

U.S. Domestic Chairpersons

FAA CHAIR	Robert Davis
INDUSTRY CHAIR	Casey Seabright
INDUSTRY CO-CHAIR	Rich Yuknavich

TABLE OF CONTENTS

January 18, 13:00 - 17:00 P.M Session			
	OPS SPEC #	TOPIC or OPS SPEC TITLE	PAGE (Link)
	----	Chairperson's Remarks	2
1	C050	Special Pilot-in-Command Qualification Airports (Standing Agenda Item)	2
2	S400	CAST Safety Enhancement	3
3	C073	IFR Approach Procedures Using Vertical Navigation	3
4	C063	C063: IFR RNAV 1 Departure Procedures (DP) and Standard Terminal Arrivals STAR)	3
5	C081	Special Non 14 CFR Part 97 Instrument Approach or Departure Procedures	4
6	B343	Fuel Reserves for Flag and Supplemental Operations	4
7	C067	Special Airport Authorizations, Provisions, and Limitations	4
8	C054	Special Limitations and Provisions for Instrument Approach Procedures and IFR Landing Minimums	5
9	C051	Terminal Instrument Procedures	5
10	A029	Aircraft Interchange Agreement for Part 121	5
11	C300	Part 97 NDB, NDB/DME, VOR, and VOR/DME Instrument Approach Procedures Using Substitute Means of Navigation	6
12	C055	Alternate Airport IFR Weather Minimums	6
13	--	Stakeholder Survey	7
January 19, 09:00 A.M. - 12:00 P.M Session			
14	--	WebOPSS Update	8
15	A010	Aviation Weather	8
16	A025	Electronic Record Keeping Systems	9
17	B036 /B05 4	Class II Navigation	9
18	C059	Category II Instrument Approach and Landing Operations	10
19	D084	Special Flight Permit with Continuous Authorization to Conduct Ferry Flights	11
20	D081	Parts Pool Agreement Authorization	11
21	D301	Aircraft Network Security Program (ANSP)	12
22	---	New Business /	12
22a	- A117	A117 Fatigue Risk Management	12
22b	C060	C060: Category III Instrument Approach and Landing Operations	12
22c	C060	Category III Instrument Approach and Landing Operations	14
22d		SMGCS, Surface Movement Guidance and Control System (Low Visibility Taxi Procedures)	14
22e	--	Stage II ICAO Noise Assessment Forms and European Cockpit Inspections	14
22f	A001	Maintenance Ferry Flights with Revenue Cargo	15
22g	A027	Land and Hold Short Operations	15
23		Closing remarks	16

MINUTES

Chairpersons Discussion

Discussion
<p>Casey Seabright, (Delta) Industry Chair.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSWG 2012 Goals Casey stated his primary goals for the group was to increase the overall effectiveness of the group and to improve Industry-FAA communication and internal Industry cross communication. • Reviewed meeting dates for 2012 – All in D.C. • 17-18 Apr, 17-18 Jul, Oct-Nov TBD (Attempting to deconflict election activities) • Roster Review <p>Bob Davis, FAA Chair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advice for current or future merger parties. Single set of Ops Specs are possible as soon as the merger parties achieve single operational control. Prior to that multiple sets of Ops Specs are necessary. • Draft Ops Spec Comment Posting Issues It is up to the individual Office of primary responsibility whether to and when to post comments to draft documents. Bob has encouraged posting all representative comments, but due to some past acerbic comments from industry some OPRs are gun shy. Bob asked that comments be keep civil and, ideally, critical analysis should include suggested changed verbiage. <p>John McGraw, AFS 2 Second Day Opening Remarks</p> <p>Mr. McGraw thanked everyone for their participation, especially the industry and FAA participants who travel long distances at great expense to attend. As a senior FAA official, He views the OSWG as one of the most important forums in U.S, Aviation. He expressed apologies for any gaps in service that the funding struggles may have had on carrier operations. Congress promises that FAA reauthorization will be one of the top priorities for this year. Mr. McGraw said he regrets the slow progress in agency efficiency improvements. He is proud of one exception, the NAV Lean program. When queried, one OSWG industry participant actually knew about the program. (Rich Yuknavich denies being an FAA plant).</p> <p>The NAV Lean program centers on tracking tools to identify bottleneck in the process of Part 97 instrument procedure creation and review. In the current constrained CFR revision environment Mr. McGraw sees the use of Ops Specs as a key means of moving the aviation industry into the next generation of improved, safer operations.</p>

