

Final Minutes for MMEL IG 95

95-01B: Introduction /Administrative Remarks and Elections

IG 95-01b Minutes:

- New MMEL IG Industry Chairman: Donn Reese (AAL) first meeting as chairman.
- Kevin Peters, recording Secretary, announced the end of his participation as secretary due to conflicting work assignments. Mark Lopez (A4A) stated Kevin Hughes (UPS) was nominated and accepted the position.
- Transition of FAA Chair / leadership from FAA HDQ to FAA AEG:

SEA AEG Manager, Bob Reich (SEA AEG) spoke to a change in management of MMEL IG. He stated FAA HDQ, AFS 200, made the call to have Regional AEGs oversee, manage the IG meetings from now on and to facilitate the change in leadership the heads of the most of the regional AEG offices were in attention to show their commitment to this change in direction. Bob stated SEA AEG has been chosen to be the lead AEG. Bob introduced John Pinnow (SEA AEG) as the FAA co-chair for this initial first year of AEG leadership.

Next speaker, Pete Neff, manager of the Long Beach AEG stated initially for the next year no real change except the AEG will be the interface between industry and FAA HDQ. Pete stated the AEG inputs will be centered on providing industry the technical guidance while the FAA HDQ will be centered on the policy side. Pete stated their 'contract' with industry will be a commitment to attend with max possible AEG participation. Paul Nordstrom (Boeing) asked if John's job would be to coordinate issues between the various AEGs. Pete said the actual AEG process has yet to be worked out.

Discussion next centered on how meeting locations will be determined to accommodate maximum AEG participation. Kevin Peters (FDX) stated traditionally Lead Airlines host and fund meeting venues and he asked how is this was to be handled with AEG hosting. Pete said AEGs will not be funding meeting venues but he felt it will be worked out. Kevin then asked it this would lead to end of Lead Airline Concept. Pete stated to the contrary he felt the AEG oversight and management will lead to a strengthening of the concept but he lacked specifics of how, stressing this too will need to be worked out.

Greg Janosik (AFS 240) gave background as to why the decision to change management of MMEL IG from FAA HDQ to AEGs. He outlined how it was centered on workload and manpower issues and that these resources are located all within AFS 240, but AFS 240 branch is slated to be disbanded. He stated that this change in direction was a positive action that should benefit industry as AEGs were the appropriate resource for ironing out the technical aspects of proposed PL changes and FAA HDQ would only evaluate PL drafts for policy and regulatory compliance.

Several IG members raised concern as to status of PL drafts that are currently in FAA AFS 240 procession and were expected to go final. They asked what was to happen with them. Greg reported that they are be turned back to the AEG chairman for another review by the five AEG offices and if OK re-submitted to FAA HDQ for policy and regulatory review.

Greg quantified what he was holding on too was approximately 11 PLs that he again stressed he did not have the necessary technical inputs to pass them forward, next he reported that another 8 or so PLs who's GC header expiration dates had been reached and were being reviewed for applicability. Finally he stated some others were potentially out of date, obsolete as they are have not be revised in 15 plus years or more and thus also under re-evaluation.

Greg commented that one of prime reasons for this change in management oversight was it was being to be perceived by some in FAA that industry was potentially influencing the establishment of FAA policy and this needed to be stopped. He ended his comments by stressing the point that industry is not involved in setting FAA policy.

Final Minutes for MMEL IG 95

The new AEG co-chair, John Pinnow, spoke to his new role and how AEG participation will work. He stated he felt his role was to be a facilitator, ensuring the communication process does not break down. He emphasized that the AEGs are technically orientated group and as such he will not be able provide policy guidance as that will be responsibility of FAA HDQ.

95-02: MMEL IG / FOEB Calendar

IG 95-02 Minutes:

Updates needing to be made to calendar:

2014:

4Qtr IG 96: SWA Dallas, TX. Dates confirmed, 29-30 October
Meeting location details pending.

2015:

1Qtr IG 97: ALPA HDQ Herndon, VA, dates are still TBD.

2Qtr IG 98: Textron Aviation, Wichita KS, 29-30 April, meeting site TBD.

FOEB for A350 tentatively scheduled for June, 2015. Lead Airline: American Airlines, location TBD.

3Qtr IG 99: FAA Seattle, tentatively scheduled to held at FAA
AEG, Renton

4Qtr FOEB for DHC-8-100/-200/-300 tentatively scheduled for Oct 28-30 in LGB, CA

FOEB for DHC-8-400 tentatively scheduled for Nov 4-6 in LGB, CA

Item remains OPEN for future updates.

