MMEL IG Meeting 77 Minutes
January 6-7, 2010
Cincinnati, OH

Time	Agenda Item Number	DAY 1 Wednesday, January 6, 2010	Lead
0830-0845	77-01	**Introduction / Administrative Remarks** **MMEL IG Charter Discussion**	Tom Atzert
0845-0900	77-02	**MMEL IG / FOEB Calendar**	Tom Atzert
0900-0915	77-03 77-04	**2009 Final Policy Letters** **MMEL Policy Letter Status Summary**	John Melotte
0915-0930	77-05	**Agenda Item 75-07: FOPB Process Discussion**	Steve Kane Bryan Watson
0930-0945	77-06	**Agenda Item 66-07: ATA – MMEL / MEL Value to Industry Survey**	Tom Atzert Mark Lopez
0945-1000	77-07	**Agenda Item 66-15: PL-100, Cargo Restraints Components**	NWA
1000-1030		**BREAK**	
1030-1045	77-08	**Agenda Item 64-10a: PL-98, Navigation Databases**	NDB WG / ALPA
1045-1050	77-09	**Agenda Item 72-11: PL-86, Compliance with MMEL Revisions**	FedEx
1050-1100	77-10	**Agenda Item 66-11: PL-40 - New ETOPS Rule**	Paul Nordstrom Mark Lopez Jim Foster
1100-1110	77-11	**Agenda Item 71-13: PL-39, Altitude Alerting System Requirements**	Bob Davis Tom Atzert
1110-1120	77-12	**Agenda Item 75-14: PL-118, Nitrogen Gas Generation / Fuel Inerting - CLOSED**	
1120-1130	77-13	**Agenda Item 71-24: PL-1, Wide-body Door / Slide Inoperative**	Tom Atzert Rudy Canto / Airbus
1130-1140	77-14	**Agenda Item: PL-99, All Cargo Slide Relief**	Paul Nordstrom
1140-1150	77-15	**Agenda Item: PL-25, Policy Concerning MMEL Definitions - CLOSED**	
1150-1200	77-16	**Agenda Item 75-18: PL-25, Policy Concerning MMEL Definitions**	Bob Taylor Tim Kane
1200-1315		**LUNCH**	

Time	Agenda Item Number	DAY 1 (Cont'd) Wednesday, January 6, 2010	Lead
1315-1325	77-17	**Agenda Item 75-19: PL-104, Overhead Storage Bin(s)/Cabin and Galley Storage Compartments/Closets**	David L. Robinson
1325-1335	77-18	**Agenda Item 75-20: PL-87, Master Minimum Equipment List (MMEL) for Flight Data Recorder (FDR)**	Tom Atzert Steve Kane
1335-1350	77-19	**Agenda Item 75-21: PL-123, Passenger Notice System (Lighted Information Signs)**	Gene Hartman
1350-1415	77-20	**Agenda Item 70-12: PL-31, MMEL Format Specifications - CLOSED**	Steve Kane
1415-1425	77-21	**Agenda Item 75-24: PL-31, MMEL Format Specification – 'Next-Gen' MMEL Specs**	Walt Hutchings
1425-1445	77-22	**Agenda Item 75-25: Clarify Use of "-" in "Number Installed" Column in Operator MELs**	Tom Atzert David Burk
1445-1500	77-23	**Agenda Item 70-18: Policy Letter Rewrite: New Format, FAA Branding and incorporate new GC Header**	Mark Lopez Tom Atzert
1500-1530		**BREAK**	
1530-1540	77-24	**Agenda Item 2003-04: Conversion of FAA MMEL Documents To XML (MMEL Transformation)**	Bob Davis Mark Lopez
1540-1550	77-25	**Agenda Item 77-25: PL-119, Two-Section MMELs**	JP Dargis
1550-1615	77-26	**New Agenda Item: MMEL Preamble Discussion**	Steve Kane Tom Atzert
1615-1630	77-27	**New Agenda Item: NEF Universal List Discussion**	Steve Kane Tom Atzert Jim Foster

MMEL IG Meeting 77 Minutes
January 6-7, 2010
Cincinnati, OH

Time	Agenda Item Number	DAY 2 Thursday, January 7, 2010	Lead
0830-0835	77-28	**Agenda Item 39-01: FAA / EASA MMEL Harmonization**	FAA
0835-0845	77-29	**Agenda Item 71-29: ASAWG Update**	Dennis Landry
0845-0900	77-30	**Agenda Item 71-15: PL-58, Boom Microphone**	David Burk
0900-0905	77-31	**Agenda Item 60-14: PL-85, Lavatory Door Ashtrays**	Mark Lopez Bob Wagner
0905-0910	77-32	**Agenda Item 75-37: PL-79, Passenger Seatback and Seat Cushion Removal**	Tom Atzert
0910-0920	77-33	**Agenda Item 67-17: PL-VV, Policy for Equipment Required for Passenger Carrying Operations**	Paul Nordstrom
0920-0925	77-34	**Agenda Item 76-32: PL-24, Lavatory Fire Protection - CLOSED**	Tom Atzert
0925-0930	77-35	**Agenda Item 76-33: PL-96, Galley/Cabin Waste Receptacles Access Doors/Covers**	Bob Taylor Pete Neff
0930-0945	77-36	**Part 91 MEL Documents AC 91-67 and PL-36**	Tom Atzert
	77-37	**New Business** **Review Action Items**	Tom Atzert
0945-1000	77-38	**New Agenda Item: PL-9, PA / Interphone**	Bob Taylor
1000-1030		**BREAK**	
1030-1040	77-39	**New Agenda Item: PL-79, Passenger Seats**	Todd Schooler
1040-1045	77-40	**New Agenda Item: PL-124, Damaged Window/Windshield Relief**	Steve Kane Bryan Watson
1045-1115	77-41	**New Business: 8900.1 Discussion:** **- New AEG/FOEB Guidance** **- Rewrite Project: Volume 4, Chapter 4 (MEL)**	Steve Kane
		IG 77 ADJOURN	

MMEL IG Meeting 77 Minutes
January 6-7, 2010
Cincinnati, OH

AGENDA ITEM DETAILS

Prior to MMEL IG 51, agendas contained all of the minutes on each open agenda item, starting from the inception of that item. This made the agenda package very large and not "user friendly". The agendas now contain what happened only at the last meeting to include action items. However, to make it easy to refresh your memory on what happened at previous meetings, you can refer to "Attachment 00" which contains a history of each open item from the previous minutes on.

We attempt to include draft policy letters with this agenda. However, we do not always have a draft. In addition, sometimes the drafts change between the time we send out the agenda and the time of the meeting.

All attendees are requested to check the FAA KSN web: (http://ksn.faa.gov/km/avr/AFS/afs200/afs200/mmel/default.aspx) or opspecs.com web site a day or two before the meeting to ensure they have the latest drafts of any policy letters to be discussed.

Also, attendees may wish to check the new ATA Member Portal website for the same info: (http://memberportal.airlines.org/Login/Pages/Login.aspx?ReturnUrl=%2fPages%2fdefault.aspx)

Any lead that has not posted the latest draft is requested to bring it electronically and also 50 hard copies.

NOTE: We will no longer divide the agenda into "old" and "new" agenda items. New agenda items may be introduced on the first or second day of the meeting, as the Chairman deems to be appropriate. The idea is to make sure we cover the most important items during the first day.

77-01. Introduction / Administrative Remarks- See Agenda 77-01

IG-77: Tom Atzert reported that an updated version of the MMEL IG Charter had been posted on www.opspecs.com.

Steve Kane talked about AFS coordination with MMEL IG. Steve would like to change "will notify" to read, "should notify" of any Policy Letter changes.

Per Pete Neff and Bob Davis – FAA wants to include reference to specific CFRs within the Remarks or Exceptions section of the MMEL / MEL.

Paul Nordstrom volunteered to draft a Policy Letter listing CFR references for the various MMEL / MEL items. Pete Neff and Darrel Sheets volunteered to assist Paul.

77-02. MMEL IG / FOEB Calendar - **See Agenda 77-02**

Standing Action: Members are to review the calendar and advise the IG Recording Secretary of any changes or updates.

IG-77: Calendar was reviewed and changes are reflected in a revised version which is attached to these minutes.

United Air Lines will be the new Lead Airline for the Airbus A350. FAA Seattle AEG, United, US Airways and Hawaiian Airlines agreed to the assignment.

77-03. 2009 Final Policy Letters - **See Agenda 77-03**

IG-77: Final PL document was reviewed and changes are reflected in a revised version which is attached to these minutes.

Policy Letters 24, 25 and 31 will be added to the final list.

77-04. MMEL Policy Letter Status Summary - See Agenda 77-04

Standing Action: Members are to review the PL Status Matrix and advise John Melotte of any changes – john.melotte@delta.com, or 404-714-6753

IG-77: Policy Letters 40, 79 and 99 will soon be added. PL-99 is still in work.

Policy Letters 1, 39, 87, 96, 98 and 100 are still in work.

77-05. Agenda Item 75-07: FOPB Process Discussion

Objective: Discuss history of FOPB (Flight Operations Policy Board) and the process moving forward.

Item Lead: Tom Atzert

Discussion: MMEL IG participation in the FOPB process is vital to its success.

IG 75 NOTE: Bob Davis is looking at re-establishing the FOPB, an FAA working group to interact with the IG to help with the review and approval processes for our IG documents.

Bryan Watson from the FAA will be on the agenda for the next IG Meeting (76) in Wichita, KS to discuss progress with FOPB.

Tom Atzert will seek assistance from Mark Lopez, Paul Nordstrom and Walt Hutchings to revising the MMEL Agenda Proposal and Coordination Process document to align it with current MMEL document authoring protocol.

IG 76 NOTE: Bob Davis reported that an FAA order needs to be changed prior to re-establishment of the FOPB. He also mentioned a Document Control Board within Flight Standards that would be new (ref FAA Order 8900.3, dated 10/2109: **SUBJ:** Flight Standards Service Document Control Board).

IG-77: Due to the holiday season, no actions were accomplished.