1. C050: Special Pilot-in-command Qualification Airports

Discussion		
Standing Agenda Item:		
- No standing requests for addition or deletion of any specific airport.		
Question was raised about where the request for change in the listing was located: http://fsims.faa.gov/PICResults.aspx?mode=Publication&doctype=OPSS Guidance		
Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
None	N/A	N/A

2. S400: CAST Safety Enhancements

Discussion		
<p>S400 is a data collection tool intended to gather critical information about the voluntary implementation of Commercial Aviation Safety Team (CAST) Safety Enhancements. A recent legal review confirmed carrier protection from Freedom of Information Act disclosure of confidential safety related information. AFS-260 solicits assistance from any carrier who is willing to participate in testing the Beta programming associated with S400 sometime in the March timeframe. The group consensus was to change this item status from a standing item to delete unless significant program changes arise.</p>		
Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Remove as Agenda Item; Monitor	FAA : Greg Michael, Keeton Zachary Industry: Steve Bush Rich Yuknavich	N/A

3. C073: IFR Approach Procedures Using Vertical Navigation (VNAV)

Discussion		
<p>Kel Christiansen AFS 470 Revised Ops Spec and Guidance should be posted soon Minimal discussion</p>		
No Update		
Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
AFS 470 plans to post draft on web site for comment	FAA: Kel Christiansen Industry: Joe Devito	March 2012

4. C063: IFR RNAV 1 Departure Procedures (DP) and Standard Terminal Arrivals (STAR)

Discussion		
<p>Kel Christianson AFS-470. A revised non-mandatory Ops Spec C063 template has been posted. The WebOPSS guidance menu also contains a link to the accompanying guidance in N 8900.176, Subject: OpSpec/MSpec/LOA C063, Area Navigation (RNAV) and Required Navigation Performance (RNP) Terminal Operations (For 14 CFR Part 129, see Order 8900.1, Volume 12, Chapter 2, Section 5.) This notice also announces the revision to all C063 templates. This is a non-mandatory revision. The current template will remain valid and will only need to be updated when one of the following occurs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The certificate holder/operator/program manager needs to make a change to the aircraft or systems on the template, or • The certificate holder/operator/program manager applies for RNP 1 or TA authorization.. <p>Rich Yuknavich Post meeting note: It might be helpful to read the C063 guidance in Order 8900.1, Vol. 3, Chap. 18, Sec 5 Change 188 (1/6/12) for an overview before referring to N8900.176.or slugging through the Advisory Circulars.</p>		
Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Retain as discussion item for future feedback about approval process	FAA: John Swigart Christiansen Industry: Rich Yuknavich	N/A

5. C081: Special Non 14 CFR Part 97 Instrument Approach or Departure Procedures

Discussion		
<p>Kel Christianson AFS-470. The issue of private approaches used by multiple users has created a funding conundrum. A purely private procedure used by one or maybe two carriers is easy to assess upkeep charges. Truly public procedures are maintained with appropriated funds. Supposedly private but actually just non-public procedures used by multiple carriers are problematic. FAA lawyers are studying the issue and if an equitable fee regime cannot be developed, such approaches may be made public with special authorization required. What may be the result is a published, Non-Part 97 procedure.</p>		
Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Monitor for updates	<p>FAA: John Swigart (AFS 470) Industry: Jim Winkleman</p>	2012-01 meeting