95-03: MMEL Agenda Proposal & Coordination Process

IG 95-03 Minutes:

Kevin Peters (FDX) briefed the IG on the document background and updated the group on progress made to date on the rewrite. He stated there have been two teleconferences with the workgroup. The first centered upon draft of what he referred to as the front matter, sections on the Introduction, Background, Scope and Lead Airline Concept. He stated they had revised, retitled the Lead Airline to Airline Focal in an effort to address the expansion of the process from being strictly a Part 121 centric process to an all-inclusive one that took into account multiple operating Parts such as 91, 91 sub-part K, 135, etc.

Kevin continued with an outline of draft version 2 which addressed the previous Ch.4, Formal FOEB Process, and Ch.5, the Electronic FOEB, combining both into single section, a more generic FOEB Process. He listed off changes and walked thru 14 steps of the FOEB process that detailed the pre-FOEB actions and post-FOEB actions. One of significant ones was the removal of the timeline listed in days

Final Minutes for MMEL IG 95

allotted to each step/action. Some IG members questioned the logic of removing the timelines. Kevin responded that the timelines can be added back but he stressed they need to be annotated as guidelines and are not hard limits.

Tim Kane (JetBlue) questioned the de-personalization of document's highlights by removal of contact names. Kevin responded with it is an effort to make document more generic and to help minimize constant need for revision. Kevin continued explaining changes made, stating after the reworked sections 1 thru 5, there is only reference material listed in Appendices and these too were being de-personalized.

Several IG members objected to removal of the listing of Lead Airline representatives. Kevin's response was the appendices for OEMs, AEGs, and A4A are all still listed and members can contact these entities to find out who is the Lead. Kevin concluded with outline of how he completely revised the final appendix that outlines how an operator should present an FOEB proposal. He stressed this was his creation and as such needed to be reviewed and accepted by AEGs.

Valentino Venier (Airbus) spoke against the change of Lead Airline to Industry Focal stating it would be counter to language used in Volume 4, Chapter 4 of 8900.1 where the Lead Airline Concept is still listed. Mark Lopez suggested until 8900.1 is revised this document can be revised to list both titles together such as Lead Airline / Industry Focal.

Coyler Burbach (Textron Aviation) spoke in favor of the de-personalization, removal of contact names in favor of pointers to where these contacts are also being maintained; the A4A website, <http://memberportal.airlines.org>.

A Recommendation for an addendum to document was raised by Jack Bailey (Fort Worth, AEG) who spoke against FAA continued use of A4A spec 100 coding to identify A/C systems/components. He reported Fort Worth AEG has been switching over to an alternate coding scheme he identified as JASC (Joint Aircraft System Component Coding) table. He reported that this new standard is a modification of A4A Spec 100 and was designed by FAA, AFS 600 and as such is an FAA standard.

Jack continued with explanation of why and how Fort Worth AEG is changing schema and he cited 8900.1, Volume 8, Chapter 5, Section 6, Service Difficulty Reports, which he stated reports SDR are to be converted to JASC code when entered into FAA computer. He also cited an AC 20.109-A and a CFR 121.703 that address the SDR program and which is controlled by AFS 620. Thus he reports that JASC is the law and should be employed across all FAA documentation, but thus far is only been used for SDRs. Yet he states that is now changing.

Jack cautioned the group to begin to prepare for its transition and thus far some 53 MMELs are currently using it. He identified Cessna as an OEM currently converting to this new coding schema. Next he described A4A specifications as not public material as it is designed for members only and FAA not due paying member and hence should not be using it.

Kevin Peters (FDX) asked for clarification on topic of JASC, asking if Jack wants to have the JASC code entered into the Agenda Proposal and Coordination document. Jack offered to work with him. Todd Schooler (Cessna) offered a critique of JASC stating it is an incomplete scheme as it does not address some new areas of new technology. He stated in order to use JASC they have to selectively pick between spec 100, spec 2100 and JASC.

Action item: Kevin Peters to revise document, re-introduce Lead Airline Concept for 121, add Lead Airline listing and include commentary of optional use of JASC coding.

Item remains OPEN.

Final Minutes for MMEL IG 95

95-04A: Policy Letters Issued in Calendar year

IG 95-04a Minutes:

Donn Reese (industry Chair) questioned if there was any updates especially after Greg Janosik's earlier comment that he was withholding moving forward with of the PLs that have been forwarded to FAA AFS 240. George Ceffalo (AFS 240) stated there was no PLs released this year and only one PL, PL 106 is currently listed on FSIMS draft site.

Item remains OPEN for future updates.

