

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes  
April 28-29, 2010  
Chicago, IL**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Agenda Item Number</b>	<b>DAY 1 Wednesday, April 28, 2010</b>	<b>Lead</b>
0830-0845	78-01	<b>Introduction / Administrative Remarks</b>	Tom Atzert
0845-0900	78-02	<b>MMEL IG / FOEB Calendar</b>	Tom Atzert
0900-0915	78-03	<b>2009 Final Policy Letters</b>	John Melotte
	78-04	<b>MMEL Policy Letter Status Summary</b>	
0915-0930	78-05	<b>Agenda Item 75-07: FOPB Process Discussion</b>	Steve Kane
0930-0940	78-06	<b>Agenda Item 66-07: ATA – MMEL / MEL Value to Industry Survey</b>	Tom Atzert Mark Lopez
0940-0945	78-07	<b>PL-1, Wide-body Door / Slide Inoperative - CLOSED PL-24, Lavatory Fire Protection - CLOSED PL-39, Altitude Alerting System - CLOSED PL-40 - New ETOPS Rule - CLOSED PL-79, Passenger Seat Cushion Removal - CLOSED PL-86, Compliance with MMEL Revs - CLOSED PL-96, Galley/Cabin Waste Receptacles - CLOSED PL-99, All Cargo Slide Relief - CLOSED PL-124, Damaged Window/Windshield – CLOSED PL-125 (was VV), Passenger Items - CLOSED</b>	Tom Atzert
0945-1000	78-08	<b>Agenda Item 66-15: PL-100, Cargo Restraints Components</b>	NWA
1000-1030		<b>BREAK</b>	
1030-1045	78-09	<b>Agenda Item 64-10a: PL-98, Navigation Databases</b>	NDB WG / ALPA
1045-1115	78-10	<b>Agenda Item 78-10: Nitrogen Gas Generation / Fuel Inerting – Repair Category Discussion</b>	AFS-260 Mark Lopez
1115-1130	78-11	<b>Agenda Item 75-18: PL-25, Policy Concerning MMEL Definitions</b>	Bob Taylor Tim Kane
1130-1145	78-12	<b>Agenda Item 75-19: PL-104, Overhead Storage Bin(s) / Cabin and Galley Storage Compartments / Closets</b>	Bryan Watson David L. Robinson
1145-1200	78-13	<b>Agenda Item 75-20: PL-87, MMEL for Flight Data Recorder (FDR)</b>	Tom Atzert Steve Kane
1200-1315		<b>LUNCH</b>	

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes  
April 28-29, 2010  
Chicago, IL**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Agenda Item Number</b>	<b>DAY 1 (Cont'd) Wednesday, April 28, 2010</b>	<b>Lead</b>
1315-1330	78-14	<b>Agenda Item 75-21: PL-123, Passenger Notice System (Lighted Information Signs)</b>	Darrel Sheets
1330-1400	78-15	<b>Agenda Item 78-15: PL-31, MMEL Format Specifications – (Spec #12; Identification of FARs)</b>	Paul Nordstrom Darrel Sheets Pete Neff
1400-1415	78-16	<b>Agenda Item 75-24: PL-31, MMEL Format Specification – ‘Next-Gen’ MMEL Specs</b>	Walt Hutchings
1415-1430	78-17	<b>Agenda Item 2003-04: Conversion of FAA MMEL Documents To XML (MMEL Transformation)</b>	Bob Davis Mark Lopez
1430-1445	78-18	<b>Agenda Item 70-18: Policy Letter Rewrite: New Format, FAA Branding and incorporate new GC Header</b>	Mark Lopez Tom Atzert
1445-1500	78-19	<b>Agenda Item 75-25: Clarify Use of “-“ in “Number Installed” Column in Operator MELs</b>	Tom Atzert David Burk
1500-1530	<b>BREAK</b>		
1530-1545	78-20	<b>Agenda Item 77-25: PL-119, Two-Section MMELs</b>	JP Dargis
1545-1550	78-21	<b>Agenda Item 78-21: MMEL Preamble Discussion</b>	Steve Kane Tom Atzert
1550-1615	78-22	<b>Agenda Item 78-22: PL-116 &amp; NEF Universal List Discussion</b>	Steve Kane Tom Atzert Jim Foster
1615-1630	78-23	<b>New Agenda Item: Airbus EASA MMEL Section 3 Discussion</b>	Tim Kane Tom Atzert Airbus Rep