6. B343: Fuel Reserves for Flag and Supplemental Operations

Discussion		
<p>B343 as an Ops Spec remains on hold and not available to additional carriers at this time.</p>		
<p>FAA is working toward a PBM fuel reserves model similar to the draft ICAO Annex 6.</p>		
<p>FAA requests that carriers review and comment on Annex 6 (draft) through IATA or ATA.</p>		
<p>Once the new Annex 6 is settles/issued, B343 should be resurrected.</p>		
Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Review draft Annex 6 and comment through IATA or A4A.	<p>FAA: Gordy Rother, Dave Burnham, Leo Hollis</p>	
	<p>Industry: Steve Kuhar</p>	

7. C067: Special Airport Authorizations, Provisions, and Limitations

Discussion		
<p>Dispatch Inspector Scott Stacy, discussed C067 and his proposal that since there are two paragraphs (A&B) that deal with different specific airport issues, that the single table should be two tables; one for each specific issue.</p>		
<p>Rich Yuknavich (American): Two tables may not be necessary. A single table would suffice if, for each airport, information could be inserted in horizontally rows that span the entire table/page width. With the current triple column formatting, 90% of the verbiage is contained in the last column which drives up the page count with mostly blank space on the left side of the table.</p>		
Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Update at next meeting	<p>Industry: Jim Winkleman and Rich Yuknavich</p>	Open Item

8. C054: A Special Limitations and Provisions for Instrument Approach Procedures and IFR Landing Minimums)

Discussion		
John Cowan in absentia: C054 needs to be more specific in its reference to “the landing field length specified for the destination airport by the appropriate Sections of the CFR”.		
Jackson Seltzer (United) recommended standardization between C054 and other Ops Specs governing approach criteria. Suggestion by Bob Davis was for coordination with industry and participation by Brant Welch, Gordy Rother and Jerry Ostronic.		
Coby Johnson pledged support for harmonization guidance among Ops Specs C054, C059, and C060		
Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Industry proposed draft language for Ops Spec Paragraphs and applicable guidance.	FAA: TBD Industry John Cowan	New Item

9. C051: Terminal Instrument Procedures

Discussion		
Update language in C051 due to JAR-OPS has been replaced with EU-OPS effective July 16, 2011		
Chris Hope AFS 410 mentioned that a revision to this Ops Spec language is needed to update terminology PANS-OPS to EU-OPS. Kel Christianson added that 051 may be combined with C052.		
Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Industry proposed draft language for Ops Spec Paragraphs and applicable guidance.	FAA: TBD Industry Andy Newcomer	New Item

10. A029: Aircraft Interchange Agreement for Part 121

Background: Authorizes Part 121 certificate holders to use aircraft interchange agreements with other operators.		
Discussion		
Rich Carpenter: Definition of Primary operator is not correct.		
Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Need correction to definition of primary operator, and the addition of aircraft serial number to the Part 121 template. Proposed draft verbiage solicited.	FAA for Part 121: David Catey AFS-200 FAA for Part 135: Larry Buehler AFS-200	N/A
	Industry: Rich Carpenter	

11. C300; Navaid Substitution

Discussion		
John Swiggart AFS-470 briefed that there are no plans to make any immediate changes to the Ops Spec, but AFS-470 would entertain submission of non-language language for special cases. John suggested that carriers, especially those without Ops Spec C300 make maximum use of the provisions outlined in AC90-107 for RNAV substitution. Depending on the final analysis of the MITRE study AFS-470 may first allow use of C300 for alternate approaches.		

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
	FAA: AFS-470 John Swigart	
Update/Monitor	Jackson Seltzer, Jim Winkleman, Rick Yuknavich	N/A

12. C055: Alternate Airport IFR Weather Minimums

Discussion		
<p>Update from John Swigart AFS-470. In December 2011, a draft copy of the MITRE contractor study concerning feasibility and safety assessment of allowing alternate minimums based on GPS approaches was published. AFS-470 is reviewing the study. If it is determined that changes can be made to current policy, there will need to be harmonization between the different 14 CFR carrier types. Related guidance in the Instrument Procedures Manual and the AIM will also need to be updated. If GPS minimums are allowed, there is a possibility of two eligibility tiers for aircraft based on navigation system levels of fault detection and fault alerting. Similar RAIM prediction requirements as are in place for C300 may be required. (References TSO 196 for WAAS, TSO-129 for DME/DME updating.</p> <p>Jackson Seltzer (United/Houston) query: will the FAA ever require all carriers to have WAAS in the future. John Swigart said some carriers may need WAAS for demanding conditions. In some cases DME/DME FMS RNAV is adequate. FAA would like all aircraft to first have GPS. Until that happens WAAS is a separate issue.</p>		
Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
	FAA: AFS-470 John Swigart	
Update/Monitor	Jim Winkleman, Andy Newcomer	N/A