95-05: MMEL AEG Draft Policy Letters Open for Comment

IG 95-05 Minutes:

Paul Nordstrom (Boeing) asked what the status of other PLs besides PL 106 listed on FSIMS draft site. Greg stated he did not know they were still being carried as their suspense dates had come and gone and he said they should have been pulled down. He outlined them as 106 as done and going final, 76 and 63 still have action items open. As for 105 he stated this in with AFS 400 and being reworked.

Dave Stewart (on WebEx) questioned why PL 106 was going final as FAA promised to resolve the issue on security codes for SATCOM provider Iridium before releasing PL 106. George Ceffalo (AFS 240) confirmed this is yet to be resolved. Paul Nordstrom (Boeing) stated releasing the PL without resolving issue will deny all Iridium SATCOM users the ability to use the PL relief.

Greg Janosik (AFS 240) answered stating the current draft of PL 106 meets the existing regulatory and policy guidelines and as such is acceptable for release. He stated for those want to add to it will have a hard time and if their change is regulatory in nature they will need to seek an exemption as current PL 106 is written based upon 2011 legal interpretation and until that is changed PL 106 will stand. Dave Stewart stated if that is way PL 106 is to be released then it will conflict with 8900.1 which states Datalink is a means of Long Range Communication system. Greg retorted with comment that Dave was referring to 8900.1, Vol 8, chapter 2, section 3 that Greg said is currently in work, and is getting changed in line with PL.

95-06: Swapping Compatible Component Positions to Apply Minimum Equipment list Relief

IG 95-06 Minutes:

Tom Helman (AFS 300) reported no updates are available. He stated that it is undergoing FAA internal review and had a suspense date of 31 July, but he has been unable to get a report on it status.

Item remains OPEN

Final Minutes for MMEL IG 95

95.07: PL-104, Storage Bins

IG 95-07 Minutes:

Todd Schooler (Textron Aviation) stated he had no updates as he felt this was a 'catch 22' as the PL is considered applicable to all operating Parts but it should not be so. He reported both the historic and current regulation clearly indicate applicability only to Part 121 aircraft with 19 seats or more. He stated he cannot explain why but this PL as it has been written is applicable to all operating Parts. He stated there was a proposal to separate it into two draft PLs, one for Part 121 and the other for other than 121 but he said this had not happened, thus he states it is in limbo at moment. Alternatively he stated existing PL could be annotated as just applicable to Part 121, 19 seats and over but that would totally eliminate any application to his type smaller aircraft.

Discussion pursued on the proviso language that is in contest, conflict, and that is a requirement to remove a compartment door as has previous discussed at length (please refer to minutes of IG 94-07 below). Todd stated the impact of the certification rule on mass properties containment in an emergency landing was unknown by most small aircraft manufacturers when they designed their aircraft stowage compartments to use the door as part of the containment requirement. He reported only recently was conflict with how this PL is written had surfaced. He said this type of conflict was also was not detected by his AEG chairperson also.

PL was reviewed and discussion on proviso use of the phrase 'permanently fixed' was spoken to as a potential problem as it did not meet the certification requirement for all small aircraft. An IG member suggested alternate solution of adding a Note to remarks and exception column that stated any door that is required to meet mass G loading certification standards cannot be removed. Todd took that as valid proposal and said he would submit a new draft.

Item remains OPEN.

95-08: PL-98, Navigation Databases

IG 95-08 Minutes:

Greg Janosik (AFS 240) reported that this is one of the PLs he has on hold but unlike to others this one will not be passed back to AEG as he stated he believes industry has given a complete, technically reviewed package. As for the procedures contained within it he stated while he still has issues based around regulatory side of it, the procedures otherwise have been received by some in FAA as an acceptable, safe way of conducting operations.

He reports the PL is back in his hands and he will run it by other managers who may or may not see it the same way. He hopes to have a resolution for next meeting.

Item remains OPEN.

Final Minutes for MMEL IG 95

95-09: PL-130, AC 117-1 Crew Rest Facilities

IG 95-09 Minutes:

Mark Lopez (A4A) stated they were trying to coordinated with Dale Roberts (FAA Lead) to re-open PL 130 to address minor changes to allow deferral of what he stated are insignificant items of the crew rest facilities (CRF) such as curtains, etc. Mark reported they have received no feedback.

Greg Janosik (FAA AFS 240) stated that FAA welcomes any inputs from industry on improvement of PL but this PL was 'very nicely wrapped' around the legal requirements of the regulation, thus he stated if changes are proposed they most likely will first require an exemption request to the regulation be pursued and approved.