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes  
April 28-29, 2010  
Chicago, IL**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Agenda Item Number</b>	<b>DAY 2 Thursday, April 29, 2010</b>	<b>Lead</b>
0730-0735	78-24	<b>Agenda Item 39-01: FAA / EASA MMEL Harmonization</b>	FAA
0735-0745	78-25	<b>Agenda Item 71-29: ASAWG Update</b>	Dennis Landry
0745-0800	78-26	<b>Agenda Item 71-15: PL-58, Boom Microphone</b>	David Burk
0800-0805	78-27	<b>Agenda Item 60-14: PL-85, Lavatory Door Ashtrays</b>	Mark Lopez Bob Wagner
0810-0820	78-28	<b>Agenda Item 67-17: PL-VV (PL-125), Policy for Equipment Required for Passenger Carrying Operations</b>	Paul Nordstrom
0820-0825	78-29	<b>Agenda Item 78-29: PL-9, PA / Interphone</b>	Bob Taylor
0825-0830	78-30	<b>Agenda Item 78-30: FSIMS 8900.1 Rewrite Project: Volume 4, Chapter 4 (MEL)</b>	Steve Kane
0830-0845	78-31	<b>New Agenda Item: Discrete Warning / Caution / Advisory &amp; Other Types of Status Lights</b>	Tom Atzert
0845-0900	78-32	<b>New Agenda Item: TCAS: Required to be Operative in Certain Foreign Airspace?</b>	Tom Atzert
0900-0930		<b>BREAK</b>	
0930-0945	78-33	<b>New Agenda Item: Night Vision Goggles</b>	Steve Kane
0945-1000	78-34	<b>New Agenda Item: Capstone Equipment (was PL-115)</b>	Steve Kane
1000-1030	78-35	<b>New Business</b> <b>1. PL-15, Policy Regarding Continued Operations with Inoperative or Missing Equipment: No mention of 14 CFR 121.628</b> <b>2. PL-29: CVR</b>	Tom Atzert Paul Nordstrom
<b>IG 78 ADJOURN</b>			

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes  
April 28-29, 2010  
Chicago, IL**

**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 opssecs.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.**

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes  
April 28-29, 2010  
Chicago, IL**

**78-01. Introduction / Administrative Remarks**

**IG-78:**

Tom Atzert introduced Mr. Don Dillman from United's' Operations Control Center. Mr. Dillman reinforced the importance of the MMEL IG and the benefits that it accomplishes for industry.

Also, Jim Perella will assume the Co-Chairman duties from Tom at the next IG meeting in Aug.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes  
April 28-29, 2010  
Chicago, IL**

**78-02. MMEL IG / FOEB Calendar - See Agenda 78-02**

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

**IG-78:**

MMEL IG 79 will be conducted on Aug 18 and 19 in DCA.

MMEL IG 81 will be conducted on January 26 and 27 in San Antonio.

DC-10 Lead Airline – Dave Burk to ask World Airlines to volunteer for Lead Airline for the DC-10.

Tom Atzert said UAL is assigned as the lead airline for the A350.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes  
April 28-29, 2010  
Chicago, IL**

**78-03. 2009 Final Policy Letters - See Agenda 78-03**

**IG-78:**

Refer to FINAL FAA Policy Letters Issued in 2010 .

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes  
April 28-29, 2010  
Chicago, IL**

**78-04. MMEL Policy Letter Status Summary - See Agenda 78-04**

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

**IG-78:**

Refer to POLICY LETTER STATUS SUMMARY.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-05. 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-78:**

Steve Kane reported to the Group that the FOPB will not be reinstated at this time. A variant of the FOPB may be assembled in the future at a later date TBD.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-06. Agenda Item 66-07: ATA MMEL / MEL Value to Industry Survey**

**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-78:**

ATA has received only 3 completed surveys to date. Tom Atzert called for all carriers to complete the survey and forward it to ATA. Any questions about completing the survey can be addressed to Tom Atzert or Mark Lopez.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-07. CLOSED Agenda Items:**

PL-1, Wide-body Door / Slide Inoperative – R4 dated 02/27/2010

PL-24, Lavatory Fire Protection – R4 dated 11/02/2009

PL-39, Altitude Alerting System – R5 dated 01/28/2010

PL-40 - New ETOPS Rule – R2 dated 12/03/2009

PL-79, Passenger Seat Cushion Removal – R7 dated 12/01/2009

PL-86, Compliance with MMEL Revs – R5 dated 01/29/2010

PL-96, Galley/Cabin Waste Receptacles – R2 dated 01/29/2010

PL-99, All Cargo Slide Relief – R2 dated 02/26/2010

PL-124, Damaged Window/Windshield – R0 dated 01/20/2009 (posted 04/02/2010 with minor change)