13. Stakeholder Survey

Discussion		
If you attended the meeting and didn't fill out a survey, you can FAX or E-mail this sheet below to: Paul Lepine, AFS-260, Paul.Lepine@faa.gov FAX 202.267.5229 Office 202.267.3205		
Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
	FAA: Bob Davis	Standing Item

	<p>AVS Quality Management System</p>	<p>QPM # AFS-002-206-F1</p>	<p>Revision 0</p>
Title: Ops Spec Template Feedback Survey		Date: 1/18/2011	Page 1 of 1

1=Low 2=Average 3=High

1. What is your overall satisfaction with your interaction with FAA personnel related to Ops Spec template and guidance development?

1 2 3 N/A

2. What is your overall satisfaction with the template and guidance development process?

1 2 3 N/A

3. What is your overall satisfaction with the structure of the OSWG?

1 2 3 N/A

4. What is your overall satisfaction with the quarterly OSWG meetings?

1 2 3 N/A

Please provide comments for any question you marked 1 (low).

14. WebOPSS Update

Discussion Bob Davis AFS-260 FAA Chairperson		
<p><u>WebOPSS Overview.</u> Currently 100% of WebOPSS budget is devoted to simply maintaining the system, and that amount has been cut 25% for FY12. The amount of funds that is left does not leave much capability for rapid or large system improvements. WebOPSS (and all Flight Standards IT) has received NO funding for any enhancements in FY12. One of the reasons that FAA has not yet been able to produce an ICAO Ops Spec Synopsis for each international carrier is that such a capability was not built into the system from the start. The staff is exploring the possibility of an alternate report function that might produce the desired product. In the interim the ultimate goal and high priority project is building the capability for direct data transfer to the ICAO. One of the impediments to this effort has been POI/PMI and carrier misuse of operator database information entry especially aircraft data. To prevent some of this freelancing, AFS-260 will try to add a database field for:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> AIRCRAFT NOT IN SERVICE <input type="checkbox"/> AIRCRAFT NOT IN REVENUE SERVICE</p>		
<p><u>ICAO Format Ops Spec Synopsis</u> ICAO wants the Ops Spec Synopsis to be Make/Model/Series specific. WebOPSS report will be designed to display unique M/M/s on separate display pages. The menu sequence will probably be WebOPSS/Tolls/Reports/ICAO. Ops Specs Navigation display will be based on a hierarchy of performance-based navigation. If OSWG members know of any Ops Spec related information different from the standard ICAO template, please forward the information. AFS-260 is looking for carriers who are willing to help in testing the ICAO reports programming. Contact Monica Grusche (Monica.Grusche@faa.gov).</p>		
<p><u>WebOPSS Export Function</u> For Ops Specs D085 or C070 it is possible to export to an excel spreadsheet. Under Operator Data, when the airports or aircraft window is displayed if the export box at the bottom of the screen is clicked an excel file will display. A future planned capability will be the export of only Make/Model/Series (M/M/S) information from the database.</p>		
<p><u>Bad WebOPSS Practices</u> Some other practices that are causing issues are the creation of "Dummy Aircraft" (In anticipation of acquisition?) and the use of extraneous symbols.</p>		
Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
None	FAA: Theo Kessararis	Open Item
	Industry: Casey Seabright	