Mark stated they were interested in opening the PL as they were aware that the regulation and PL leaned heavily on an SAE standard that is being updated to address the newer CRF design features, and that they knew that the FAA semi rushed the approval of this PL (Dec, 2013) to meet the regulation implementation date (Jan, 2014). He stated it therefore did not fully capture all the details.

Tom Atzert (UAL) outlined the problem with PL and CFR 117. He stated UAL and many foreign carriers have installed first and business class seating all classified as Class 3 CRF's but when PL came out he said it did not allow or address that configuration very well and UAL had to hastily revised MELs. He also indicated Boeing has been withholding incorporation of PL 130 into the B777 MMEL on the anticipation of pending revision of PL because as currently written it does not lead itself into incorporation into an MMEL.

Mark asked if Tom would take the lead on revising PL but Tom Deferred it back to current A4A Lead, Bob Ireland as more appropriate. Tom stated what industry sees as needing fixing in PL does not conflict with regulation. He continued stating when PL was initially drafted it was not envisioned that entire compartment would become CRF classified.

Paul Nordstrom (Boeing) stated they had been withholding incorporation of PL as it lacked guidance on a multitude of components that could negatively impact seats CRF classification. He stated they have been placing operational Notes on many items in the DDG stating operator should take in account impact on augmented crew duty times with this item inoperative. He concluded with Boeing does not establish the CRF classification of the seats installed, that is the operators responsibility. Therefore Boeing cannot write clear cut provisos.

Paul directed question to John Pinnow (AEG chair) how AEG will address this within the Master MELs. John stated the Chairpersons he had spoken to agreed it would extremely hard to apply this PL as it is written. John McCormick (FDX) requested that when it is placed in MMELs that it be clearly annotated as not applicable to Part 121 all cargo operations.

Item remains OPEN.

95-10: PL-24, Lavatory Fire Protection

IG 95-10 Minutes:

Darrell Sheets stated he has not updated the PL draft since submitting it after last MMEL IG nor has he any comments on PL. He outlined his changes as having added a new D category sub-item for in items not required by regulation along with adding a GC header to the letter. He discussed how the original PL was based upon a Part 121 rule that ties the PL to aircraft with more than 19 seats.

Tim Kane (JetBlue) stated that this is the first PL draft that is now subject to the new AEG managed MMEL IG and he asked what will be the procedural steps going forwarded. John (new AEG Chair) stated the AEG Office managers have yet to formulate the AEG internal procedure. It was asked what was to done with PL until one is designed.

He stated this PL was straight forward and that he will be sending it to FAA AFS 240 for it to be posted on FSIMS draft document website for comment. He said that the industry needs to determine what will be an acceptable

Final Minutes for MMEL IG 95

technical standard for submission to AEG. Darrel stated he did not know what process that would look like, he suggested an industry comment grid process to vet a PL before submitting proposal?

Mark Lopez counted that idea and proposed that each submitter should do their own due diligence before submitting to AEG such as work within their workgroup, etc., or circulate draft PL thru internal intradepartmental reviews before submitting to AEG, etc.

Pete Neff (AEG LGB) seconded the suggestion of industry working through a project team and stressed industry needs to ensure proposed drafts are fully collaborated and clean, what he referred to as 'polished' before submission to AEGs to avoid rejections. He stated the project team Lead is to submit the 'polished' submission to the Industry Chairmen who in turn submits to the AEG Chair

Brief discussion was had on how industry should establish a standard of using strike though and color coding text while it under goes industry development. Finally, the question of what happens after AEG Chair accepts an industry PL draft. It was stated it will be send to FAA HDQ for posting on the FSIMS draft website for public comment as currently done.

It was asked who would vet public comments. Pete Neff stated that would depend on nature of comment(s), stating it would be collaboratively handled, FAA HDQ addressing regulatory and policy issues, AEG technical and if it is clearly screwed up, rejected or handed back to industry to rework.

Item remains OPEN.

95-11: PL-63, Equipment Required for Emergency Procedures

IG 95-11 Minutes:

Donn Reese (Industry Chair) reported that PL 63 draft had been posted to the FSIMS draft doc site and only one public comment had been received. Mark Lopez (A4A) stated industry Lead, Eric Lesage, had given an answer which was forward to FAA and a response was due by FAA. Greg Janosik (AFS 240) who stated he will look into it and get back to IG.

Discussion moved to this PL being used as a development tool for designing the AEG internal review process. Greg stated it not the custom of FAA to entertain a PL that benefits only one operator, in this case Airbus, thus he asked if this PL had been adequately technically assessed. He suggested that this PL be sent back to AEG and re-evaluated for technical merit and as such be a test case AEG can use to devise, document the AEG process.