PL-125 (was VV), Passenger Items – R0 to be posted final

**IG-78:**

PL-100 is signed by AFS per Steve Kane and should be posted as final soon.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-08. Agenda Item 66-15: PL-100 Cargo Restraints / W&B - See Agenda 78-08**

**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**

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

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](http://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**

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

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-78:**

PL 100 signed per Steve Kane and to be posted as final soon. Item CLOSED.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes  
April 28-29, 2010  
Chicago, IL**

**78-09. Agenda Item 64-10a: PL-98, Navigation Databases**

**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 Nav aids 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**

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

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

*Comments from opssecs.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**

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

*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**

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

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 opssecs.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 Opssecs.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 OPSSECS 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 opssecs.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**

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

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-78:**

Per Steve Kane, Bob Davis recommends leaving PL-98 in its present form. Dennis Landry strongly disagrees with this and is concerned about data base issues when operating within today's airspace environment. Tom Atzert recommended leaving PL-98 on the agenda.

UAL nav data base expert Mr. Fergus Flanagan gave a presentation on how they validate nav data base changes and how they cope with nav data base issues at United.

Steve Kane said that he would arrange a nav data base meeting the afternoon of the second day of the next MMEL IG meeting in DCA to discuss.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-10. Agenda Item 78-10: Nitrogen Gas Generation / Fuel Inerting – Repair Category**  
**Discussion - See Agenda 78-10**

**Objective:** Change to Category D during compliance period, and Category C at compliance deadline.

**Item Lead:** Mark Lopez, ATA

**Discussion:** Mark has been in discussions with ACO concerning Repair Category.

**IG-78:**

Mr. Bryan Watson from SEA AEG gave a presentation on the NGS system and how the rules relate to it and how the MMEL time limit was determined for the A318/319/320/321. The timeline was also shown indicating when operators to retrofit their aircraft with these systems. Ref. CFR 121.1117.

Boeing 737, 747-400 & 777 MMEL relief for NGS at Cat A, 10 day  
A320 Family MMEL relief for NGS at Cat A, 20 day

Industry is concerned that spare parts unavailability will lead to flight interruptions since MMEL relief at Cat A is not extendable.

It is highly possible that, during the compliance period, an NGS modified airplane at one gate could be grounded for lack of spare parts, while an airplane without NGS installed at the next gate departs.

Dave Stewart suggested that pilot group may be able to influence repair category during the compliance period.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-11. Agenda Item: PL-25, Policy Concerning MMEL Definitions - See Agenda 78-11**

**Objective:** To revise coverage for Airbus Electronic Fault Alerting Systems in Definition 23; correct definition 1.e and add new definition for HMT.

**Item Lead:** Tom Atzert

**Discussion:**

1. Airbus FOEB Chairman signed off on Airbus Def #23c
2. Minor correction to rev bar requirement in Def #1.e
3. Much discussion at IG meeting concerning use of acronym HMT in MMELs. AFS-300 agreed to latest proposal. New Def #31 added.

**IG-78:**

PL-25 issued – Item CLOSED.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-12. New Agenda Item: PL-104 Overhead Storage Bin(s)/Cabin and Galley Storage Compartments/Closets – See Agenda 78-12**

**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-78:**

PL-104 revised to add “Retracted in Fully Open Position”. Jim foster recommends deleting term “overhead”. Tom Atzert will re-title PL (remove overhead) and then repost PL.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-13. Agenda Item 75-20: PL-87, Master Minimum Equipment list (MMEL) for Flight Data Recorder (FDR) - See Agenda 78-13**

**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-78:**

Final – Item CLOSED.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-14. Agenda Item 75-21: PL-123, Passenger Notice System (Lighted Information Signs) - See Agenda 78-14**

**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-78:**

Presently under review by AFS-200, should go final soon. Item CLOSED.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-15. Agenda Item 70-12: PL-31 MMEL Format Specifications; Spec #12; Identification of FARs- See Agenda 78-15a & 78-15b**

**Objective:** Revise PL-31 Spec #12 to address identification of specific FAR references in MMELs

**Item Leads:** Paul Nordstrom, Darrel Sheets, Pete Neff

**Discussion:** Recent change to PL-31 required insertion of specific FAR reference in certain MMELs with “As required by FAR” in Remarks or Exception column. Many members objected to the PL change and offered suitable alternative suggestion, which basically adds a list of specific FAR references and the associated MMEL relief item as Appendix A to PL-31. This will facilitate operator MEL development and the FAA inspector MEL review and approval process.

