPTER 6**

6.7 There is no comparable requirement for Category B helicopters. (CA/JAR 27 only complies for Category A helicopters.)

6.8.1 *Performance Class 1, 2 and 3 helicopters.* The United Kingdom classifies helicopters as either  
Category A or B for certification.

## CHAPTER 7

7.1 The United Kingdom does not comply with the Human Factors element.

---

**PART I****Definitions**

*Performance Class 1, 2 and 3 helicopters.* In the United States, large helicopters (heavier than 6 000 lbs) are classified as either Category A or B on the basis of weight/passenger-carrying capacity and auxiliary systems as well as performance capabilities. There is no classification scheme for all other helicopters (6 000 lbs or less).

*Standard Atmosphere.* The FAA uses the U.S. Standard Atmosphere 1962. This Standard contains a sea level molecular weight ( $M_0$ ) of  $28.9644 \text{ kg (kg-mol)}^{-1}$ . The United States Standard Atmosphere 1962 is in agreement with ICAO Standard Atmosphere up to 65 000 feet in altitude.

**PART II****CHAPTER 1**

- 1.3.4 This provision states that a Contracting State issuing an approval for the design of a modification, repair, or replacement part shall do so on the basis of satisfactory evidence that the aircraft continues to comply with the design aspects of the airworthiness requirements used for its type certification. The United States may choose to require application of later requirements or special conditions, if deemed appropriate, to approvals of modifications or repairs.

**CHAPTER 3**

- 3.6.3 This provision prohibits a damaged aircraft from being flown unless it will be restored at the destination airfield. This is not always possible. The United States may also allow an aircraft to fly to a place where it can be assessed for repair and/or only partially repaired.

**CHAPTER 4**

- 4.3.1 This provision requires notification of the State of Design upon entering a non-United States manufactured aircraft on the United States registry for the first time and issuing an airworthiness certificate. The United States does not formally notify the State of Design as required in this provision.
- 4.3.3 This provision requires the State of Registry to address mandatory continuing airworthiness information from the State of Design. The United States does not generally issue Airworthiness Directives for non-type certificated aircraft. This includes foreign aircraft that are United States-registered but operate under experimental rather than standard airworthiness certificates.
- 4.3.5 This provision requires a system whereby information on faults, malfunctions, defects, and other occurrences are transmitted to the organization responsible for the type design of an aircraft. The FAA ensures that operators have a system to collect this information. For products for which the United States is not the State of Design, the FAA then forwards this information to the State of Design, not the type design organization.
- 4.3.7 This provision requires a continuing structural integrity programme (which includes specific information concerning corrosion prevention and control) for aircraft over 5 700 kg. The FAA



requires applicants to establish instructions for continuing airworthiness during type certification. At this time, however, the FAA requires a corrosion prevention and control programme for specific 14 CFR Part 25 aircraft models only.

## **PART IIIA**

### **CHAPTER 1**

- 1.1.3 ICAO Annex 8, Part IIIA, applies to all aeroplanes weighing over 5 700 kg. The applicability of United States regulations to aircraft certificated between 13 June 1960 and 2 March 2004 is consistent with ICAO Annex 8, Part IIIA. However, effective 17 October 1979, the United States certificated certain aeroplanes at weights in excess of 5 700 kg but under 8 620 kg that did not fully meet the ICAO airworthiness standards of Annex 8, Part IIIA.
- 1.3 This ICAO provision requires that operating limitations be established that include a margin of safety to render the likelihood of accidents arising therefrom to be extremely remote. The United States requires operating limitations to be established for safe operation but does not require a specific assessment that these limitations provide a safety margin that ensures the likelihood of an accident arising therefrom is extremely remote.
- 1.5.1 The ICAO provision requires that compliance with airworthiness requirements be based on evidence from tests, from calculations, or from calculations based on tests. In some cases, the FAA does not require strict proof of compliance with the airworthiness standards. Per 14 CRF 21.21, the United States permits equivalent safety findings as a compensating factor that provides an equivalent level of safety to an airworthiness requirement.

### **CHAPTER 2**

- 2.2.3 This ICAO provision requires performance data to be scheduled for ranges of gradient of the landing surface for landplanes and ranges of water surface conditions, water density and strength of current for seaplanes. For landplanes, the United States only requires the landing distance to be determined on a level runway. For seaplanes, the United States only requires the landing distance on water to be determined on smooth water. Operational take-off and landing distance margins are applied where appropriate by United States operating regulations and guidance.