15. A010: Aviation Weather Data

Discussion
<p>Theo Kessararis. Update: The draft A010 revision documents were sent to OSWG members via email prior to the January 2012 meeting. The FAA has received no comments from OSWG members so far; however we have received some internal comments that we have incorporated. The documents will now go through formatting and be posted to the public website. This could take up to 2 months. NOTE: The agenda to the meeting held in January did not include an update to the explanation of changes to A010. The FAA had originally intended to change only the OpSpec template and guidance applicable to certificate holders conducting part 121 operations. The scope of the change has now been extended to certificate holders and program managers conducting part 91, subpart K, 125 and 135 operations. The FAA will inform the OSWG members by email when the formatted documents are posted to the public website.</p>

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
None	FAA: Theo Kessarlis AFS-260 Leo Hollis AFS-220	N/A
	Industry: Casey Seabright	

16. A025: Electronic Record Keeping

Discussion		
<p>Theo Kessarlis. Theo Kessarlis. On hold pending further research, reflection and cogitation. There are currently numerous overlapping guidance documents. No easy fix. "In for a dime in for a dollar". Theo is looking for general suggestions or multiple Industry leads.</p>		
Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
None	FAA: Theo Kessarlis	Open Item
	Industry: Casey Seabright Mike Keller	

17. B036/B054: Class II Navigation

<p>Madison Walton AFS-470. Regarding position plotting, an operations safety assessment was performed which provided some support to revise current guidance. Goal is to retain harmonization with ICAO guidance.</p>
<p>Issue Statement: Both of these Ops Specs include the same provision in paragraph b. (4) which refers to a required gross navigation error check using an "airways navigation facility". GPS is understood to be an accepted "airways navigation facility" and as such, a clarification is needed to prevent misunderstandings. Additionally, while Ops Spec B036 includes no reference to plotting or adherence to AC 90-79, the "job aid" inappropriately requires the Inspector to ensure that the procedures included in the AC are used, thus causing differing expectations.</p>
<p>Background: Where the FAA does not desire the operator to consider GPS as an acceptable airway navigation facility, the clarifier "ground based" is used. Several readers have incorrectly interpreted this provision with the same "ground based" mind set which has led to confusion when GPS equipped aircraft are concerned. Since a job aid for an Ops Spec should not contain provisions, limitations or requirements that are not also contained in the Ops Spec, the B036 job aid should be revised to match the Ops Spec:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The principal operations inspector (POI) must ensure the operator's LRN program incorporates the practices and procedures recommended in the most recent version of Advisory Circular (AC) 90-79, Recommended Practices and Procedures for the Use of Electronic Long-Range Navigation, or the operator has approved procedures equivalent to or exceeding those in AC 90-79 or other applicable ACs.
<p>Intended Outcome: Clarify the provision to specify that it is referring to non GPS equipped aircraft as follows: <i>B-036:</i> <i>b. (4) Prior to entering any airspace requiring the use of a <u>non GPS based</u> long-range navigation system, the aircraft position shall be accurately fixed using airways navigation facilities or ATC radar. After exiting</i></p>

this airspace, the aircraft position shall be accurately fixed and the long-range navigation system error shall be determined and logged in accordance with the operator's approved procedures.

Discussion:

Rich Yuknavich (American) proposed to modify John Cowan's draft language concerning Nav Accuracy Checks to accommodate aircraft with automatic position updating (DME/DME or GPS). This would cover aircraft without GPS installed and would also cover aircraft with inoperative GPS.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Rich Yuknavich to draft revised Ops Spec and Order 8900.1 verbiage.	FAA: Madison Walton Part 121 Industry: John Cowan Rich Yuknavich	

18. C059: Category II Approach and Landing Operations

Discussion

Steve Kuhar (FEDEX)

The charting requirement to have the statement "Category II ILS – Special Aircrew & Aircraft Certification Required" is superfluous and unneeded.

If it is critical to alert a flight crew that the approach chart is to be used only by special aircrew why not also alert the pilot that "only instrument rated pilots are authorized", or for that matter "only used by licensed pilots". This is an unreasonable charting requirement which only serves to clutter the chart.

Bryant Welch stated that the note was more for General Aviation pilots.

Rich Yuknavich asked if it might be possible to include verbiage in future C059 and C060 allowing Part 121/135 carriers to tailor CAT II & III charts to eliminate this note.