77-06. Agenda Item 66-07: ATA MMEL / MEL Value to Industry Survey - See Agenda 77-06

Objective: To determine overall $$ value of MMEL / MEL to industry. Once the value is determined, provide the numbers to upper management via ATA EMMC. The financial contribution the MMEL IG makes to industry is significant and this needs to be communicated properly to upper management.

Item Lead: Tom Atzert

Discussion: Task ATA to provide updated numbers on the value of MELs to our industry.
ATA (Mark Lopez) will work with UA (Tom Atzert) to develop survey that will be used to collect the data needed to determine the value.

IG-74 NOTE: Draft of survey completed, with UAL numbers "crunched." Validation and revision to survey underway. Final version of survey will hopefully be presented by ATA at IG 75 in D.C.

IG 75 NOTE: Mark Lopez said that he should have the final version of the value survey soon. Mark gave a demo of a spreadsheet that will be part of the survey. The spreadsheet auto-calculates the value of an operators MEL as data is input.

Mark reiterated that the 'value' calculated by the spreadsheet is cost avoidance, expressed in dollars. The value is the amount operators would have to spend to fly their existing schedule if the MEL did not exist. Cost avoidance figures relate to additional parts, tooling, manpower and downtime that would be needed to repair systems and equipment, rather than deferring per the MEL.

IG 76 NOTE: Tom Atzert presented a copy of the survey and stated that it is ready to go live, be populated and fed back to the ATA. Mark Lopez will send the survey out to operators.

IG-77: Information is still being gathered from member airlines. Mark Lopez reported that the Excel spreadsheet is available on the ATA website. Tom Atzert mentioned that gathering this information is definitely a team effort within each organization.

77-07. Agenda Item 66-15: PL-100 Cargo Restraints / W&B - **See Agenda 77-07**

Objective: Discuss the Repair Category requirement for dispatch with cargo restraint components inoperative.

Item Lead: NWA

Discussion: Florida West International, B767 cargo operator out of Miami, FL, has questioned the need for a repair category for inoperative cargo restraint components. Their argument is that, like the CDL (which has no repair limits), operation with inoperative cargo restraint components is an FAA approved configuration with the necessary weight limitations assigned. Since the configuration is FAA approved, there should be no need to assign a repair category. Florida West has encountered problems with restraint component vendors, causing costly flight interruptions due to the MEL repair requirements. They argue that safety is not compromised when dispatched in the FAA approved configuration. The decision to dispatch with inoperative cargo restraint components is economic in nature. Reduced cargo capacity with inoperative restraint components causes operators to complete repairs as soon as replacement/repaired parts are available.

Comments from opspecs.com:

Mario Gonzalez – Florida West 7/9/2007 This is an update to my previous comment. I also concur with Jim Perella of UPS on removing the C repair category from both items

Carlos Duran – Lan Airlines 5/17/2007 Excellent initiative, the new wording will remove the possibilities of interpretation between the MEL and the W&B/Loading manuals

Jim Perella – UPS 5/7/2007 Need to remove the "C" repair category from both sets of relief in the Policy Letter example.

Mike Krueger – FedEx 6/26/2007 I concur with Jim Perella - UPS Airlines - concerning the repair category

Mario Gonzalez – Florida West 5/12/2007 We support this change as it will help the cargo industry and does not compromise safety in any way.

IG 68 NOTE: Revised proposal sent to AFS-260 to post for review and comment on Opspecs.com.

ITEM CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

Date: 03/24/2008 Comment #PL080320-01.07

By: Patrick Hammer; Freight Runners Express; Chief Pilot printer friendly comment

---

We support the change to a category "A" item, but do not believe there is a need to have the "C" repair interval listed as the "A" statement would cover this as well.

Patrick Hammer
Chief Pilot
Freight Runners Express
1901 East Layton Avenue, Milwaukee, WI 53207
(414)-688-1556 cell, (414) 744-5525 office, 1-800-776-5525 toll-free, (414) 744-4850 fax
www.freightrunners.com

Date: 03/24/2008 Comment #PL080320-01.08

By: Mario Gonzalez; Florida West International Airways, Inc.; Director of QC and Engineering printer friendly comment

---

Florida West has been working with the MMEL group to change the repair category on this Policy Letter and after reviewing it agrees with the changes made.

Regards,
Mario Gonzalez
Director of QC and Engineering
Florida West International Airways, Inc.
PO Box 025752
Miami, FL 33102
Office: 786-265-2173

IG 72 NOTE: IG recommended R2 D6 go final. Copy submitted to AFS-260.

IG 73 NOTE: Revision 2, Draft 6 was to have gone final per last meeting. George Ceffalo will find out what the hold up is and try to go final as soon as possible.

ITEM CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

IG 74 NOTE: George Ceffalo stated that AFS-300 Maintenance has some problems with repair time of Next Heavy Maintenance Visit. Tom Atzert and Bob Davis recommend a Category "D". Jim Perella recommends keeping it a Category "C" for now and keep pushing for Category "A" – Next Heavy Maintenance Visit. If there is a problem with the wording then many currently published Policy Letters could be in jeopardy. Kevin Peters of FedEx stated that this would be an economic issue for carriers, not a safety of flight issue. It was suggested that this be left on the Agenda until next meeting in DCA where we can get AFS-300 to attend.

IG 75 NOTE: AFS-300 needs a definition of Heavy Maintenance Visit. Reference was made to FAR 121-343 or 8900.1 CHG 0 Vol 6 Chap 11, Section 14 6-2489 (a heavy maintenance check is defined as a "C" check or segment thereof, a "D" check or segment thereof, or other scheduled maintenance visits where structural inspections are accomplished).

Bob Davis will continue to work with AFS-300 to get approval.

IG 76 NOTE: The definition for HMV was discussed. Steve Kane will go to Tom Helman at AFS-300 to discuss. Jim Perella will organize a conference call to discuss. The issue is not use of the term HMV, but the repair interval itself (going all the way to HMV until repairs are made). Jim and Tom Atzert pointed out that the HMV limit will not impact safety in that the alternate loading configuration is per an FAA approved manual. The decision to go all the way to HMV before repairs are made is an economic decision that does not affect safety. Economics will drive operators to complete repairs as soon as practical.

IG-77: Steve Kane agreed to take this back to headquarters to discuss HMV concerns. Jim Perella summarized a conference call in December with UPS, FedEx, AFS-260, AFS-300 and Alaska Airlines; AEGs are ultimately responsible for the time frames placed in the MMELs. AFS-300 agreed to check with the AEGs.

Gene Hartman says that this is an economic issue. Bob Davis mentioned that the AEGs did buy off on PL-100. Steve Kane asked Tom (AFS-300) to confirm that it was alright to publish PL-100.

77-08. Agenda Item 64-10a: PL-98, Navigation Databases - **See Agenda 77-08a & 77-08b**

Objective: Modify current PL MMEL provisos by removal of proviso b).

Item Lead: ALPA

Discussion: A current navigation database for an FMS/INS aircraft provides the capability for an aircraft to fly point to point (waypoint to waypoint) without being dependent on ground-based Navaids as a back-up navigation source (assuming no operational restrictions on the route being flown, e.g., DME/DME or GPS update). If the database is not current, but a procedure is established for verifying the accuracy of the waypoints being used, as is required per current Proviso "a)" that outlines the requirement of verifying the waypoints (Navigation Fixes), the aircraft will navigate with the exact same accuracy as an aircraft with a current database.

Current Proviso "b)" seems to imply that ground based Navigation Facilities are required to be used for the enroute portion of flight. The use of such facilities is not necessary if all Navigation Fixes are verified to be valid for enroute operations using available aeronautical charts (as is already directed by proviso a). I believe that proviso "b)", as written, should be deleted. If a ground based Navigation Facility is "required" for any particular operation, then current practices require that its status be checked through the Notam system (standard operational procedure). Under this strict interpretation that ground navigation facilities are to be used, aircraft would be restricted to filing standard domestic Airways and not able to operate on oceanic, polar or RNAV routes, or any other operator defined custom routes?

As a minimum, the intent of proviso "b" needs to be clarified, and the wording of the proviso revised.

IG 64 NOTE: A working group will be formed to discuss this issue. Members of this working group are ALPA, NWA, Comair, Gulfstream, Cessna, FedEx. One of the topics to be discussed is whether this should be a MEL Item.

IG 65 NOTE: Revision to PL 98 under consideration.

IG 68 NOTE: Revised proposal sent to AFS-260 to post for review and comment on Opspecs.com.

IG 69 NOTE: The Nav Database working group held a teleconference on April 3. It was decided during the telecom to hold a face-to-face working group meeting after IG 70 adjourns. The goal of the meeting will be to decide on a set of provisos that will ensure an equivalent level of safety is maintained for dispatch with the database out of currency, as well as agreeing on the Repair Interval.

ITEM CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

IG 71 NOTE: PL 98 D9 under review by FAA HQ.

Comments from opspecs.com

John Melotte – Delta – 7/9/2007 Delta definitely does not support ALPA's position on the suggested change to the NAV Database Repair Category change. Our Flight Operations folks reviewed the contents of the discussion and kept asking the same thing, "Exactly how does a change in repair category enhance operational safety?" We feel that operational safety begins in the cockpit when the flight crew cross checks the currency of the NAV databases prior to each departure. Delta currently has several procedures in place should the database be out of currency. One element that we cannot control is the timeliness of delivery of the new databases from the suppliers. Also, Jeppesen charts are updated every 14 days (if there is a change), but the FMS is only updated every 28 days. This implies that there will be times when the charts have more accurate information than the FMS. By forcing us to meet a 3 day guideline we risk grounding aircraft even though the new database may contain the exact same information as the previous one. We definitely feel that more discussion and debate on this topic is needed

Pete Moll – Midwest Airlines 7/8/2007 We are opposed to the category change from C to B. At the Memphis IG meeting, it was understood the category would stay at C, only the proviso would be tweaked

Tim Sullivan – Chantilly Air 7/5/2007 We believe changing this from a C to B repair interval could potentially cause major operational problems and not provide any measurable increase in safety

Bob Taylor – US Airways 7/2/2007 It is my understanding from the discussion in Memphis that the repair category for PL-98 would remain a C. A review of past applications of this MEL at US Airways indicates most repairs take place within 0 to 3 calendar days however, there have been on occasion times when more than 3 calendar days were necessary on the international fleets. Repair categories in excess of 3 days (i.e. category C) are necessary and not unreasonable provided an operator's MEL procedures meet the PL's requirement that they "validate route data for the intended flight from the database that is out of currency against current navigation data".