John Pinnow (AEG Chair) stated this would be a good test article. He reported there a varied amount of opinion with the AEG community of the merit of this PL. Todd Schooler (Textron Aviation) wasn't just for benefit of one manufacturer as it has bearing upon other decisions made by AEGs._

Pete Neff (LGB AEG) stressed that before this PL is send back to AEG the industry needs to ensure that it is in what FAA, Greg Janosik (AFS 240,) previously mentioned is in the final 'polished' form, i.e., includes all industry input and has industry consensus backing. Pete continued by stating this PL, while it definitely has technical issues AEG has concerns over, it has also definite policy concerns that FAA HDQ controls. That concern was whether policy of FAA over items of equipment required by emergency procedure will become changed.

Item remains OPEN.

95-12: PL 73, MMEL Relief for Emergency Medical Equipment

IG 95-12 Minutes:

Final Minutes for MMEL IG 95

Mark Lopez (A4A) reported that the CFR 121-803 did not make the cut as one of top five CFRs for A4A EMMC to petition for more relief thru proposing revision to CFR. He spoke to the stop in manufacturing of certain drugs listed as required to be carried in EMKs (refer to previous IG minutes) and how A4A is working now with an alternative approach on how to update the required contents of kits but he had no updates, specifics to report.

Candace Kolander (AFA, on webex) stated that if group was trying to challenge what is required as to contents of EMK then she requested it be placed on record that AFA is not supportive of any change. She quantified this with comment that AFA is not against review and change, updating, of what is required in kits but that the decision on whether absence of any quantity was ruled as a GO versus NO GO decision.

Greg Janosik (AFS 240) stated that any effort to extending relief per this PL was not viable as this is a legal policy issue; current PL conflicts with CFR Preamble. History of change was outlined and subject of the need of airlines to continue to extend, rewrite exemption letters, for shortages of content of kit especially since some of these required items are no longer being produced was discussed. Finally discussion moved to whether there an opportunity for rule to be reopened by another means then UAL has requested A4A look into seeing that current PL relief be revised back to 3 days for deferral .

Item to remains OPEN.

95-14: PL-79, Passenger Seat Relief

IG 95-14 Minutes:

Greg Janosik (AFS 240) reported this PL was one of many going to be passed back to AEG Chair for AEG re-evaluation.

Item remains OPEN.

95-15: PL-106, HF Radio Communications MMEL Requirements

IG 95-15 Minutes:

Donn Reese (Industry Chair) opened with comment that Doug Snow (FDX) had requested the IG group consider the implication of how this PL was currently drafted compared to language in ops specs B50 and B45 in respect to required flight plan coding. It was questioned why was this was an issue as it was understood that this PL had been issued as final.

Mark Lopez (A4A) stated he had spoken with FAA HDQ inspector Gordon Rother (AFS 400) who reported there was a revision to ops spec B45 regarding the dual two Long Range Comm System (LRCS) requirements and it contained some verbiage regarding LRCS system reliability in order to be enable exercising of MEL deferral.

Mark stated he believed it also referred to what can be used as an LRCS and it accounted for use of SATCOM Voice as an option but not as a standalone. He said HF, one system, was still required. He concluded that this revision to B45 was due to be imminently released. He concluded that he did not believe that the revision to ops spec B45 would introduce any requirements that would conflict with recently approved PL 106.

Item to remain OPEN for any updates.

95-16: Heads Up Display (HUD) and Enhanced Forward Vision (EFVS)

IG 95-16 Minutes:

Final Minutes for MMEL IG 95

John McCormick (FDX) requested this item remain tabled until next meeting.

94-17: MMEL relief for Emergency Escape Path Marking Systems

IG 95-17 Minutes:

Tom Atzert (UAL) spoke on behalf of David Burk who was absent. Tom reported that he has been informed that Dave wanted to report that he has been unable to make satisfactory progress on this PL and requests that PL agenda item be withdrawn.

Item CLOSED.

95-18: FSIMS 8900.1 Rewrite Project: Volume 4, Chapter 4 (MEL)

IG 95-18 Minutes:

Greg Janosik (AFS 240) stated the rewrite of 8900.1 is ready to move into the FAA internal document control board. He explained the DCB is an FAA internal review process that allows documents to be reviewed by internal branches and even field offices prior to initiation of formal approval process. He reported any comments will need to be addressed and reviewed before process proceeds. He said once initiated the DCB typically lasts at minimum three weeks.

As for the all the inputs by industry submitted he assured IG members that all are incorporated and essentially preserved as inputted. He cautioned while industry input is in the document it may hard to initially find as entire document has been re-formatted and paragraphs re-numbered.