This was another issue which may be more appropriate for the Charting Forum

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
	Bryant Welch AFS-460 Industry: Steve Kuhar Rich Yuknavich	Open

19. D084: Special Flight Permit with Continuous Authorization to Conduct Ferry Flights

Discussion		
Tom Taylor (FEDEX)		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ops Spec D084 item b. does not provide wording to allow ferrying an aircraft to storage or to a place where the aircraft will be donated, scrapped, sold, etc. 2. Ops Spec D084 item d. does not provide wording to allow ferrying to storage on the way to a repair facility to have an expired AD complied with or to a place where the aircraft will be donated, scrapped, sold, etc. 		
<p>FAA Fred Sobeck and Tim Holt. Tom Taylor (FEDEX) Tom raised the issue of a lack of flexibility in moving an aircraft if it is not airworthy for some reason and the carrier wants to move it to a temporary location pending availability of maintenance to correct the airworthiness issue. It is possible to ferry an aircraft directly to a maintenance location, but often times the maintenance locations do not have adequate parking space to accommodate medium term storage. Tom is seeking an Ops Spec provision or CFR exemption relief. Fred Sobeck 39.23 AD guidance. Flight to fix is OK but no provision for storage pending repair. CMO or FSDO issue ferry permits under two provisions: Item A Allows Storage Item B No mention of storage. Therefore, informal interpretation was that there is no provision for storage under D084. For a formal legal interpretation business letter is usual format but an E-mail from an appropriate company official would be acceptable. Communication directed to AGC-200.</p>		
Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
	FAA:	OPEN
	Industry: Tom Taylor	

20. D081: Parts Pool Agreement Authorization

Discussion		
Mike Keller (American)		
Does D081 allow for "parts borrowing" or not?		
Background:		
Can "AJ Walters" be added to the Ops Spec if possible to be able to borrow parts from them internationally? AJ Walters is a parts supplier and not an airline which seems to be the issue. AJ Walters is an associate member of the IATP as well. Some other airlines may be utilizing AJ Walters, but under what authority?		
Bob Davis AFS-260		
. Bob Davis said that D081 applies to agreements between certificated entities. If a supplier such as is not a certificated entity then pooling under D081 would not apply.		
Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Further Research required	FAA:TBD	N/A
	Industry: Mike Keller	

21. D301: Aircraft Network Security Program (ANSP)

Discussion		
<p>Issue Statement: The FAA is concerned about the cyber security vulnerabilities of avionics systems. This Ops Spec authorizes the certificate holder to operate e-Enabled aircraft that have a manufacturer's recommended network security program.</p> <p>Issues</p> <p>Refer to latest posted Power Point presentation for details</p>		
Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Monitor Developments	FAA: Rochelle Brisco	OPEN
	Industry: TBD	

22a. New Business A117 Fatigue Risk Management

Discussion		
<p>A117 Fatigue Risk Management.</p> <p>Dale Roberts Power Point presentation. Overview: Ops Spec 117 will become effective concurrent with effective dates of Rulemaking. There are three associated Advisory Circulars: AC 117-3 Fitness for Duty; AC117-2 Fatigue Training, and AC 117-1 Onboard Crew rest Facilities. .</p>		
Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Awaiting posting of draft documents	FAA: Dale Roberts	N/A
	Industry:	

22b. New Business (Revisited Old Business)

C060: Category III Instrument Approach and Landing Operations

Discussion		
<p>Ops Spec C060 Revision Update Bryant Welch and Coby Johnson AFS-410 Background</p> <p>When the proposed changes to the Ops Spec C060 template and associated Order 8900.1 were initially made in August 2011, most carriers focused on the changes to transmissometer report requirements, specifically, Ops Spec paragraph d(1). replacement of the roll-out advisory report with a specified minimum RVR, and the specific prohibition against using lower mid field and roll-out reports than the published chart minimums (Paragraph d.(1), NOTE.) For example, aircraft with roll-out systems previously were authorized to use TD/MID/RO reports as low as 600/400/Advisory. Some carriers applied that authorization to airports with published RVR 600 minimums. The current Order 8900.1 and the revised C060 template specifically restricts carriers from initiating an approach when ANY of the required reports are below published minimums.</p> <p>When carriers got around to analyzing the other changes to the draft guidance and Ops Spec verbiage there arose some concerns about changes made to the old paragraph b. verbiage</p> <p>b. Required Field Length and Special Operational Equipment and Limitations. The certificate holder shall not begin the final approach segment of a CAT III instrument approach unless the runway field length requirements, and the special operational equipment (installed and operational) and limitations listed or referenced in Table 1 are met.</p> <p>(1) The required field length is established by multiplying these factors by the runway field length required by the provisions of Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) § 121.195 (b).</p>		