Tom Atzert – FAA/ATA MMEL IG Co-Chairman 6/29/2007 All comments received to-date will be considered by the full IG at the August meeting in Minneapolis. I had several conversations with the FAA (AFS-260 and AFS-350) about this PL and can tell you they are concerned about providing 10-day relief for nav databases. I've also spoke with an inspector from the Alaska FSDO and he has a completely different perspective: out-of-date databases should be handled via Ops Specs and not by the MMEL, and that alternate procedures and repair limits should be set by the operator in their MEL (via Administrative Control) and approved by the POI. The Alaska FSDO position is that an out-of-date database does not affect the airworthiness of the nav system and therefore is not a candidate for MMEL relief. This may be the correct position from a legal and regulatory compliance standpoint. Obviously, more discussion and debate on this topic is needed.

ITEM CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

Jon Haag – Kraft Foods 6/28/2007 It appears from the discussion that the change is not well received. From a business aviation perspective, I also don't agree with the change. We spend a great deal of time in international flight operations and trying to catch up with the aircraft and the costs involved to upload the FMS Navigation Database would be cost prohibitive. It is not uncommon to be out on a trip for more than 3 days. The current relief is more than adequate and the flight crews are very aware that they need to have or get the latest and greatest NAV charts to get from point A to point B. I have to believe that Part 91K and Part 135 operators would not agree with this change. I have sent this on to NBAA to get their opinion on this matter.

Larry Benedict – FedEx 6/28/2007 I have to agree with the other comments. The agreement that "industry" understood was the proviso change as worded in PL-98 D4, and to maintain a "C" relief. Numerous cases were cited during MMEL IG #66 in Memphis demonstrating the virtual impossibility of being able to comply with "B" relief timeline

Jim Perella – UPS 6/27/2007 UPS does not support the ALPA position on revision 1 draft 4. This draft contradicts everything that was agreed to by the Industry, FAA and ALPA at the last MMEL IG meeting in Memphis. ALPA at the meeting accepted the Industry and FAA position that no change to category relief was necessary. ALPA has ignored this and drafted the Policy Letter with "B" level category relief. The draft example is acceptable with category "C" relief restored but not with category "B" relief

Luke McGarrh – FedEx 6/26/2007 This does not reflect the discussions and elements that transpired at the MMEL IG #66 in Memphis, April 18 regarding the discussion on the Nav Data Base currency issue. We have reviewed it and take exception to the Discussion statement, first sentence that the industry was in agreement with the benefits of revising the repair interval to a B category from current C category. We were not remotely in agreement. Due to the nature of our operations, changing the repair interval to a "B" would be logistically and financially prohibitive

Larry Hills – FedEx 6/26/2007 This does not reflect the discussions and elements that transpired at the MMEL IG #66 in Memphis, April 18 regarding the discussion on the Nav Data Base currency issue. We have reviewed it and take exception to the Discussion statement, first sentence that the industry was in agreement with the benefits of revising the repair interval to a B category from current C category. We were not.

Mike Krueger – FedEx 6/26/2007 D4 does not remotely represent the IG meeting consensus. The consensus was to leave the repair category as C and simplify the proviso language

Bruce Barefoot – Gulfstream 6/28/2007 D4 does not reflect the consensus of the group when the subject was discussed in Memphis. We have Part 91 and 135 operators who are on international trips for several days at a time and in locations where updates may not be available. To change relief from "C" to "B" would increase operating cost and create the potential for loss of revenues for an operator.

ITEM CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

IG 72 NOTE: Revision 1, draft 9 and draft 10 have been posted on the website. Draft 9 was authored by the Flight Operations Policy Board (FOPB). A notice needs to be sent to advise that draft 10 has been posted. Bob Davis got comments from AFS 200 and AFS 400 that the C repair interval category was too long. ALPA, APA and operators were agreeable with a C category and feel that a B category is too short. This would pose an inconvenience for operators who are stuck at far-away stations. THE Current FMS relief is a C category. Jerry Mumfrey proposed that we add provisos that would address missing data in order to address AFS-400's concerns. All members were requested too make their comments on opspecs.com in opposition to the proposed B category. There was also a proposal to merge the two sets of provisos to accommodate routes that included RNAV and non-RNAV procedures or routes. Draft 11 has been submitted to AFS-260 for posting on Opspecs.com for public review.

IG-73 NOTE: In draft 11 of PL-98, Tom Atzert tweaked the NOTE, combined sub-items and changed the repair category back to a "C". Draft 11 is currently on the OPSPECS website for comment. Bob Davis held meetings within the FAA and with AFS-300/400 AEGs. Their position was how best to comply with an equivalent level of safety (Risk Management). Bob was unable to get a total consensus within the FAA. Plans are to have another internal telecon and report back at the next meeting. Dave Stewart asked that the FAA come back at the next meeting with their position on what repair category is appropriate. The IG group consensus is to have a Category "C" for relief. Tom asked group members to comment on the website as the FAA weighs their own internal comments.

IG-74 NOTE: Group recommends that Draft 11 go final. Bob Davis spoke to risk management. FAA view is that "we need to reduce flight crew workload to minimize risk." FAA recommends Category "B" – 3 days if the flight crew manages or Category "C" – 10 days if the company has dispatch / maintenance manage. PL to be re-written by AFS-260 and D12 will be posted for public review and comment on opspecs.com upon its completion.

IG 75 NOTE: Charting expert from FAA HQ spoke to the group about chart changes and their relation to nav database updates. Bob Davis will work with the charting group to add wording to the PL-98 for clarification.

Mark Lopez will resend operator out-of-currency MEL procedures to Bob Davis for review as part of the overall PL-98 revision process. Item was tabled until next IG meeting.

ITEM CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

IG 76 NOTE: Steve Kane reported that there was no update yet. Two new FAA orders about air traffic are in work. There is also an AIM revision about NAV Databases along with the two new FAA Orders. AIM drafts will be posted along with the minutes.

*** Draft 14 of PL-98 is now posted on Opspecs.com. *** Several comments posted ***

IG-77: Steve Kane reported that the AIM is still in coordination. The FAA has issues with Air Traffic Order 7400.2. Air traffic groups are starting over. We cannot move forward with PL-98 for at least six months to a year or longer until FAA Air Traffic completes their internal processes. Steve would also like to see what published procedures airlines have for crews to follow for out of date nav databases. John McCormick from FedEx will provide their version.

Bob Davis told the group that ATL and DFW RNAV departures were at risk due to various off track events. At our next meeting in Chicago, Tom Atzert plans to have a United Air Lines dispatcher give a briefing on how they handle out of date nav databases.

77-09. Agenda Item 72-11: PL 86 Compliance with MMEL Revisions - **See Agenda 77-09**

Objective: Extend the 60 day deadline to submit an MEL revision and revise PL 86 on how the handle new more restrictive MMEL relief that becomes effective with release of the MEL revision

Item Lead: Jim Perella and FedEx

Discussion: Jim Perella raised the issue about the requirement in PL-86 to submit a MEL revision no later than 60 days after a MMEL revision. He inquired whether consideration could be given to extend this to 90 days, as is the case for EASA. FSIMS 8900 guidance allows some negotiation with POI to extend the deadline under certain circumstances. The FAA ISO process raises a flag to the POI when 120 days go by if the MEL revision has not been submitted. Bob Davis indicated that this 60 day policy belongs to AFS 1 who is responsible for 8900. ATA will approach AFS 1 to consider extending the time line.

PL 86, revision 5, draft 1 was proposed by FedEx. (see e-mail below from Kevin Peters). Fedex will pare down the text of the PL.

> **From:** Kevin Peters [mailto:knpeters@fedex.com]
> **Sent:** Thursday, July 31, 2008 5:00 PM
> **To:** Lopez, Mark
> **Cc:** gene.hartman@faa.gov
> **Subject:** New draft rev to PL 86
>
> Mark,
> Attached is my draft on transition guidance on how the handle new more restrictive MMEL relief that becomes effective with release of the MEL rev. Current PL clearly talks
>
> to the 60 day period to get the MMEL changes into an MEL and presented to the POI but we have been experiencing more than a little misunderstanding of how immediately those changes should be put in place once that relief becomes effective in the MEL book. Since Gene has PL 86 for the PL audit workgroup I have providing this prelim draft to him also.
> Regards,
> Kevin Peters.

IG 72 NOTE: The request to review the 60 day requirement is now with AFS-1. Kevin Peters presented an abridged version of his proposal. The material from this PL may be more appropriate in Handbook 8900 as part of the PL Rewrite project. R5 D4 has been submitted to AFS-260 for posting on Opspecs.com for public review.

ITEM CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

IG-73 NOTE: PL-86 is not yet posted for comment on OPSPECS. Mark Lopez will re-address a letter previously sent to Jim Ballough to new AFS-1 John Allen at FAA. The AEGs at attendance at the meeting had no objections with the proposal. The increase from the 60 day requirement to 90 days is still in work. PL-86, Handbook 8900 and ISO 9000 QMS will need to be revised to reflect 90 days from revision date if the compliance period is extended as requested.

IG-74 NOTE: PL-6 R5 Draft 4 posted for public review and comment on opspecs.com. Tom will send George a Draft 5 which puts the revision statements in reverse order – no substantive changes from D4. The increase from the 60 day MEL revision requirement to 90 days has been accepted by AFS-1. The change will be worked outside the scope of PL-86 as there are internal FAA process changes that must be made to account for the additional 30 days. Once fully implemented, operators will have 90 days to submit more restrictive MMEL changes, and FAA will have 90 days to review the MEL and approve/disapprove.

