

## Aviation Safety Regulation Review

1. My Submission to this Inquiry addresses the Structure, Effectiveness and Process item of the terms of reference.
2. On several occasions I have contacted the CASA to notify authorities of regulatory breaches as well as some poor training practices at the Airline for which I work. On at least one such occasion the CASA provided my email, without permission, to the company I reported breaching regulations. It is also the company for which I work as a pilot.
3. CASA employees [REDACTED] were directly responsible for this breach of privacy. The Office of the Australian Information Commissioner subsequently found that CASA had breached the Privacy Act. I also suspect that many other prior breaches of privacy have occurred to me and others. As a result of that breach I was demoted. I continue to be discriminated against by the company for which I continue to work. The Fair Work Ombudsman also investigated and “counselled” the airline but did not prosecute under the Workplace Relations Act.
4. It seems to me the CASA protocol, if there is one at all, is not necessarily implemented or easily thwarted. At the time the FOI and Safety Specialist I reported matters to (in person) incorrectly stated to me there was no available procedure for giving my reports of non compliance in writing. In spite of this I wrote the matters out and provided it to CASA reception in the building on a blank sheet of paper provided from reception. It was my belief the FOI and others were/ are corrupt. I did not receive any reply to my report. [REDACTED]
5. [REDACTED] subsequently, without any communication with me, provided my e-mail addressed to [REDACTED] to the Chief Pilot of the airline for which I work. The Airline Chief Pilot then demoted me and explained his “good working relationship with CASA” and how he received the email over a cup of coffee in a local coffee shop with [REDACTED]. Despite this open admission the CASA ICC in her investigation did not make a finding that [REDACTED] actually passed the e-mail to the Airline.
6. Because what has occurred is across several different jurisdictions investigation has not been completed thoroughly by any one body. The Privacy investigation was not concerned with the result (i.e. my demotion) nor in the substance of the aviation matters I did report. It could not investigate any individuals. The Fair Work Ombudsman was not interested in the substance of my aviation complaint or in the breach of Privacy. Their interest was only the Workplace Relations Act.
7. This has resulted in corrupt CASA Officers easily passing off their corrupt actions to each external agency as “safety” related. CASA has in essence indicated it “had to supply the e-mail with identity etc to the Airline because of the safety implications”. The lie in this statement is exposed by CASA lack of action in rectifying the substance of the complaint and failure to protect me from retribution. My complaint remains unaddressed to this day. The airline has provided no explanation and letter for my demotion. This is a requirement specified in the Training and Checking Manual. CASA is responsible to ensure the requirements of the manual are met.
8. In October and November 2013 I again made further complaint to CASA of Non Compliance and poor training and assessment. I did not seek confidentiality. I have received no reply from CASA. A director of the Airline informed me in November 2013 “CASA do not think much of your complaints”.

9. There is no process or structure followed by CASA following complaint. CASA has not been effective in addressing the substance of my complaints. CASA has not protected me from further retribution.

10. As a result of these experiences I think an "Auditor General "or similar external oversight agency of aviation matters as suggested by Senator Xenophon is necessary. In my view CASA have demonstrated themselves as dishonest and corrupt.

11. I urge the Review to consider "whistleblower" legislation within the aviation law framework.

Additional Information;

1. [REDACTED]
2. The non compliances reported to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and recorded on the blank sheet of paper were an instance of a passenger flight being flown without engineering inspection after a bird strike into the engine. The Chief Pilot persuaded the crew to do this contrary to written instructions and good sense. In addition an instance where the Chief Pilot attempted to coerce me into flying a scheduled flight with an unserviceable crew oxygen mask was recorded and handed to CASA reception. No reply was received from CASA.
3. The Email to [REDACTED] gave information concerning poor training and the involvement of the Chief Pilot in deflation of tyres following repeated heavy braking. No reply was received from [REDACTED] or CASA.
4. The matters reported in October and November 2013 included the non compliances of obscuring the windscreen in flight and failure to be route qualified as well other matters of poor training and assessment. They also included an example of intimidation by a CASA delegate as a result of my complaint about poor training. No reply was received from CASA.
5. I stand by the truth of all matters reported.