(2) For operations with a controlling runway visual range (RVR) at or above 600 feet the required field length is 1.15 times the field length.

(3) For operations with an RVR below 600 feet, the required field length is either 1.15 or 1.3 times the field length required by the regulations cited in b.(1) above, depending on the operational procedures and/or additional equipment used by the operator.

The revised verbiage combined the previous three subparagraph into two and removed the {1.3} “worst case” multiplier in the new subparagraph c.(1):

“The required field length shall be at least 115 percent of the runway field length required by 121.195(b)”

The revised subparagraph (2) listed considerations in determining landing distances that included: “the runway to be used, runway conditions, weather, AFM limitations, operational procedures and aircraft equipment status at the time of landing.”

The above Ops Spec wording and the initial Order 8900.1 guidance raised industry concerns about the inclusion of “runway conditions” and the reference to SAFO 06012. Concerns were also raised about the subparagraph (1) retention of reference to 14 CFR 121.195(b), which covers landing performance assessments at time of dispatch. The specific concern was that the combination of the Subparagraph (2) emphasis on runway conditions on arrival different than forecast at the time of dispatch and the reference to a dispatch CFR passage might imply that PICs would be required to coordinate with dispatch for procurement of updated landing performance calculations.

Draft Order 8900.1 Vol. 3, GENERAL TECHNICAL ADMINISTRATION, Chap. 18, OPERATIONS SPECIFICATIONS, Section 5 Part C Operations Specifications—Airplane Terminal Instrument Procedures and Airport Authorizations and Limitations. Para 3-871 Ops Spec C 060 Subparagraph D. Runway Field Length Requirements (August 2011):

(1) The aircraft shall not begin the Final Approach Segment (FAS) of the CAT III approach unless the runway field length requirements have been evaluated and the minimum required runway length is available.

(2) For all CAT III operations, the required field length is at least 1.15 times the field length required by:

- Part 91K, § 91.1037(b) and the AFM,
- Part 121, § 121.195(b),
- The AFM for parts 91 and 125, or
- Part 135, § 135.385(b).

(3) The required field length must be determined considering the runway in use, runway conditions, current weather, AFM limitations, operational procedures, and aircraft equipment status at the time of landing. Acceptable criteria for the determination of the required field length can be found in Safety Alerts for Operators (SAFO) 06012, Landing Performance Assessments at Time of Arrival (Turbojets).

(4) The “Special Operational Equipment and Limitations” column in Table 1 (see Figure 3-67F) is provided for equipment that is in addition to that required by 14 CFR and not included in the AFM. For example, additional equipment may be required to meet the field length requirement where “procedural” means alone is not acceptable

Coby Johnson agreed to change the draft verbiage to specifically state that Pilots are not required to obtain revised landing performance calculations from dispatch, and would consider changing the runway conditions verbiage. Intent of verbiage is for crew calculations, not dispatch reassessment. There was no intention to compel radical changes to current carrier procedures. Coby emphasized that the reason for adding runway conditions is that unlike CAT I approaches, Cat III ILS procedures include a roll-out component which, ideally, should terminate on a runway surface. Coby asked that any revised wording be reviewed quickly (No more than two weeks from proposal posting) so that the guidance and template can be expedited.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
	FAA: AFS400/410 Bryant Welch	
	Industry: John Cowan	