IG 75 NOTE: 8900.1 has been revised to allow operators 90 days to submit MEL revisions to comply with more restrictive MMEL changes. PL-86 changes proposed by FedEx were requested to go final since those changes have already been agreed to by the IG and will benefit their MEL revision process.

IG 76 NOTE: Tom Atzert will give Gorge Ceffalo PL-86 with the 90 day change along with Kevin Peters draft for 8900. Kevin Peters mentioned the FedEx requirements by their FAA inspectors about the 90 days and PL-86 should be covered in their handbook 8900. Final draft of PL-86 sent to George for coordination on 11/18.

IG-77: George Ceffalo reported that PL-86 is still in the coordination process at headquarters. Tom Atzert mentioned that PL-86 D5 that was sent to George has the 90-day change in it.

77-10. Agenda Item 66-11: New ETOPS Rule – PL-40 - **See Agenda 77-10**

Objective: To examine impact of new ETOPS rule on MMELs and PL-40 for twin engine, 3 engine and 4 engine aircraft.

Item Lead: Paul Nordstrom, Mark Lopez, Jim Foster

Discussion: Dave Burr indicated that the new ETOPS rule is now issued (296 pages). Revision to PL-40 is under consideration. These new rules also address polar operations. This new rule is available on the FAA website. The requirement for an operational weather radar system for ETOPS beyond 120 minutes needs to be addressed.

IG 72 NOTE: Review is continuing, but is not finalized yet. A PL draft is planned to be ready for IG 73 or sooner and, if so, will be posted on the website for comment.

IG-73 NOTE: Revision 2, Drafts 2 and 3 were discussed during the meeting. Draft 3 was written to address Part 135. Tom Atzert requested that Draft 1 be removed from the website and re-addressed during a conference call. We will try to maintain this PL in current form and align with the new rule. Paul Nordstrom would like to incorporate the new regulations and aircraft into PL-40 and leave everything for two engine aircraft alone.

IG-74 NOTE: Paul Nordstrom presented a new draft. The group agreed to post this one as a draft (5), with new changes from NetJets, for comments. Draft 5 posted for public review and comment on opspecs.com.

IG 75 NOTE: Steve Kane from AFS-260 had some proposed changes regarding Polar Suits be included in the PL. IG recommended that the new reference to Polar Suits be removed from the Policy Letter. Bob Davis will discuss this with AFS-220. PL-40 D5 will be posted as final without changes or as a draft for comments (D6) if the Polar Suit changes are to remain.

IG 76: Latest draft of PL-40 is acceptable to the FAA. Rudy Canto proposed additional changes to the policy letter. Paul Nordstrom objected to the changes right now and suggested we publish the Policy Letter as is and then re-open the PL if Airbus would like to make some changes. Tom Atzert also suggested that the Policy Letter be published as is.

Final draft of PL-40 sent to George for coordination on 11/18 – awaiting signature.

IG-77: PL-40 R2 posted to Opspecs.com 1/26/10. CLOSED

77-11. Agenda Item 71-13: PL-39 Altitude Alerting System Requirements – **See Agenda 77-11**

Item Lead: Bob Davis / Tom Atzert

Discussion: It seems that PL 39 is in conflict with FAR 91.219 with reference to the requirement for the "device in operable condition". Other FARs say that the device has to be "installed". AFS 260 will look at the PL versus the rule and adjustments may be necessary for the PL to meet the rule. Perhaps we need to gather some operators' data to find out how many times was this relief used and for how long, and also how many altitude busts happened while on MEL. Mark Lopez will look for some altitude bust data.

UAL Deferral Data (previous 12 months):
737: 1
747: 0
757: 4 total write-ups with partial system failure (1 aural only inop, light OK; 3 light only inop, aural OK)
767: 0
777: 0
A319/320: 1

Altitude Deviation Data (from Mark Lopez / ATA)
Per the below ATA ran a query today on the ASRS database searching for altitude deviations with an altitude alerter system inoperative.
Here are the results:

1st query = Pilot Altitude Deviation AND Excursion from Assigned Altitude = 6,117 reports
2nd query = Same as above with MEL added to text search = 30 reports

Of the 30 MEL ASRS found, 7 were Autopilots on MEL (1 was ALT HOLD INOP), 1 was Altitude Encoder? (EMB145), 1 was FMS inop and 3 were Altitude Alerter inop, 2 B-737 and 1 Cessna Citation (Part 91).

IG-73 NOTE: Bob Davis has had several discussions and telecons with headquarters and is getting no support to re-instate PL-39 at this time. Tom Atzert will attempt a re-write using information in FARs 91.213, 91.219 and 121.628.

IG-74 NOTE: Tom Atzert made some changes since last meeting and is labeled Draft 2, which is posted for public review and comment on opspecs.com.

ITEM CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

IG 75 NOTE: Tom Atzert is going back to the drawing board on this Policy Letter re-write. IG suggested that repair station be designated, similar to PL-87. Bob Davis suggested sub-items for visual and aural alert.

IG 76 NOTE: Tom Atzert mentioned that some MMELs have already deleted the Altitude Alert relief. It is suggested that PL-39 be issued as soon as possible to restore the relief with the revision to also include the Altitude Capture requirement (Dave Abbott noted that the latest draft excludes DC-9, or any other turbojet aircraft that does not have autopilot altitude capture mode). Final draft of PL-39 sent to George for coordination on 11/18.

Comment By: Patrick Hammer; Freight Runners Express; Chief Pilot

Freight Runners Express, Inc. agrees with this version of the policy letter. However we would like the Aural Alert and Visual Alert added to the Other Than Turbojet-Powered Civil Airplanes as Repair Interval C items with 0 required for dispatch with the remarks and exceptions as follows:

1) Aural Alert - May be inoperative provided visual alert operates normally
2) Visual Alert - May be inoperative provided aural alert operates normally

Patrick Hammer
Chief Pilot
Freight Runners Express
1901 East Layton Avenue, Milwaukee, WI 53207
(414)-688-1556 cell
(414) 744-5525 office, 1-800-776-5525 toll-free
(414) 744-4850 fax

IG-77: Still awaiting approval at FAA headquarters.

77-12. Agenda Item 75-14: PL-118, Nitrogen Gas Generation

Objective: Revise to account for NGS special conditions and to make the certification statement more clearly based on STC/TC.

Item Lead: Bob Davis, AFS-260

Discussion: SEA ACO Certification has issue with the current 120 day relief. The current PL has language about regulatory or certification requirement that would reduce NGS to category "C".

NOTE: Industry objects to a revision to this PL, which is intended to provide flexibility during the compliance period. PL-62 should be followed with NGS. Industry has no problem with Category "C" once the equipment is required by regulation. Keeping repair Category "D" provides operators the incentive to aggressively install the system, knowing that ample MEL relief is available should the need to "de-bug" the system arise.

IG 75 NOTE: ACO says A-10 days. Policy Letter will be archived and deleted. Internal discussion ongoing at Boeing and ACO, which may result in changing the repair limit to C-10 days.

IG 76 NOTE: It was reported that 50% of all aircraft are required to have this system installed by 2014 and 100% by 2017. Mark Lopez was asked to send a letter to ACO expressing concerns with A-10 day repair limit, particularly during the compliance period. Letter will recommend C-10 days, which will provide sufficient dispatch flexibility, while maintaining adequate system operability. Spare parts availability is the issue.

IG-77:

PL-118 to be deleted and archived as it no longer serves a purpose. Item CLOSED.

There was a discussion about the time limit of "A" – 10 days. Mark Lopez/ATA is going to write a letter to FAA ACO objecting to the Category "A" – 10 day relief as well as substantiation for Category "C" 10 day relief. Jim Foster mentioned that SFAR 88 is also related.

77-13. Agenda Item 71-24: PL-1 Wide-body Door / Slide Inoperative – See Agenda 77-13

Objective: To determine whether we need to add the A380 model aircraft to PL-1

Item Lead: Tom Atzert

Discussion: Rudy Canto from Airbus presented a draft revision to PL-1 (R4 D1). He was asking whether there are other alternatives to get door/slide relief for new aircraft models. This is a sensitive issue. At a previous IG meeting, Paul Nordstrom was told that we did not need to add the 787 model and that door/slide relief could be requested through the FOEB. Rudy Canto suggested that a Working Group be formed to address this issue for adding new models. Tom Atzert suggested that a conference call be organized with all players involved to resolve this issue (Boeing Airbus, FAA, ALPA, AFA, and IG).

IG 70 NOTE: A conference call was held on July 17, 2008 to discuss the A380 door/slide MMEL issue. On the call were: Rudy Canto (Airbus), Bob Davis (AFS-260), Jim Foster (SEA-AEG), Mark Lopez (ATA) and Tom Atzert (UAL/MMEL IG). AFS-260 & SEA-AEG agreed to consider addition of relief for upper deck and/or lower deck door/slide missing or inoperative to the A380 MMEL via the normal FOEB process, rather than revise PL to incorporate A380. Airbus will coordinate the A380 MMEL door/slide proposal with the FOEB. If the proposal is deemed acceptable, the draft MMEL will be posted for public review/comment on www.opspecs.com. Concerned parties should post their comments on the draft MMEL *Discussion* page or contact the A380 FOEB Chairman (Jim Kling) directly.

IG 71 NOTE: It has been recommended to AFS 260 that we revise the PL so it is generic, and simply applies to wide-body fleets, with no data for specific fleet types. New fleet types can add relief based on the PL, but will always require FOEB Chairman to evaluate the data. Dave Stewart from APA agrees. There were some objections to a proposal to defer this issue to the FOEB Chair. Tom Atzert stated that FOEB chairs are competent and capable to handle this relief via the FOEB process. Bob Davis assured the IG that the Airbus 380 passenger evacuation test was done as per FAA standards and that none of them were circumvented. There was a suggestion to form a working group with representatives from the IG to look at the issue and recommend on the maximum number of inoperative doors for the Airbus380. Tom Atzert, Bob Davis and Rudy Canto will discuss this offline.