### **CHAPTER 4**

- 4.1.6 b), g), h), i) With the exception of the door required by 11.2, the FAA does not have similar requirements. The FAA has begun work in an effort to amend the United States regulations with the purpose of eventually meeting the intent of these provisions.

### **CHAPTER 8**

- 8.4.1 ICAO requires that aeroplanes operating on the movement area of an airport shall have aeroplane lights of such intensity, colour, fields of coverage and other characteristics to furnish personnel on the ground with as much time as possible for interpretation and for subsequent manoeuvre necessary to avoid a collision. The FAA has no such requirement.

- 8.4.2 b) This provision addresses the lights' effect on outside observers in reference to "harmful dazzle". The United States regulations do not address the effect of aircraft lights on outside observers. However, visibility to other pilots and the lights' effect on the flight crew are addressed.

## CHAPTER 9

- 9.3.5 With the exception of the door required by 11.2, the FAA does not have similar requirements. The FAA has begun work in an effort to amend the United States regulations with the purpose of eventually meeting the intent of these provisions.

## CHAPTER 11

- 11.1 With the exception of the door required by 11.2, the FAA does not have similar requirements. The  
11.2 FAA has begun work in an effort to amend the United States regulations with the purpose of  
11.3 eventually meeting the intent of these provisions.

## PART IIIB

### SUB-PART A

- A.2.1 This ICAO provision requires that operating limitations be established that include a margin of safety to render the likelihood of accidents arising therefrom as extremely remote. The United States requires operating limitations to be established for safe operation but does not require a specific assessment that these limitations provide a safety margin that ensures the likelihood of an accident arising therefrom is extremely remote.
- A.4 This ICAO provision requires that compliance with airworthiness requirements be based on evidence from tests, from calculations, or from calculations based on tests. In some cases, the FAA does not require strict proof of compliance with the airworthiness standards. Per 14 CRF 21.21, the United States permits equivalent safety findings as a compensating factor that provides an equivalent level of safety to an airworthiness requirement.

### SUB-PART B

- B.2.7 This ICAO provision requires performance data to be scheduled for ranges of gradient of the landing surface for landplanes and ranges of water surface conditions, water density and strength of current for seaplanes. For landplanes, the United States only requires the landing distance to be determined on a level runway. For seaplanes, the United States only requires the landing distance on water to be determined on smooth water. Operational take-off and landing distance margins are applied where appropriate by United States operating regulations and guidance.
- B.4.1 The ICAO provision allows a single failure to be catastrophic provided that the single failure was shown to be extremely improbable. The United States does not accept any catastrophic single failure, regardless of probability.

**SUB-PART C**

- C.6.1 The ICAO provision frequently refers to the “expected loads in service” as well as “expected” or “likely” conditions. The United States requires that the design envelope must go sufficiently beyond this to ensure that the structure can withstand less frequently encountered loads and unexpected events.
- C.6.1 c) When determining expected load in service, this provision states that account shall be taken of the likely manoeuvre spectrum, taking into account pilot abilities. United States regulations do not address pilot abilities.

**SUB-PART D**

- D.2 b), g) 3), h), i) With respect to D.2 h), the FAA does have provisions to protect against possible instances of cabin depressurization. The FAA has begun work in an effort to amend the United States regulations with the purpose of eventually meeting the intent of these provisions.
- D.2 f) The provision requires lavatory fire protection systems (detection and suppression) for all aeroplanes covered by Part IIIB. United States regulations only require lavatory fire protection systems for aeroplanes with 20 or more passengers.
- D.2 g) Paragraph D.2 g) 1) of the ICAO Standard requires a fire suppression system for each cargo compartment accessible to a crew member in a passenger-carrying aeroplane. United States requirements permit manual fire fighting in an accessible cargo compartment by a crew member or members for an all passenger-carrying aeroplane or a passenger-cargo combination carrying aeroplane.
- D.5 While there are no specific electrical bonding requirements in the FARs, United States regulations address lightning and system requirements. The FARs do not address the protection of those persons coming into contact with an aeroplane on the ground or in the water.