Greg stated the reformatted the Volume 4 / Chapter 4, MEL / CDL, still retains the four sections over the current 11 sections and he praised the FAA workgroup for their efforts. He then reported that the corresponding AEG and FSB section 8 was currently undergoing review by AFS 240. Next he stated volume 8, section 3, the FOEB process, which is still in draft form, will be incorporating some 32 policy letters, of which half are in archived status. He then outlined that another 18 were current policy letters, of which he stated were mostly old static letters, not having been revised for up to 10 years or so.

Item remains OPEN.

95-19: A4A MEL Survey

IG 95-19 Minutes:

Mark Lopez (A4A) reported on survey on MEL deferrals rates per categories over one month of summer. He referred to the earlier MEL deferral survey has having been well received and it was requested to repeat the survey for the summer. He stated this second survey too been positively received with 7 airlines having contributing data and he will providing a report soon.

He stated as a follow on another operator requested a survey on NEF program and it was much more board in nature addressing others Parts, other than 121 operations, such as 91, 135. He also briefly touched upon subject of yet another survey on how operators handle, manage their MEL programs. Both he stated were well received and responded to.

Item remains OPEN.

Final Minutes for MMEL IG 95

95-21: PL 105 Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast System

IG 95-21 Minutes:

Paul Nordstrom (Boeing) stated that this PL, 105, had previously been sent to FAA HDQ with the expectation it was ready to go final, it possibly is now one of the many to be sent back to AEG to be re-addressed via the new AEG vetting process. Greg Janosik (AFS 240) outlined how he has received word that the new AEG Chair is prepared to accept this PL as technically acceptable to be moved directly on the FAA HDQ.

Greg then stated he will forward it back to the Industry Chair and requests that it be routed appropriately around and given another review by industry and then passed from industry chair to AEG as he said he does not want it to be considered acceptable to skip, side step around, the new steps of the AEG process.

Item remains OPEN.

95-22: PL-86R6-D1 Policy Regarding Compliance with Master Minimum Equipment List (MMEL) Revisions

IG 95-22 Minutes:

Greg Janosik (AFS 240) stated he worked with management of AFS 800 and has gotten for benefit of Part 91 operators that they too can have 90 days to submit new, or more restrictive, MMEL relief in an MEL revision. He stated 8900.1 has been edited to reflect 90 days versus current 30 days for Part 91. He said this change will be picked in the rewrite of 8900 also.

Discussion was held on purpose of keeping PL86_R6 as it was only to change the 30 day to 90 day and now that 8900 is changing then revision to PL is not required. Yet review of draft revealed that Rev 6 draft also expanded effectivity to include Part 91, in addition to current Part 91, Sub-Part K and as such Greg stated it should remain a viable draft to be evaluated further.

Todd Schooler (Textron Aviation) raised the question of PL 36 needing to be similarly updated to reflect 90 days for part 91. Greg remarked upon the effective date of this older PL, 1997. He stressed that his manager does not support keeping such old letters still active. Greg stated it was the responsibility of the industry to periodically evaluate and update them, or risk them been cancelled. He suggested an industry workgroup should be formed to inspect older PL and revised them.

Item remains OPEN until revised 8900 is finally released.

Side NOTE: In discussion or 95-21 agenda it was noted that FSIMS publication listing for 8900 sections contained duplicate entries of sections such as duplicates of Vol 4 / Ch. 4 section one, seven and eight. Greg explained that this was intentional as it was document edits of the sections to conform to new standard called SAS (safety assurance system). He said they cannot change the source document and thus the source and SAS modified document will be presented side by side in the system from now on.

94-24: PL-119, Two Section MMELs

IG 95-24 Minutes:

Dan Leduc reported on Bombardier success with meeting and briefing FAA on benefits of allowing operators to have a two part MMEL. He presented an overview of the presentation given to members of FAA HDQ and AEGs. Objective to grant 121 operators access to two part (CAS Message) MEL already accepted by TC and EASA.

FAA response was mixed. FAA has more than a few concerns but promised to discuss it more detail internally and will get back to Bombardier in a few weeks. Mark Lopez (A4A) asked Pete Neff (FAA AEG LGB) for comment at this time regarding follow up action but Pete had no comment.

Item remains OPEN.

Final Minutes for MMEL IG 95

95-25: PL-9 Public Address System, Crewmember Interphone and Alerting Systems

IG 95-25 Minutes:

Donn Reese (Industry Chair) stated this PL has previously been forward to FAA HDQ and had been posted and comment period expired. He reported this was one of approximately 11 PLs he understood Greg Janosik would be passing back to the AEG to be reworked via the pending AEG process.