IG 72 NOTE: It was agreed that the best approach would be to revise PL-1 and make it more generic. Future aircraft models would be vetted by the FOEB process. Tom Atzert presented Draft 5 to the group, which deleted all aircraft specific data. Dave Bridgens suggested that we keep one table set of data as an example to show how this relief was developed. R4 D6 posted on Opspsecs.com for comment.

ITEM CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

IG-73 NOTE: Candace Kolander from AFA opposes a revision to this PL to add relief for double-deck wide-body airplanes (such as the Airbus 380). It was suggested that we go final with Revision 4, Draft 6.

IG-74 NOTE: PL in coordination at HQ. New draft posted by AFS-260. MMEL IG has concerns with latest draft (Draft X) that need to be resolved before it goes final. Comments to Draft X posted by Boeing, UAL and APA (see below).

Date: 05/05/2009 Comment #Draft_PL090422-01.01

By: Paul Nordstrom; Boeing; Boeing Flight Operations Engineering

PL-1 revision 4 draft 6 is already posted. The posting of this draft X version is not in compliance with the agreed upon ATA MMEL IG processes. Comments regarding PL-1 revision 4 draft 6 can be posted as allowed by using the "Click here to email your suggestions/proposed changes and have them appear here on the web" link or be brought to the IG meetings for discussion. This version should be removed as soon as possible.

The modifications by draft X add no value to the intent of the tables and some are misleading and in error. Please note that the demonstrated evacuation for certification is done with half the exits (four) not available and the table certified exit design limit is 110 passengers per exit. For four exits available, the exit design limit is 440 passengers. For three exits available, the exit design limit is 330 passengers. In regard to the modifications to the "Evacuees Per Exit", showing rates to the tenth is mathematically correct and is acceptable (passenger evacuation substantiation documents for certification show flow rates to the hundredth). Modifications to the tables or added discussion for the tables is not needed. The FOEB Chairmen have been able to understand the tables and implement Policy Letter 1 for more than 13 years.

Date: 05/05/2009 Comment #Draft_PL090422-01.02

By: Tom Atzert; United Air Lines; Industry Chairman, MMEL IG

United Air Lines agrees with Boeing's comments. Posting a new draft without the benefit of MMEL IG review and debate serves no purpose. The IG has no way of knowing who objected to R4 D6 and therefore cannot offer a rebuttal directly to the author of Draft X. This is counterproductive.

FOEB Chairmen have been working with PL-1 for years and fully understand how to address it in MMELs. Several FOEB Chairmen that are members of the MMEL IG have given their approval for R4 D6. PL-1 was debated at length at several MMEL IG meetings, the results of which are included in D6.

Draft X should be removed from opspecs.com and the authors should contact the MMEL IG for further discussion.

Date: 05/21/2009 Comment #Draft_PL090422-01.03

By: Captain D.V. Stewart; APA

APA agrees with Boeing's and United's comments. The industry has a process in place and expects ever body including the FAA to follow the process.

ITEM CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

IG 75 NOTE: Bob Davis is going to work with the Seattle AEG and bring a re-write to the next IG meeting. The current tables are too hard to understand. Boeing should be consulted in any rewrite as they have background and history on current tables.

IG 76 NOTE: Draft Policy Letter was posted on September 29th. Bob Davis and Steve Kane reported that it was ready to go. It was suggested it be published as final (Jim Foster's version).

Final draft of PL-1 sent to George for coordination on 11/18.

IG-77: Further minor clarification/correction to be made by Paul Nordstrom and Jim Foster, and will then be sent to AFS-260 for final coordination and publication as final.

77-14. Agenda Item: PL-99, All Cargo Slide Relief - **See Agenda 77-14**

Objective: Revise PL to cover all narrow and wide-body cargo configurations.

Item Lead: Paul Nordstrom

Discussion: To provide coverage for "all" cargo aircraft, not just wide body.

IG 73 NOTE: Revision 2, Draft 2 was presented by Paul Nordstrom. The wording for wide body relief was taken from PL-1 and put into PL-99 to accommodate all aircraft types in "all" cargo configurations. The group recommends that the PL go up on the website for comments.

IG-74 NOTE: After the last meeting Tom Atzert sent Draft 2 for posting. PL-99 posted on opspecs.com for public review and comment.

IG 75 NOTE: This item will be tabled until the next IG meeting due to the re-write of PL-1. It was suggested that PL-1 and PL-99 be released together.

IG 76 NOTE: Opspecs.com Comment from Kevin Peters from FedEx: "I like to recommend shortening the Subject line by striking out the words "Narrow Body" and insert "Airplanes" followed by strike out of words "Configuration" and "Wide-Body Airplanes in All-Cargo and" as follows:

Door / Slide Relief Policy for in All-Cargo and Combination Passenger / Cargo Configurations

This would then read:

Door / Slide Relief Policy for Airplanes in All-Cargo and Combination Passenger / Cargo Configurations

The Policy Purpose statement sufficiently describes the effectivity of PL is for Narrow Body and Wide Body airplanes thus the name is Subject line can shorter and more concise. Easier to quickly scan and comprehend."

Final draft of PL-99 sent to George for coordination on 11/18 – awaiting signature.

IG-77: Further minor clarification/correction to be made by Paul Nordstrom and Jim Foster, and will then be sent to AFS-260 for final coordination and publication as final.

77-15. Agenda Item: PL-25, Policy Concerning MMEL Definitions

Objective: To provide coverage for A380 aircraft in MMEL Definitions.

Item Lead: Rudy Canto

Discussion: Revise PL to add A380 to Paragraph "c." of Definition 23.

IG-74 NOTE: Rudy Canto was not in attendance at this meeting. We will keep this on the Agenda for next meeting.

IG 75 NOTE: Rudy Canto was not in attendance. This item will be tabled until the next IG meeting.

IG 76 NOTE: A380 change acceptable to group.

IG-77:

PL-25 Rev 15, dated 11/2/09 posted 11/25/09. Item CLOSED.

77-16. Agenda Item 75-18: PL-25, Policy Concerning MMEL Definitions- **See Agenda 77-16a and 77-16b**

Objective: Proposal to clarify conflict between Definition 22 and 27 concerning "Day of Discovery".

Item Lead: Bob Taylor

Discussion:

IG 75 NOTE: Bob Taylor from US Airways made a presentation to the group. Tim Kane from JetBlue will work on adding a new definition for "Heavy Maintenance Visit." Recommend posting the Policy Letter with Bob Taylor's changes. Tom Atzert will send to Bob Davis.

IG 76 NOTE: Definition 22 & 27 changes acceptable to group. HMV changes tabled pending industry/FAA telecom on PL-100.

Luciano Resende pointed out an inconsistency in the instructions for Rev Bars when comparing PL-25 Def # 1e, to PL-31 Spec #3. This should be corrected in PL-25 as PL-31 Spec #3 is correct.

Also, revision number near the top of page 2 of the PL should reflect the correct revision (one revision behind right now).

IG-77: Time Kane mentioned that 8900 uses "C" and "D" Check definitions in different parts and they differ slightly. Tim will be adding a definition to PL-25. Bob Davis will coordinate with AFS-300 to standardize the definition of HMV. It will not include "C" and "D" terminology.

77-17. New Agenda Item: PL-104 Overhead Storage Bin(s)/Cabin and Galley Storage Compartments/Closets – See Agenda 77-17

Objective: Add relief for Hinged Door(s) and Retractable Door(s).

Item Lead: David L. Robinson, SEA AEG

Discussion: The current policy letter does not provide relief for hinged or retractable door(s) such as those on the EMB-135/145.

IG 75 NOTE: David Robinson was not in attendance. Item will be tabled until next IG meeting.

IG 76 NOTE: Item tabled. Bryan Watson to coordinate with the author on new proposal.

IG-77: Bryan Watson to work on a re-write to PL-104 to include Hinged Door(s) and Retractable Door(s).

77-18. Agenda Item 75-20: PL-87, Master Minimum Equipment list (MMEL) for Flight Data Recorder (FDR) - See Agenda 77-18

Objective: Review current PL for possible revision.

Item Lead: David L. Robinson, SEA AEG

Discussion: The "Number Required for Dispatch" designators for each proviso set are confusing. Some of them are hyphens where they may possibly need to be ones and vice-versa.

IG 75 NOTE: AFS-260 will review PL-87 in response to a Safety Rec submitted by a field inspector having concerns with 20-day relief for required DFDR parameters.

IG 76 NOTE: PL-87 R9, D2 presented. This limits the number of required parameters that can be inoperative under second relief option. D2 aligns FAA PL with Transport Canada and EASA policy. D2 also clarifies the PL is applicable to both FDR and CVFDR installations (FedEx request).

Final draft of PL-87 sent to George for coordination on 11/18.

IG-77: This is going final per Steve Kane.

77-19. Agenda Item 75-21: PL-123, Passenger Notice System (Lighted Information Signs) - See Agenda 77-19

Objective: Clarify PL as it pertains to operations other than 14 CFR Part 121 and 135 with less than 19 seats – see below.

Item Lead: Gene Hartman, LGB AEG

Discussion: This policy letter is applicable to 121 air carriers, and 135 air carriers operating aircraft with more than 19 passenger seats. It does not provide useable relief for 135 operators who operate aircraft with less than 19 seats.

1. Most 135 aircraft with less than 19 seats are not required to have a flight attendant or cabin hostess. Nor are they required under 135.150 to have a PA system.

2. Because some of these aircraft have fewer seats, (in some cases only 4-6 passenger seats), only 1 "Fasten Seat Belt" or "No Smoking" may be installed on the aircraft. Therefore Proviso 1 is not appropriate. Limited availability of seating could also pose a problem.

3. Also because many 135 aircraft do not have a PA system because of less than 19 seats, Proviso 2 is not appropriate.

4. And, because, cargo configurations are not applicable to many 135 aircraft, Proviso 3 is not appropriate.

That leaves the proviso that addresses Part 19 aircraft without PA systems or Cabin Crew. This proviso should pertain to Part 91 operations and Part 135 operations in aircraft with 19 seats or less and without a required cabin crew (which is the vast majority of 135 operations).