**SUB-PART E**

- E.3.5.5 b) This ICAO provision requires flammable fluid system components to be capable of containing the fluid when exposed to fire conditions. The United States usually requires these components to be time limited resistant to fire exposure (i.e. fire resistant or fireproof).

**SUB-PART F**

- F.4.1 ICAO requires that aeroplanes operating on the movement area of an airport shall have aeroplane lights of such intensity, colour, fields of coverage and other characteristics to furnish personnel on the ground with as much time as possible for interpretation and for subsequent manoeuvre necessary to avoid a collision. The FAA has no such requirement.
- F.4.2 b) This provision addresses the lights’ effect on outside observers in reference to “harmful dazzle”. The United States regulations do not address the effect of aircraft lights on outside observers. However, visibility to other pilots and the lights’ effect on the flight crew are addressed.

**SUB-PART K**

- K.1 With respect to K.1 and K.3, the FAA does not have any specific requirements. With respect to  
K.2 K.2, the FAA has no current requirements with respect to the flight crew compartment bulkhead.  
K.3 The FAA has begun work in an effort to amend the United States regulations with the purpose of  
eventually meeting the intent of these provisions.

**PART IV****CHAPTER 1**

- 1.2.2, Note 1 This provision addresses the establishment of limitations. ICAO allows maximum operating mass and centre of gravity limits to vary with each altitude and with each possible and practicable separate operating condition. The United States does not allow the weight and centre of gravity limitations to vary as a function of altitude or phase of flight.

**CHAPTER 2**

- 2.2.2 ICAO bases their helicopter classification (Class I, II and III) on performance. The FAA has only two performance classifications (Category A and B). The United States does not have a performance classification equivalent to ICAO performance Class II.
- 2.2.3.1 These provisions address take-off performance data for all classes of helicopters and require that  
2.2.3.1.4 this performance data include the take-off distance required. However, the United States has not adopted the requirements to present take-off distance for Category B helicopters weighing less than 6 000 lbs.

**CHAPTER 6**

- 6.7 This provision requires that there be a means for restarting a helicopter's engine at altitudes up to a declared maximum altitude. In some cases, the FAA does not require demonstration of engine restart capability. Since there is a different level of certitude for transport and normal category helicopters in the United States, the engine restart capability is only required for Category A and B helicopters (14 CFR Part 29) and Category A normal helicopters (14 CFR Part 27).

**CHAPTER 7**

- 7.4.2 This provision addresses the need to switch off or reduce the intensity of the flashing lights. The United States has minimum acceptable intensities that are prescribed for navigation lights and anti-collision lights. No reduction below these levels is possible.
- 7.4.2 b) This provision addresses the lights' effect on outside observers in reference to "harmful dazzle". The United States regulations do not address the effect of aircraft lights on outside observers. However, visibility to other pilots and the lights' effect on the flight crew are addressed.

**PART I****Definitions**

Uzbekistan has accepted AP-29 of the Interstate Aviation Committee (IAC) of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) as its airworthiness standards. Under those standards, helicopters are divided into Categories A and B. Category A corresponds to Class 1, B to Class 3 and, in part, to Class 2.

**PART IIIA****CHAPTER 4**

- 4.1.6 g), h) and i) Uzbekistan has accepted AP-25 of the IAC of the CIS as its airworthiness standards. Uzbekistan participates in the IAC Council and will adopt the amendments to those standards once the appropriate agreement has been reached.

**CHAPTER 11**

- 11.1 Uzbekistan has accepted AP-25 of the IAC of the CIS as its airworthiness standards. Uzbekistan  
11.2 participates in the IAC Council and will adopt the amendments to those standards once the  
11.3 appropriate agreement has been reached.

**PART IV****CHAPTER 2**

- 2.2.3.2 b) Uzbekistan has accepted AP-25 of the IAC of the CIS as its airworthiness standards. Those standards do not include requirements concerning continued flight with the two critical engines inoperative (in the case of helicopters having three or more engines). There are at present no helicopters in Uzbekistan with three or more engines, and no such aircraft are operated.

**CHAPTER 4**

- 4.1.6 f) Uzbekistan has accepted AP-25 of the IAC of the CIS as its airworthiness standards. Those standards do not provide for the protection of the occupants of a helicopter in the case of cabin depressurization.
-

**PART II**

**CHAPTER 3**

- 3.2.3            The Yemen Civil Aviation Regulations require a performance check during the Certificate of Airworthiness renewal.

---