Item remains OPEN

Final Minutes for MMEL IG 95

95-26: PL-129, Cockpit Smoke Vision Systems

IG 95-26 Minutes:

Greg Janosik (AFS 240) stated he had no intent to remove the STC number from this PL. In fact he stated he sees no reason for this to be a policy action but an item handled by AEG via the FOEB process. He said he has not received any feedback from his requests to the STC holder on this issue of applying for FOEB relief; instead a PL action was pursued.

Further he reports there has been a lot of talking regarding absence of a GC Header to this PL but he reported he has received nothing as far as a request or any justification for one and he will not support addition of one as it would be in his opinion be applying a work around, skirting, of AEG authority. He concluded with he will passing this PL back to AEG to re-evaluation under the new AEG process.

It was stated that AEG Chairman had concerns that this equipment came under the umbrella of PL 63, Instruments and Equipment Items Required for Emergency Procedures as it, CSVS, is intended to only be used in an emergency situation. Pete Neff (FAA AEG LGB) outlined how they managed to overcome the fact that the STC Holder used the term Emergency in the nomenclature for the system.

He reported they had the certification office remove it from the STC AFM emergency section to the abnormal section, thus that action, along with name change allowed them to consider offering relief for system.

Item remains OPEN.

95-27: PL-029 R6D1 Master Minimum Equipment List (MMEL) Requirements for Cockpit Voice Recorder (CVR)

IG 95-27 Minutes:

Lead, Collyer Burbach (Textron Aviation), stated this PL had previously been forwarded to FAA HDQ and thus he has no update. It was then mentioned this PL is also going back to AEG for re-evaluation via the pending AEG process.

Item remains OPEN.

95-28: PL-054 R11D1 Terrain Awareness and Warning System (TAWS)

IG 95-28 Minutes:

This PL is also going back to be passed back to AEG for re-evaluation via the pending AEG process.

Item remains OPEN.

Final Minutes for MMEL IG 95

NOTE to Donn Reese: The agenda I have and followed in meeting has two agenda items in the TOC, 95-29 and 95-30, but agenda document and my recordings jumped from item 95-28 to new business 95-32?

95-32: PL 25, Master Definition 19. Inoperative Components of an Inoperative Systems

IG 95-32 Minutes:

Lead representative was not present and no update was provided.

Item tabled until next meeting.

95-33: PL-59, Global Change (GC) Revisions

IG 95-33 Minutes:

Kevin Peters (FDX) outlined the workgroup progress on the draft PL after workgroups initial meeting. He stressed they felt a lot of redundant information was in the current PL along statements that that are not specific to a GC but instead was applicable to any PL in general. He gave example to such language that referred to GC Header as may be time sensitive. Next he stated they added language that gave more flexibility to assignment of a GC header. He they added that GC applicability can be listed in inclusively or exclusively manner and then removed a Note that gave specific instruction that a GC header must include aircraft make, model or type of operation.

Next he stated they removed a statement from letter that stated this policy will be incorporated into 8900 and then archived as while being a probable true statement it has no bearing on how or why a GC header is used. Then he stressed that he felt the current example of a GC header box as currently written is misleading. He outlined how it has two 'fill in the applicable' blank spaces that are described in different manner.

The first of which lists the term "specify" which is described in Policy step 2.A that speaks to requirement that header should carry aircraft applicability. Yet the second fill in the applicable blank, instead of term "specify" carries the phrase 'provisos are to be carried verbatim...' whereas Policy step 2.B states that GC PL provisos are to be carried forward in operator MEL either verbatim or by use of equivalent terminology. This he claims prejudices that the only acceptable term is 'verbatim.' He reported this clarification of what can be optionally applied to a GC header was a significant change.

Kevin re-emphasized that the workgroup wanted to remove excess verbiage and examples from PL that did not directly speak to what a GC was and how it should be applied. On this point he stated they felt only step 3.C of current letter's Policy step 3 had any bearing on what a GC PL should be.

Todd Schooler (Textron Aviation) stated they were not in favor of removal of step 3.A. His contention was when a MMEL standard revision is developed and released it can change what is carried in the GC PL and if GC continues to remain in existence then some operators may try to use it to avoid the MMEL. Todd stated to counter that possibility they had requested step 3.C added into PL 59. An industry member asked if in fact Policy step 7 precludes that from happening. It was agreed in general that therefore step 3.C could be removed.

Final Minutes for MMEL IG 95

A general discussion was held on how industry was to accommodate FAA HDQ new process that requires industry submissions be thoroughly vetted before going FAA. Discussion pursued on creation of and industry comment grid and log similar to FSIMS draft document comment grid.