"(O) May be inoperative provided alternate procedures are established and used to notify cabin occupants."

Right now, the way I read this Policy Letter, it handicaps many small 135 operators.

Stephen L. Ford
Federal Aviation Administration
Long Beach Aircraft Evaluation Group

IG 75 NOTE: Darrel Sheets will take the lead on this and work on a re-write.

IG 76 NOTE: Formatting was discussed. Darrell Sheets has PL in work and has sent to Tom Atzert.

IG-77: A category will be added for aircraft with 19 seats or less. Draft sent to AFS-260 for posting on Opspecs.com for review/comment.

77-20. Agenda Item 70-12: PL-31 MMEL Format Specifications

Objective: Revise PL-31

Item Leads: Cessna

Discussion: Cessna proposed changes to PL 31 MMEL Format Specifications. They are mostly editorial changes in nature. Tom Atzert, Paul Nordstrom and Dave Burk will review the proposal and present their findings at the next IG meeting.

Comments from Tom, David and Paul re: PL-31 proposal submitted by Cessna:

Tom:
5. This one may need to stand as is. When an (M) is assigned to an item, provisos are typically used to clarify/specify the intent.

17. I don't recall seeing the phrase "…Operating Requirements" in MMELs. If that phrase has been used, perhaps the offending MMEL should be revised. If the intent is to restrict the operation i/a/w an Ops Spec paragraph, then "as required by FAR" would work. I don't think a change is warranted here.

19. Unless I'm mistaken, changes bars are being deleted at number and letter revisions. I don't think we need to change this practice. It may be a bit more work for Chairmen due to the new Word MMEL templates; however, historically rev bars have indicated changes only in that revision, not previous ones.

The other suggested changes improve readability and provide clarity.

David:
I have to agree with Paul on the M and O issue. I believe that any time there is an M or O, then there should be some kind of proviso. Just having an M or O never has made sense to me.

Paul:
For Specification 5, I believe this is when there is a zero in column 3, no remarks are required in column 4. Some MMELs use to have remarks "May be inoperative."

The proposed revision to Specification 5 has it as a (O) and (M) issue. If this is what we want, then I think it should be just the opposite of the proposal. The specification would be that any time there is a (O) and (M), there must be provisos in the Remarks column.

New Word MMEL format inconsistencies:
- Rev numbers (in header)
- Rev bars (old ones remaining)
- New practice as compared to PL-31 (MMEL Format Specs) concerning Definitions and Preamble (See MMELs: 777 14d / 767 32bs)

ITEM CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

IG 70 NOTE: The following proposed changes to PL 31 require careful consideration by the MMEL IG:

5. When there is an (O) or (M) in the REMARKS AND EXCEPTIONS column, no remarks are necessary unless clarification or proviso(s) is required.

- *Several IG members commented that the specification should be that any time there is a (O) and (M), there must be provisos in the Remarks column.*

17. When the terms "as required be FAR", "Any in excess of those required by FAR may be inoperative" or "as required by Operating Requirements" are used in the proviso, the applicable FAR(s) or Operating Requirement(s) should not be identified.

- *Previous AFS-260 rep Dave Burr disagreed with this suggestion. His argument was that this is an FAA document and should refer to FAA regulatory requirements.*

19. All change bars applicable to the previous number revision of the MMEL shall be removed at the next number revision. This guidance applies to all pages, including those not affected by the new revision. Change bars shall not be removed for letter revisions.

- *We need AEG to weigh in on this. This is a significant change from the current practice, which is to remove old rev bars at each revision – numbered and lettered.*

NOTES – their placement in the MEL item seems to cause some confusion as to which set of provisos they apply to. FedEx made a PowerPoint presentation (attached to these minutes).

IG 71 NOTE: Cessna will draft a revision to PL-31 to clarify the use of NOTES, i.e., they should be repeated for each set of provisos to which they apply. Specification 5 needs to be reworded since the IG agrees that remarks are required. Specifications 17 and 19: no change to current specifications. Cessna will revise their draft and send to AFS-260 for posting and comment. Specification 20 should add an extra item to address NEF. Bob Davis feels we need a specification for the MMEL title page for consistency across fleets.

IG 72 NOTE: PL-31 R2, D4 is posted for comment on Opspecs.com.

IG 73 NOTE: Cessna and NetJets will work to reorder the format specification to facilitate FOEB Chairmen MMEL revision activities. Walt Hutchings will review the latest draft, and after his concurrence the draft will be sent to AFS-260 for HQ circulation and posting as final.

ITEM CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

IG-74 NOTE: Per George Ceffalo this should go final soon. Tom Atzert sent George Revision 2, Draft 6, which includes final minor changes accepted by MMEL IG.

IG 75 NOTE: Bob Davis reported that there a few issues that still need to be ironed before this can go final.

IG 76 NOTE: George Ceffalo said that this is awaiting signature. Will post as final after signature obtained.

IG-77:

PL-31 Rev 2, dated 10/15/09 posted 11/18/09. Item CLOSED.

* Steve Kane will discuss the change to MMEL Spec # 12, which now requires FOEB Chairman to list the applicable FAR in the MMEL.

77-21. Agenda Item 75-24: PL-31 MMEL Format Specifications – "Next-Gen" MMEL Specs

Objective: Align PL-31 with new XML MMEL product.

Item Lead: Walt Hutchings, MKC AEG

Discussion:

IG 75 NOTE: Walt Hutchings reported on the progress of the new FAA XML Schema. Testing is in progress at the FAA. Walt hopes to do a presentation at the next IG meeting in Wichita. It was discussed that we will need to revise PL-31 to align with the new schema and authoring protocol.

IG 76 NOTE: No updates. More to come after first FAA XML schema is launched.

IG-77: Walt Hutchings reported that this project is still in work and making progress.

77-22. Agenda Item 75-25: Clarify Use of "-" in "Number Installed" Column in Operator MELs

Objective: Clarify the use of "-" in "Number Installed" column in operator MELs.

Item Lead: Tom Atzert, UAL

Discussion: Many in the industry contend that there are many items where a "-" in the "Number Installed" column of operator MELs is appropriate.

IG 75 NOTE: Tom Atzert and David Burk agreed to draft proposal for 8900.1 that will allow use of "-" in operator MELs for certain items like Flight Deck Lighting, Cabin Lighting, Storage Compartments, and others where the dispatch limitations are clearly delineated in the Remarks or Exceptions column. For these type of items, the requirement to have a hard number in the "number installed" column serves no purpose.

IG 76 NOTE: Tom Atzert and David Burk are working on a proposed change for 8900. Tabled.

IG-77: Bob Davis commented that further "tweaking" will be required to ensure that it is not mis-applied. Tom Atzert and David Burk will coordinate and submit formal proposal.

77-23. Agenda Item 70-18: Policy Letter Rewrite: New format with FAA branding and incorporate new GC Header

Objective: 1) Adopt new PL format w/FAA branding, and 2) incorporate new GC header.

Item Lead: AFS-260 Bob Davis, Tom Atzert

Discussion: AFS-260 has begun to use a new PL format that improves readability and standardizes the manner in which PLs are authored. This new format should be rolled to existing PLs. In addition, with the release of revised PL-59 (Global Change), PLs designated as GC should incorporate the new header.

IG 70 NOTE: PL Working Group held conference call to discuss/refine objectives, issued final PL assignments. New PL format developed and approved by AFS-260 and distributed to W/G.

IG 72 NOTE: Mark Lopez reported that some proposals have been received for archiving and they have been posted on opspecs.com for comment. January 28-29, 2009 is the target for submissions and Working Group members are requested to send their revised PLs to Mark Lopez. Mark suggested that the Working Group have a web meeting on December 5th to go over the revised PLs. He further suggested that we have a meeting on January 27th, 2009 in PHX before IG 73 around 1 pm. Mark will advise and confirm later about the meeting in PHX depending upon how many of the reviewers would be able to attend.

IG-73 NOTE: The PL working group recommended 19 (total) PLs recommended for action. Of those, 13 are recommended for archiving via incorporation into 8900.10, which belongs to AFS-1, and 6 PLs that can be deleted / canceled. 8 PLs still need to be submitted / reviewed. There are 89 total PLs and of those 71 have been revised to the new format. Below is a list of the recommendations and some of the comments received. Please see attached file for summation.

PL Reformat W/G Recommends the Following Action for these PLs:

PL-6 (Digital Engine Tachometer Certification Guidance) - Certification issue - Guidance i.e. PL-6 put in same place.

PL-11 (Part 23 Fuel Pressure Indications): This PL should be deleted / canceled as this PL is more restrictive than what is required by FAR (14 CFR) 23.1305.

PL-16 (Operations (O) and Maintenance (M) Procedures): 8900 Guidance is available.

PL-27 (Electrical Systems-two engine A/C): This is basic airmanship – Can be canceled.

PL-33 (Pax Convenience Items): No longer applicable due to NEF.

PL-36 (**FAR Pt 91 MEL Approval)**: Information contained in preamble to PL 34.

ITEM CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

PL-46 (Standard and Interim Revisions): Only change since original issued in 1990 is the reformat from 1997. Recommend relocation to 8900.

PL-47 (Megaphones): This PL should be incorporated into 8900.

PL-65 (Cargo Provisions for Cargo Ops): 8900 Guidance available.

PL-68 (Use of Additional (M) and (O) Symbols in Operators' MEL): Only change since original issued in 1993 is the reformat from 1997. Recommend relocation to 8900.

PL-69 (**External Door Indicating System):** PL is specific to one kind of door and can be canceled

PL-70 (**Definitions Required in MELs) –** Delete Pax Convenience Item definition (only).

PL-71 (Policy Concerning Configurations and Fleet Approvals): Was incorporated into PL-25 by Revision 6 dated 1/31/95.

PL-81 (MEL and CDL Operator Procedures): Information included in 8900.1 Volume 4, Chapter 4 Section 4-878.

PL-82 (Use of "Operative" Terminology in MELs): Only change since original issued in 1996 is the reformat from 1997. Recommend relocation to 8900.

