

About the Commentary: The Commentary addresses selected issues within the Code of Conduct to elaborate on their meaning, provide interpretive guidance, and suggest ways of adopting the Code of Conduct. It is intended primarily for implementers, policy administrators, aviation association management, and pilots who wish to explore the Code in greater depth, and will be updated from time to time. Please send your edits, errata, and comments to <PEB@secureav.com>. Terms of Use are available at <secureav.com/terms.pdf>.

COMMENTARY ADDRESSING CODE OF CONDUCT MODEL, LENGTH, AND ORGANIZATION

1. Model

The Codes of Conduct (“Codes”) are *models*, and are not mandatory, regulatory, or otherwise proscriptive. As such, they are inherently flexible, aspirational recommendations—resources to be modified to suit the unique needs of each implementer. They offer a foundation for drafting and implementing diverse codes of conduct and associated guidance.

2. Length

No particular size is optimal for all users—one size doesn’t fit all. Some pilots may desire a substantive, robust reference document as a professional code or a resource from which to open a conversation; other pilots may desire a broad-based *vision of excellence* to assist in customizing a checklist, best practices, or personal minimums documents. Still other pilots may desire a one-page document. Thus, length *per se* is not critical. The basic model is a multi-page document. A one-page model code is also available.¹

3. Organization

No particular organization of the Codes’ content is optimal for all users. Many formulations were considered—and rejected—including one interlineating the Codes’ principles and Sample Recommended Practices (SRPs). The interlineated version was found unworkable because (a) many SRPs were applicable to more than a single principle, (b) readers tended to compartmentalize and artificially limit the applicability of the SRPs to the adjacent provision, (c) the end-result was unbalanced—both visually and substantively, (d) significant redundancy would be necessary to cure the imbalance (i.e., restating SRPs in multiple locations), and (e) from a pedagogical perspective, it was feared that the interlineations would not encourage the reader to think and grapple with the issues (and doing so are hallmarks of effective learning). Implementers are encouraged to experiment with, and adopt an organizational structure suitable for their unique requirements.

¹ See, for example, the abridged *Aviators Model Code of Conduct* at <www.secureav.com/http://www.secureav.com/AMCC-v1.2-Abridged.pdf>, or the one-page version of the *Flight Instructors Model Code of Conduct* (linked from “Additional Resources” in that Code) at <www.secureav.com/FIMCC-Summary.doc>. As an historical note, the first version of the *Aviators Model Code of Conduct* was a single page document criticized as failing to: (i) explain how pilots might implement the principles, and (ii) provide actionable examples of possible text (as a model) to facilitate expedited and well-considered content. Further general/introductory guidance on the Codes of Conduct is at <<http://www.secureav.com/Comment-AMCC-Introduction.pdf>>.