Item remains OPEN.

IG 95-34: PL 25, triple asterisk.

IG 95-34 Minutes:

Lead, Collyer Burbach, spoke to work group efforts to remove duplication of items found in both PL 25 and 31 and consolidate them into a draft of PL 25. They said some of these actually contradicted the other and they sought to update and revise them with the intent of archiving PL 31 when done. He said to accommodate this they devised a new format to document as he reported there are some 7 or so items from PL 31 that did not lend themselves to be definitions in PL 25 so they arranged them in a new sub section of PL 25.

He stated they also reworked Master Definition 33, Electronic Flight Alerting Systems by removing a lot of the aircraft specific information and revised it to be more generic in nature. He said some definitions were expanded upon and others were revised for clarification purposes. One new one was added, guidance on opening of circuit breakers as an (O) procedure. He cited change to guidance on rev bars was also made. He concluded that they also updated some Appendix A CFR references.

He stated one of comments they had to grapple with was that some people felt most of what is listed as definitions in PL 25 is actually guidance and to that end he proposed a new format, landscape versus portrait, that had columns for different types of data; element, definition, required or optional and guidance, etc., thus clarifying what is currently all grouped together but referred to definition material only.

Some observations were highlighted. Collyer informed the group that it was discovered that an error in many MMEL page template existed. The right hand column title should state 'Remarks or Exceptions' whereas in many MMEL it was printed as 'Remarks and Exceptions'. Next he stated since EASA uses mostly the same list of definitions they will keep them informed, advised of the workgroup changes.

Finally, he stated most of the definitions in PL 25 are also carried in 8900.1. Greg Janosik (AFS 240) stated he did not want to address these points until PL is finished and passed through to FAA HDQ. He then quantified that the PL definitions are already removed from rewrite 8900.

Decision was made to continue on with the reformat of document. Finally, it was also decided that this draft PL be used as a test case article for development of industry draft comment grid.

Item remains OPEN.

95-37: MMEL IG FAA Representation

IG 95-37 Minutes:

Refer to agenda item 95-01b for discussion on change in FAA HDQ representation and outline of new AEG leadership of IG meetings.

95-38: MMEL IG Charter Document

Final Minutes for MMEL IG 95

IG 95-38 Minutes:

Mark Lopez (A4A) outlined a minor problem with the Charter document which is intended to address the protocol and working relationship of the three principal groups involved in industry group, FAA, A4A and Industry. He stated he was in communication with FAA HDQ regarding the recent change in oversight and relationship of FAA HDQ to the industry group as outlined in charter when he was informed this document was not a FAA signed document and hence not an official FAA recognized document.

On review of document he discovered the current rev standard, rev 6, needs some work to reflect recent changes and he was requesting a workgroup to work on it. He outlined how the document lists the organization structure of the IG and roles of Chairs, Co-Chairs and Secretaries. He outlined their roles and responsibilities. He stated the persons assigned these roles are located on A4A Members Portal, MMEL IG site, home page.

Mark requested volunteers to participate in workgroup to revise the charter:

Kevin Peters (FDX)

Tom Atzert (UAL)

Paul Nordstrom (Boeing)

Item remains OPEN.

Final Minutes for MMEL IG 95

95-39: PL 121. (EFB) Electronic Flight Bag

IG 95-39: Minutes:

Donn Reese (Industry Chair) requested item Lead speak on intent of opening this PL. John McCormick stated he that while he proposed this item he would not be able to be the workgroup Lead, yet he was willing to be a member of workgroup. He stated current PL has fallen behind and is not representative of state of art now employed. Some things that have changed is the AC has been substantially revised with a new revision D in work that will eliminated current PL classification of one, two and three, etc. John also stated the listing of Class 1 and 2 power connections as strictly EFB functions is no longer true and this something the workgroup needed to look into.

Kevin Peters (FDX) stated the issue with EFB PL listing power connection as an EFB function was true when current PL was first released but now with multitude of different type of platforms and technology being used this is no longer true. For instance he reported Boeing has an option for general personal power outlets in cockpit that can be used to charge iPads, cell phones and other devices and since these devices are being used to power devices that can be used to access EFB data their FAA CMO has forced FedEx to used Ch 46 EFB relief for these power outlets.

John stated when power outlets receive power off the aircraft electrical busses then it should an ATA 24 item. John also stated he discovered that Boeing has actually used ATA 23 for these personal power outlets. Thus the workgroup needs to resolve several issues, etc. Workgroup volunteers were requested.

New item OPENED