PL-85 (Lav Door Ashtrays): MMEL relief is per AD 74-08-09 R2, not the PL.

PL-88 (Air Carrier Handling of Discrepancies Discovered After "Blocking Out"…): This PL should be archived because this policy is now included in 8900.1, Volume 4, Chapter 4, section 4-629 E.

PL-92 (Parking Brakes): No revisions have been issued, still in original form dated 1982. Recommend PL to be archived.

PL-107 (Inoperative APU Generator): Was published because of an issue with the Fokker FOEB Chairman and has since gone away

PL-115 (Capstone-Alaska): Incorporation of Chelton EFIS into MMEL should be complete – can be archived.

IG-74 NOTE: Bob Davis is working on which Policy Letters that are remaining to go to 8900. The FAA felt that 20 Policy Letters were obsolete, should be archived or removed for inactivity.

IG 75 NOTE: Mark Lopez discussed IG Policy Letter review. Group is still working on this project. Mark asked for a volunteer to pick up Jim Foster's 8 Policy Letters for reviewing. Kevin Peters at FedEx volunteered.

ITEM CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

IG 76 NOTE: Tom Atzert updated the group on rebranding and reformatting. Sorted into several "buckets". **1.** Reformatted with no change. **2.** Reformatted, but needs rewrite. **3.** Archived. **4.** PL into 8900. George Ceffalo mentioned that he has received Policy Letters from Mark Lopez and that reformatting can move forward.

IG-77: George Ceffalo will send Tom Atzert and Mark Lopez the list of those Policy Letters that require additional final formatting.

77-24. Agenda 2003-04: Conversion of FAA MMEL Documents to XML (MMEL Transformation)

Objective: To streamline the process of formatting MMELs to upload on FAA server.

Item Leads: AFS-260 / Tom Atzert

Discussion: Working Group formed to develop MMEL XML schema. Group is to report progress at each IG meeting.

FAA will discuss short-term (convert MMELs to MS Word in tables format) solution of MMEL authoring challenges.

IG 72 NOTE: Bob Davis reported that the FAA mainframe is now shut down. The FSIMS website will host MMELs and Policy Letters and will have an e-mail notification function. He also stated that MMELs should be available on the new website within a few months.

IG 73 NOTE: Mark Lopez reported that CDG – Continental Data Graphics, a company that converts documents, will speak with Bob Davis to get some FAA-AQS contacts and XML experts to possibly begin working on a new format.

IG-74 NOTE: Mark Lopez at ATA is setting up a meeting in mid-May in Oklahoma City to discuss XML possibilities.

IG 75 NOTE: ATA e-business formed the MMEL Project Team, which has been tasked with developing a more robust MMEL XML schema that will provide data exchange capabilities. Project team met in OKC with FAA to discuss XML possibilities and direction. Representatives from Boeing, Airbus, Delta, United, JetBlue and Southwest attended. The second meeting was held recently in DC at ATA headquarters. The next meeting is to be hosted by Airbus and is planned for this October in Toulouse, France.

Walt Hutchings reported on the progress of the new FAA XML Schema. Testing is in progress at the FAA. Walt hopes to do a presentation at the next IG meeting in Wichita.

IG 76 NOTE: Bob Davis reported that testing so far has been successful. Industry MMEL Project Team (ATA e-business sponsored team) is working on an industry XML MMEL schema. Progress made at meeting in Toulouse, hosted by Airbus. Work continues, further updates to come.

IG-77: The InfoTrust group hosted the Flight Operations Information Group (FOIG) / MMEL Project Team meeting in Costa Mesa, California January 26th thru 29th. Numerous content issues were discussed to include (M) and (O) Procedures, CDL structure, System Faults and MMEL Cross Reference, CAS Identification and MMEL/DDG High Level requirements. The next meeting will be hosted by JetBlue in Orlando April 13th thru 16th.

77-25. Agenda 77-25: PL-119 – Two Section MMELs– See Agenda 77-25

Objective: Revise PL to add Part 135 applicability.

Item Lead: JP Dargis (Bombardier)

Discussion: Previous release of PL allow Section Two (CAS Message Relief) of Two-Section MMELs to be used by Part 91 operators only. Goal is to introduce Two-Section MMELs to Part 135 operators.

IG-77: Steve Kane reported that data collection is being conducted. Draft posed on Opspecs.com for review/comment.

77-26. New Agenda Item: MMEL Preamble Discussions– See Agenda 77-26a, 77-26b, 77-26c, 77-26d, 77-26e and 77-26f

Objective:

Item Lead: Tom Atzert, UAL

Discussion:

- AFS-260 has received input from Field Inspectors and Operators expressing concern and confusion with having two separate MMEL Preambles
- AEGs have also expressed concerns with the workload associated with maintaining two separate MMELs for aircraft types that are operated Part 91 as well as Parts 135
- FAA has suggested that combing the two Preambles is the best solution
- MMEL IG has submitted an alternative solution.

IG-77: Tom Atzert showed examples of the Part 91 and 121 Preambles. Bob Davis said that the vision was to print out the associated preamble, but that was too complex. FAA indicated that Tom's proposal was acceptable and may be adopted as the solution.

77-27. New Agenda Item: NEF Universal List Discussion– See Agenda 77-27

Objective:

Item Lead: Tom Atzert, UAL

Discussion:

- AFS-260 has been receiving reports of inconsistent application of NEF Guidance; some items being added to list should not be.
- One operator has expressed concerns to the IG about items like Potable Water Quantity Indicators and Potable Water and Toilet Service Dust cover caps for service ports being on the List
- Jim Foster and Tom Atzert had previously agreed to audit List and make recommendations

IG-77: Tom Atzert and Jim Foster agreed to take this offline and open up the NEF Universal List for revision. They will consider adding list of items that do not qualify for NEF.

77-28. Agenda 39-01: FAA / EASA MMEL Harmonization

Objective: Monitor the status of FAA/EASA Harmonization initiatives regarding MMELs.

Item Lead: Jim Foster (FAA AEG/SEA)

Discussion: FAA MMEL Procedures Manual discussed at IG 60. AEG SEA and AFS 260 will review the FAA MMEL Procedures Manual and report back to the IG.

IG requests this manual be formally accepted as FAA policy.

IG 68 NOTE: MMEL IG will be represented at EASA MMEL SG Meeting in Cologne, Germany Dec 18-19. Tom Atzert will attend and provide overview of EASA meeting.

IG-73 NOTE: Jim Foster had nothing new to report. Thierry Vandendorpe from EASA spoke about Operational Certificate Data (OCD) NPA and the CSS MMEL.

IG-74 NOTE: Jim Foster was not in attendance and the FAA had nothing to report.

IG 75 NOTE: Colin Hancock from EASA briefed the group. JAA has closed out as of June 30, 2009. Manufacturers must use an application form from the EASA website for MMEL changes or additions. EASA still sends the information to the National Civil Aviation Authority for final approval.

IG 76 NOTE: Thierry Vandendorpe from EASA spoke about development of a Policy Letter book for implementation in 2012.

IG-77: No change at this time per Pete Neff.

77-29. Agenda Item 71-29: ASAWG Update

Objective: To provide update on ASAWG activities

Item Lead: Dennis Landry

Discussion: At IG 70, Dennis Landry showed us a PowerPoint presentation on the Airplane-level Safety Analysis Working Group (ASAWG). This is a panel of engineers and risk experts who are looking into risk assessments pertaining to MMELs. Dennis Landry will keep us updated on the progress of the ASAWG meetings.

IG 72 NOTE: Paul Nordstrom gave us an update on the ASAWG's recent meeting in Wichita. A PowerPoint presentation was given and Colin Hancock from EASA added that the term "CS-MMEL" in the PowerPoint presentation refers to EASA's input.

IG 73 NOTE: Paul Nordstrom from Boeing and Christophe Giraudeau from Dassault are tweaking the language in the proposed guidance. They hope to have an update ready for the next IG meeting in April.

IG-74 NOTE: Paul Nordstrom provided update. Dennis Landry was not in attendance at this meeting.

IG 75 NOTE: Paul Nordstrom reported that there was a meeting in Cedar Rapids last month. There is still a push from the ASAWG group to use quantitative analysis / assessments for MMEL approval of new items.

IG 76 NOTE: CW Robertson from Cessna gave informative presentation on MMEL risk assessments as it pertains to the work being done by ASAWG. For more info, contact CW @ 316-517-1891 or cwrobertson@cessna.textron.com

IG-77: Mark Lopez has attempted to contact CW Robertson. There has been no change to date. Paul Nordstrom commented that all MEL items would have to meet certification rules. Lynn Lee (FAA) is the contact for SEA AEG.

77-30. Agenda Item 71-15: PL-58 Boom Microphone

Item Lead: David Burk

Discussion: David Burk proposed revision to PL-58 to address non-certificated operators (Part 91).

IG 72 NOTE: David Burk was unable to attend IG-72 and requested that this agenda item be deferred to IG 73.

IG-73 NOTE: David Burk requested that this item be tabled until the next meeting in Orlando. More research is needed on the regulations before moving forward. It was suggested that Draft 2 be removed from the website for now.

IG-74 NOTE: David Burk requested this be tabled again.

IG 75 NOTE: David Burk is still working on his proposal. It will be ready for the next IG meeting.

IG 76 NOTE: Tabled.

IG-77: John Melotte showed an initial draft from David Burk. David and Mark Giron will re-work to present a complete Policy Letter with discussion and revision details included.

77-31. Agenda: 60-14: PL-85, Lavatory Door Ashtrays

Objective: To determine whether or not to pursue a change to AD 74-08-09 R2

Item Lead: Tom Atzert, R. Wagner

Discussion: Qantas has requested a change to PL-85 and AD 74-08-09 R2 based on the fact that most airlines, if not all, are operating non-smoking flights. They feel that the interior ashtray is more essential than the exterior ashtray. DAL had submitted a proposal to the FAA to revise the AD in order to give maximum flexibility to the operators. FAA rejected the proposals saying that people will smoke regardless of the operating rule. On-demand air taxi and non-certificated operations (i.e. Part 91) may still allow smoking on board and, on those airplanes, lav door ashtrays are airworthiness/safety items. AD 74-08-09 R2 applies to all transport category airplanes, not just Part 121 passenger carrying operations. Seattle AEG agreed to discuss with ACO the possibility of revision to AD 74-08-09R2.