**IG-78:**

Paul Nordstrom to update PL 31, to include Appendix A in PL-25 and amend PL-70 as required.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-16. 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-78:**

Steve Kane briefed the group on the movement of all PL’s to FSIMS site by the end of the year. Web view will be very similar to what is seen today for PL’s on the OPSPECS web site.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-17. 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 78 NOTE:** Walt Hutchings reports that operator MEL compliance tracking and reporting functionality has been tested and soon to be deployed. Notice that will go out to field offices has been written, and is awaiting final coordination before sending out. AEG authoring/publication tools about two thirds complete.

**IG-78:**

Reference IG 78 NOTE above.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-18. 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 opspecc.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 5<sup>th</sup> to go over the revised PLs. He further suggested that we have a meeting on January 27<sup>th</sup>, 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.

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

**ITEM CONTINUED NEXT PAGE**

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**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.

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-78:**

AFS – 200 still working 13 PL's toward final formatting. Item CLOSED.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-19. 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 78:**

Item tabled until Aug IG meeting.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes  
April 28-29, 2010  
Chicago, IL**

**78-20. Agenda 77-25: PL-119 – Two Section MMELs– See Agenda 78-20**

**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 e used by Part 91 operators only. Goal is to introduce Two-Section MMELs to Part 135 operators.

**IG 78:**

Waiting for information from part 91 operator updates. AFS-800 to facilitate gathering of data from Part 91 Global Express operators. Revisit during Aug IG meeting.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-21. New Agenda Item: MMEL Preamble Discussions**

**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 combining the two Preambles is the best solution
- MMEL IG has submitted an alternative solution.

**IG 78 NOTE:** AFS-260 accepted MMEL IG alternative solution reviewed at IG 77. Agenda item will remain open until Preamble issue is closed.

**IG 78:**

Remove from agenda per Tom Atzert - Withdrawn.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-22. Agenda Item 78-22: NEF Universal List Discussion– See Agenda 78-22a & 78-22b**

**Objective:** Clarify PL-116 and FSIMS 8900.1 NEF Guidance concerning items that are candidates for inclusion in operator NEF Programs.

**Item Lead:** Tom Atzert, Jim Foster

**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 78:**

Tom Atzert presented NEF and DO NEF lists at the meeting.

Tom will revise the NEF list and adjust items as necessary.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-23. New Agenda Item: Airbus EASA MMEL Section 3 Discussion**

**Objective:** Make MMEL IG members aware of Airbus plans to remove Section 3 (Recommended MEL Maintenance Procedures) from the EASA MMEL.

**Item Lead:** Tom Atzert, Tim Kane, Airbus Rep

**Discussion:** Operators have expressed concern to Airbus re: their plans to delete Section 3. MMEL IG decided to elevate the discussion.

**IG 78:**

Airbus representatives Gerry Walker and Valentino Vernier presented Airbus's proposal for the removal of Section 3 from the EASA A320F MMELs. They stated that the AMM will replace section 3. Valentino stated that Airbus was able to identify 28 items that they will convert from (M) procedures to (O) procedures within their MMEL. This will allow more crew deferral items by moving the action from the AMM to the MMEL (O) procedure.

Tim Kane recommended to Airbus that they develop a Dispatch Deviation Guide for operators to use along with the current FAA MMEL. This would synchronize numbering and procedures to the FAA MMEL for use by operators when building their MEL.

Removal of Section 3 from EASA MMELs under review by Airbus.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-24. 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-78:**

Emilie Marchais from EASA stated no updates because of cancellation of a meeting in Europe due to travel problems associated with recent volcanic activity.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-25. Agenda Item 71-29: ASAWG Update - See Agenda 78-25**

**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](mailto:cwrobertson@cessna.textron.com)

**IG-78:**

Paul Nordstrom stated that numerical analysis for MMEL items is a large part of this. Final report has been sent to FAA and NPRM to be published. Item CLOSED until NPRM is issued.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-26. 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-78:**

Dave Burk briefed the item regarding single pilot headsets/microphones. Dave will solicit inputs from the group and will revise the proposal for the next IG meeting.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-27. 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**

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

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-78:**

Tom Atzert updated the group about the status of the AD. The AD is to be revised at FAA, but is in line with several other projects, so the timeframe is undetermined at this time. Todd Schooler to look at part 23 aircraft and split PL and report back to the group.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-28. Agenda Item 67-17: PL-VV Policy for Equipment Required for Passenger Carrying Operations**

