

IP N° 106 (previously CIP FAA 2010-1)

IP title: Landing Gear and Off-Wing Inspection Tasks

Meeting: IMRBPB 2010

Date: 27/APR/2010:

PB position: CIP revised in Rev 1 deleting option 2 and 3 and revising option 1.

As followed:

Policy needs to be established as the following:

For landing gear MSG 3 analysis MSI/SSI selection at the highest manageable level (i.e. ATA 32) is the acceptable approach.

However, MSG-3 analysis for landing gear is allowed to go lower than the highest manageable level without exceeding on-aircraft LRU capability. If analysis goes below LRU capability resulting tasks should be identified in a document other than the MRBR with reference in the MRBR.

Such tasks will have to be combined in the MRBR through a single high level task.

Date 2: 28/APR/2010

CIP named IP 106

MPIG response to the initial CIP before change above mentioned

CIP FAA 2010-1 - "Landing Gear and Off-wing Inspection Tasks"

- IP raised further to situation seen in Airbus ATA32 analysis
- Methodology used by Airbus was developed specifically to address EASA, FAA and TCCA MRB Chair request to determine minimum set of tasks required on gear to satisfy continuous airworthiness requirements
- MSG-3 logic used to determine CPCP inspection requirements. Need to perform task on or off-aircraft determined after requirement was determined
- Multiple tasks identified that could only be performed with gear disassembled. Tasks identified in MRBR with 'off-aircraft' identifier
- Operators supported new approach which allowed them to now identify which parts of the vendor recommended workshop tasks constitute minimum requirements.
- Tasks not identified through MSG-3 and identified in MRBR no longer considered necessary for continuous airworthiness (unless addressed by AD or Airworthiness Limitation)
- Three year effort involving large resources concluded with all parties

involved being satisfied with the result. However, when FAA & TCCA MRB Chairs submitted MRBR revision proposal to their hierarchy the practice was red flagged and considered not in line with agreed policy

Date: 29/APR/2010

MPIG comment

Policy needs to be established as to the following:

For landing gear MSG 3 analysis MSI/SSI selection at the highest manageable level is the preferred approach.

However, MSG-3 analysis for landing gear is allowed to go lower than the highest manageable level. If analysis goes below LRU level, the resulting tasks may be identified in the MRBR within a single high level task, or reference made within the MRBR to another document.

Final agreed comment :

IP revised in Revision 1 as followed

For landing gear MSG 3 analysis MSI/SSI selection at the highest manageable level is the preferred approach.

However, MSG-3 analysis for landing gear is allowed to go lower than the highest manageable level. If analysis goes below LRU level, the resulting tasks must be identified in the MRBR within a single high level task, or reference made within the MRBR to another document.