

GENERAL INFORMATION	
KEYWORDS	Category 3 aviation medical certificate, coronary artery disease
FILE NO.	O-4591-01
SECTOR (Marine or Aviation)	Aviation
SPECIFIC JOB	---
DIAGNOSIS (Primary, Secondary, etc.)	Coronary artery disease, atrial fibrillation
REVIEW	
DATE OF DETERMINATION	July 22, 2021
MEMBER	Dr. Richard Zabrodski
DETERMINATION	The member confirms the Minister of Transport's decision not to renew the applicant's unrestricted category 3 aviation medical certificate with a 24-month validity.
REASONS FOR THE DETERMINATION	
<p>Refusal to renew the applicant's unrestricted category 3 aviation medical certificate with a 24-month validity — Following the applicant's most recent medical examination report and reports of cardiovascular assessment, flexibility was applied despite coronary artery disease and atrial fibrillation not satisfying the requirements of the <i>Canadian Aviation Regulations (CARs)</i>. The applicant was issued a reduced validity category 3 aviation medical certificate annotated "12 months only." The issue before the Tribunal is not whether the applicant currently meets the required medical standards for the issuance of an aviation medical certificate. The applicant was clear in stating that he was not disputing his medical diagnosis or that aviation safety regulations must be considered regarding his medical condition and flying. Rather, the applicant suggested that the current legislation and policy framework is not reasonable, and that his request for alternative options to manage the established medical risk in his case—specifically for the imposition of flying restrictions other than those requiring additional testing—should have been considered. The member found that the Regional Aviation Medical Officer has applied flexibility based on the current scientific knowledge which is the basis for the current legislation. In contrast, the applicant has provided only the opinions of others without peer-reviewed studies, convincing scientific evidence, or other qualified analysis to support his suggested alternatives for restriction and accommodation. The member finds this to be the critical factor in this case. If there is a lack of evidence on which to base recommendations for a private pilot who flies much less than a commercial pilot, then the prudent decision for policy makers is still to place "safety first" until such evidence is available and accepted as part of the national and international guidelines and policies. For these reasons, the Minister's decision is confirmed.</p>	
APPEAL	
DATE OF DECISION	
MEMBERS	
DECISION	
REASONS FOR THE DECISION	
OTHER/COMMENTS	