22c. C060: Category III Instrument Approach and Landing Operations

Discussion		
<p>Monty Montgomery (United) General comment about CAT III ILS approach plate minimums blocks. The inclusion of separate CAT A and C minimums is wasted space. Coby Johnson mentioned that plate design is a complex issue and Europs harmonization factors enter in.</p> <p>Several FAA officials suggested that this is an issue more appropriately addressed by the Charting Forum or the CNS group.</p>		
Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Monitor	FAA: AFS-400/410 Coby Johnson	N/A
	Industry: Monty Montgomery John Cowan Rich Yuknavich	

**22d. SMGCS, Surface Movement Guidance and Control System
 (Low Visibility Taxi Procedures)**

Discussion Coby Johnson AFS-400/410		
<p>Revised SMGS Order pending. A SMGCS plan will be mandatory for all airports that have approach or takeoff minimums below 1200 RVR. There will be two tiers of approval: 1200 to 500 RVR and 500RVR and below. One goal of the order is to standardize the SMGCS charting. The charts are not NACO products so they lack standardized symbology. The order is being drafted to harmonize with ICAO.</p> <p>An associated project is being conducted by NASA at their Langley, Virginia test center for human factors interface concerning SMGCS products. NASA is seeking airline Captains and Fist Officers for three day periods during a three week test program during end of March and early April. All 14CFR Part aviators are welcome to volunteer with hotel and moderate per diem paid for by NASA. expenses airline pilots are NASA Langley contact is Randy Bailey (Phone)</p>		
Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Monitor	FAA: AFS-400/410 Coby Johnson	N/A
	Industry: Rich Yuknavich	

**22e. New Business (Revisited Old Business)
 Maintenance Ferry Flights with Revenue Cargo**

Discussion Bob Davis AFS-260		
<p>Background: An American Airlines flight diverted for mechanical issue. The passengers were off loaded and the aircraft was ferried to a major maintenance facility. The divert airport had no capability to off-load the cargo. American did not charge for the convenience of the cargo. The FAA legal interpretation is that there was still a violation of maintenance ferry flight restrictions because a cargo fee rebate engenders good will for the with the customer and would probably generate future revenue.</p> <p>Ops Spec A001 verbiage: The certificate holder is authorized to conduct flights under 14 CFR Part 91 for crewmember training, maintenance tests, ferrying, re-positioning, and the carriage of company officials using</p>		

the applicable authorizations in these operations specifications, without obtaining a Letter of Authorization, provided the flights are not conducted for compensation or hire and no charge of any kind is made for the Conduct of the flights.
Bob Davis is researching the issue to see if a remedy to this situation is possible through exemptions or Ops Spec non-standard language,

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
AFS-260 Research Phase.	FAA: TBD	N/A
	Industry: Mike Keller	

22f. Stage II ICAO Noise Assessment Forms and European Cockpit Inspections

Discussion Brian Miles (Emirates)

Stage II ICAO Noise Assessment Forms and European Cockpit Inspections.
Brian Miles (Emirates) mentioned that during cockpit inspections, European national aviation authorities were concentrating audit efforts with special focus on ICAO format Noise Certification forms.
Rich Yuknavich (Co-Chair) The reason for this may be that the forms are used to audit carrier provided landing weight figures for landing fee charges.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
AFS-260 Research Phase.	FAA: Denuta Pronsik	N/A
	Industry: Rich Yuknavich Brian Miles	

22g. A027 Land and Hold Short Operations.

Discussion

Steve Kuhar Ops Spec A027 and current Order 8900.1 verbiage are not harmonized.
Open Item pending proposed draft resolution.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
AFS-260 Research Phase.	FAA: TBD	N/A
	Industry: Steve Kuhar	

23. Closing Remarks

Discussion		
Casey Seabright, Industry Chairperson. Next OSWG meeting is scheduled for 17 & 18 April which is in the middle of a busy tourist period in Washington D.C. Even if you make reservations early, you may have to look further out from center city for reasonable rates. Consider Crystal City, Rosalyn, or even outside the beltway to the west/northwest for hotels near the red or orange Metro line stations. Make reservation now, don't wait.		
Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Make reservation today!	SELF	Yesterday