IG 64 NOTE: This has not been a problem for US carriers yet. No progress made yet on revising AD. Need feedback from SEA AEG on status.

IG 65 NOTE: Seattle AEG to have further discussion with ACO regarding the AD.

IG 66 NOTE: SEA ACO agreed to revise AD. Coordination with MMEL IG to take place before AD moves to NPRM status.

IG 67 NOTE: Bob Wagner was to review previous ACO/AEG proposal and provide suggestions.

IG 68 NOTE: Bob Wagner forwarded proposed AD revision (Para d) to Jim Foster/SEA AEG.

IG 70 NOTE: From Mark Lopez:

To all,

I called Ali Barahmi's office yesterday and received a return call from Alan Sinclair who is the FAA person responsible for this AD. I spoke with Alan and he mentioned the proposed revision to the AD, which would provide 3 days relief for more than one lavatory ashtray missing is in fact on his desk and drafted.

That being said, he mentioned the Transport Airplane Directorate (TAD) is basically on a "freeze" for revision submittals unless they are safety related (severe resource limitation). He stated the FAA legal has a long list of backlog items; one in particular is a Part 25 Cabin Equipment AC which Alan deemed much more important than this AD change request. He mentioned the draft AC has been on legal's desk for six months and keeps moving to the bottom based on other safety related items moving to the top.

Long story short is he had no estimate as to when the rule change might be published.

That's the update . . .

ITEM CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

IG 72 NOTE: Mark Lopez reported that this is still in work but at bottom of the ACO's list of priorities. The ACO has put a freeze on these activities unless they are safety related. Mark Lopez will follow-up in December and report at the next meeting.

IG-73 NOTE: Mark Lopez reported that this item is pretty much where it was at his last update. Alan Sinclair from the ACO stated that unless the revision to the FAR is safety critical (sensitive), it will be put on hold due to resources. Also, the new president has suspended any new rulemaking for now.

IG-74 NOTE: Mark Lopez had no updates at this time. Post meeting he obtained some additional SACO contact names (supervisors, etc.) and will call them for an update and report at IG 75 in D.C.

IG 75 NOTE: Mark Lopez asked the group (airline members) to look into how many onboard smoking events they have had this past year and report the results to him.

Several airlines provided data to Mark, who provided it to ACO.

IG 76 NOTE: Mark Lopez advises progress being made with the ACO toward getting the AD revised. Smoking occurrence data (requested by ACO) has been sent to Mark Lopez.

IG-77: Tom Atzert reported that Mark Lopez had written a letter to the ACO. A rule change is being pushed out of SEA in January. It should be posted as a NPRM on the Federal Register.

77-32. Agenda Item 75-37: Passenger Seatback and Seat Cushion Removal

Objective: Discuss option of removing seat backs when using passenger seat MEL relief to account for conditions where a failed seat/seatback protrudes into an exit row. Discuss option of removing seat cushions when using passenger seat MEL relief to account for spills or health hazards.

Item Lead: Tom Atzert, UAL

Discussion:

IG 75 NOTE: Jodi Baker, FAA Cabin Safety Specialist, agreed to take this back to AFS-200 for further review and research for the group and get back with us.

IG 76 NOTE: Jodi Baker, FAA Cabin Safety Specialist, agreed that seat cushions may be removed. Slight correction made to PL draft submitted by Tom Atzert. Agreed to go final, corrected draft sent to AFS-260.

Final draft of PL-79 sent to George for coordination on 11/18 – awaiting signature.

IG-77: PL-79 R7 posted final to Opspecs.com on 1/26/10. CLOSED

77-33. Agenda Item 67-17: PL-VV Policy for Equipment Required for Passenger Carrying Operations - **See Agenda 77-33**

Item Lead: Paul Nordstrom

Discussion: Paul Nordstrom raised the issue of Passenger Carrying Requirements in FAR 121.583. Previous agenda item 57-25 had the objective to determine if FAR 121.583 allows for carriage of revenue cargo. Ric Mabie was waiting for letter from Jerry Ostronic. No response from FAA on this and issue closed for now. Paul will propose a proviso (No passengers are carried) to be added to PL items required for passengers that would allow flight to only carry cargo (remains a passenger operation) and present them at next meeting. Dan Leduc will forward to Paul existing Transport Canada policy guidance on similar items

IG 68 NOTE: Revised proposal sent to AFS-260 to post for review and comment on Opspecs.com.

IG 71 NOTE: D5 sent to AFS-260 for posting on Opspecs.com for review and comment.

IG 72 NOTE: This item is still on the Draft Section of the OPSPECS website and no comments have been made. AFS-260 has been requested to post R0 D6 as final.

IG-73 NOTE: Bob Davis reported that he is receiving a lot of negative feedback in Washington on the "19" passenger provision in the PL. The FAA in Washington would like to see "0" passengers. A conference call with HQ personnel and interested IG members would help alleviate concerns with the proposed PL. Tom Atzert suggested to Bob Davis that a conference call be set up.

IG-74 NOTE: Bob Davis said that FAA Washington was still reviewing and that they had suggested changing the word "passengers" to "authorized persons". Also, there was a lot of pushback on supernumerary terminology. Bob Davis will try to get the folks in Washington that are against this to show up at the next IG meeting in DCA to express their concerns.

IG 75 NOTE: Jodi Baker, FAA Cabin Safety Specialist, was briefed by Paul Nordstrom on this item. She is going to take this PL proposal to AFS-200 for further review and research and get report back to the IG.

IG 76 NOTE: Steve Kane reported that Jodi Baker was discussing this with General Council and that we should have the FAA decision at the next meeting.

IG-77: Steve Kane said that 121.583 needs to be added into the "Policy". Revised Draft sent to AFS-260.

77-34. Agenda Item PL 24 Lavatory Fire Protection

Objective: Tom did a re-write of PL-24 - Standard Proviso for Lavatory Fire Protection to address an existing change already in the B777 MMEL. This clarifies the relief for cargo configuration. Propose that it go on OPSPECS for comment.

Item Lead: Tom Atzert, UAL

Discussion:

IG 76 NOTE: R4 presented, which clarifies Smoke Detector relief for cargo configurations. GC designation was deleted due to some airplane configurations differences. Some configurations require the lavatory door to remain OPEN for takeoff and landing, while the PL provides relief for lavatory smoke detector and fire extinguishers inoperative and requires the lavatory door to be CLOSED. MMEL relief to be modified as necessary to by the FOEB chairman.

IG-77:

PL-24 Rev 4, dated 11/01/09, posted 11/25/09. Item CLOSED.

This item will be removed from next agenda.

77-35. Agenda Item 76-33 PL 96 Galley/Cabin Waste Receptacles Access Doors/Covers - **See Agenda 77-35**

Objective: PL-96 only provides relief for the Galley Waste Receptacles Access Doors. We would like to revise the Policy Letter to include "/Cabin" after Galley. Pete Neff - A319/320 FAA AEG has assisted Bob on this re-write.

Item Lead: Bob Taylor, US Airways

Discussion:

IG 76 NOTE: Bob Taylor presented PL-96 R2, D1. All agreed to go final.

Final draft of PL-79 sent to George for coordination on 11/18.

IG-77: This Policy Letter is pending approval at headquarters.

77-36. Agenda Item 76-34: Part 91 MEL Documents AC 91-67 and PL-36 - **See Agenda 77-36a and 77-36b**

Objective: Review Part 91 MEL documents with the goal to propose changes to FAA that will align current regulatory requirements and operational environment.

Item Lead: Eli Cotti, NBAA

Discussion:

During IG 75 discussion, the group acknowledged a review of AC 91-67 and PL-36 was in order as they haven't revised in well over 10 years.

IG 76 NOTE: Steve Kane has AFS-800 lined up to work this.

Plan is to archive PL-36 and AC 91-67, and review/revise as necessary FSIMS 8900.1 Volume 4, Chapter 4, Section 2 "Approve a Minimum Equipment List for a 14 CFR Part 91 Operator"

IG-77: Mark Giron (FAA), will be involved in all Part 91 Policy Letter re-writes.

77-37. New Business / Review Action Items:

IG-77:

77-38. New Agenda Item: PL-9 PA / Interphone - **See Agenda 77-38a and 77-38b**

Objective: Bob Taylor, US Airways, is proposing a revision to correct copy / paste errors introduced into PL @ Rev 8

Item Lead: Bob Taylor, US Airways

Discussion:

IG-77: Paul Nordstrom will cleanup the Revision Highlights and then post for comment.

77-39. New Agenda Item: PL-79 Passenger Seats - **See Agenda 77-39**

Objective: Todd Schooler is proposing to add sub-items for seat features commonly found on corporate aircraft seats.

Item Lead: Todd Schooler, Cessna

Discussion:

IG-77: Item closed and will be removed from next agenda.

77-40. New Agenda Item: PL-124 Damaged Window / Windshield Relief - **See Agenda 77-40**

Objective: Minor correction being made to add "or other approved documentation" which was inadvertently omitted from the original PL release.

Item Lead:

Discussion:

IG-77: Item closed and will be removed from next agenda.

77-41. New Business:

8900.1 Discussion:

- New AEG / FOEB Guidance: Steve Kane reports AEG/FOEB Guidance is in work (Volume 8 will be added)

- Rewrite Project: Volume 4, Chapter 4 (MEL): AFS-260 has agreed to form working group, with MMEL IG participation, to audit and revise Volume 4, Section 4 (MEL) – goal is to improve and clarify guidance, align guidance with current practices and Policy Letters, and eliminate duplicate and non-value-added information, all of which will reduce number of Sections

IG-77:
Tom Atzert and Steve Kane to get a working group together for the re-write project, hopefully by the next meeting.

Since Delta Air Lines has parked all of the Northwest B747-200 aircraft, the question was raised about the Lead Airline responsibility for the B747-200 going forward.