**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 78 NOTE:** PL-125 expected to go final prior to IG 78.

**IG-78:**

PL issued. Item CLOSED.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes  
April 28-29, 2010  
Chicago, IL**

**78-29. New Agenda Item: PL-9 PA / Interphone - See Agenda 78-29**

**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 78 NOTE:** PL-9 expected to go final prior to IG 78.

**IG 78:**

PL at AFS-200. Item CLOSED.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-30. Agenda Item 78-30: FSIMS 8900.1 Rewrite Project: Volume 4, Chapter 4 (MEL)**

**Objective:** Improve and clarify content of MEL Sections of 8900.1.

**Item Lead:** Steve Kane

**Discussion:** Industry and FAA inspectors continue to struggle with intent of various portions of 8900.1 MEL guidance.

**IG 78 NOTE:** Steve Kane advises that tentative start date for project is June, 2010.

**IG 78:**

8900.1 Vol4 Chpt 4 re-write project. Steve Kane reported that Bob Davis wants this section re-written starting this summer. Steve has been tasked with forming a working group along with industry involvement. The group will consist of industry and AEG.

Submit to Tom Atzert your name via e-mail if you wish to participate in this effort. Will be 2 face to face meetings and the rest will be telecon. Probably 3 from IG will participate, but more IG members may be involved to assist those chosen. Tom will organize telecon for those interested, and to select industry working group members.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-31. New Agenda Item: Discrete Warning / Caution / Advisory & Other Types of Status Lights**  
**- See Agenda 78-31**

**Objective:** Identify best method for deferring failures of bulbs in multi-bulb annunciators and switch lights.

**Item Lead:** Tom Atzert

**Discussion:** AMTs reportedly incorrectly deferring Discrete Warning / Caution / Advisory & Other Types of Status Lights using Cockpit and Instrument Lighting System MEL item.

**IG 78:**

Tom Atzert presented annunciator light deferrals when individual bulb(s) are inoperative within a multi bulb indicator. Some operators in the past may have used the flight deck lighting MEL to defer these bulbs. MMEL relief has been developed for the Airbus and could be developed for other fleets by using EICAS or other indications as a backup.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-32. New Agenda Item: TCAS: Required to be Operative in Certain Foreign Airspace? - See Agenda 78-32**

**Objective:** Determine foreign country requirements for operative TCAS (China, Japan, Australia, etc).

**Item Lead:** Tom Atzert

**Discussion:** IFALPA reports TCAS required to be operative in certain foreign airspace and says flight crews subject to fines if TCAS on MEL and special permission to operate not obtained. Apparently waivers can be obtained, but the method to obtain the waiver is a mystery.

**IG 78:**

Dave Stewart and Dave Abbott have volunteered to work this and report back to group. They will seek information of possible annual waiver that apparently is available to local Japanese carriers.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes  
April 28-29, 2010  
Chicago, IL**

**78-33. New Agenda Item: Night Vision Goggles**

**Objective:**

**Item Lead:** Steve Kane

**Discussion:**

**IG 78:**

Steve Kane briefed the group on this new policy as is customary for all PLs. PL formatting will be adjusted before issuance.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes  
April 28-29, 2010  
Chicago, IL**

**78-34. New Agenda Item: Capstone Equipment (was PL-115)**

**Objective:**

**Item Lead:** Steve Kane

**Discussion:**

**IG 78:**

PL needs to be re-issued with new title as it is still needed. New version posted to Opspecs.com for review/comment.

**MMEL IG Meeting 78 Minutes**  
**April 28-29, 2010**  
**Chicago, IL**

**78-35. New Business:**

**IG 78:**

1. PL-15: No mention of 14 CFR 121.628

Paul Nordstrom started discussion about origin of PL and purpose as it simply discusses continued operation with inoperative equipment. It also does not list Part 121 operators. Recommend archiving.

2. PL-29: CVR

Paul Nordstrom – PL-29 R5D1 CVR presented which included relief for an independent power source. Post draft for comments and then re-visit in Aug.

3. Category A as it pertains to part 91.

Dave Burk asked about flight days Vs calendar days during a recent change to the Falcon MMEL, as three consecutive calendar days is now more restrictive and this diverges from the established policy letter 29 for CVR as well.

Also, he discussed if category A need to be adhered to by part 91 operators because the time limit is described in the proviso. Mark Giron, AFS-800, to research and report back to IG at the August meeting.