Title: Guidelines for JAA/ FAA/TCA Participation in MRB’s

Submitter: Ric Anderson, Chairman of ATA’s Maintenance Programs Subcommittee (MPSC)

Issue: Numerous additional manufacturers are requesting Maintenance Review Boards (MRBs) for the development and revision of the initial minimum scheduled maintenance/inspection requirements of derivative or newly type-certificated aircraft and power plants.

Problem: As the MSG-3 decision logic gains recognition, more and more manufacturers are attempting to use it and the MRB process; manufacturers not previously envisioned as customers (e.g., smaller Regional Aircraft and Helicopters). There are no guidelines on who a Regulatory Authority will support with resources for an MRB and who they will not support. Today’s “crystal ball” cannot foresee what Equipment Types will or will not be used by air Carriers in the future; consequently, Regulatory participation appears to be somewhat subjectively (and perhaps inconsistently) applied.

Recommendation: Propose that the IMRBPB develop written policy to guide the JAA/FAA/TCA in their decision-making on which proposals for an MRB will be supported with resources, and which will not be supported.

IMRBPB Position:

The FAA responded that they have issued a draft NOTICE N 8300.ICAW, which outlines their policy with regard to their involvement (AEG) with all aircraft certification programs.

The guidelines for JAA involvement in MRB are laid down in JAA Maintenance Procedure Chap. 16, para 16.3 and 16.4
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Position amended to include; “The guidelines for TCCA involvement in the MRB process are contained within TP 13850, Scheduled Maintenance Instruction Development Processes, Part B Chapter 3.”

Issue paper closed – Final position as stated above

Important Note: The IMRBPB positions are not policy. Positions become policy only when the policy is issued formally by the appropriate National Aviation Authority. (JAA, FAA or TCCA)