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Issue: Maintenance Review Boards and the associated Regulatory Authorities continue to be requested to accept tasks that are derived from processes foreign to the analytical logic utilized by the respective Maintenance Review Boards. A recent example is a request concerning FAA SFAR 88 defined tasks.

Problem: A) Despite other issue papers, which have referenced this problem, MRBs are still being asked to insert tasks and to accept intervals developed through means unknown to the Maintenance Review Board. When such requests are received, the integrity and validity of the Maintenance Review Board’s application of the analytical logic and corresponding processes are called into question.

B) Should external groups succeed in inserting pre-determined tasks and/or intervals into a MRBR, the process for initial scheduled maintenance task development and for the future evolution of those tasks becomes disjointed with consequent increased risk particularly where those tasks are expected to address safety issues.

Recommendation:

When a MRB receives a request to include such tasks within an existing or newly created MRBR, it is recommended that the following actions be taken:

a) the request should be treated as a comment that the existing analysis is deficient. That analysis should be reviewed to determine if it was conducted properly. If conducted improperly, it should be corrected with resultant changes to the MRBR being made, or.

b) if the analysis is found to be conducted properly, the tasks and intervals requested to be included in the MRBR should be reviewed to determine their reasonableness and if so, why the analytical logic itself did not foster the development of similar tasks and intervals.

c) if the analytical logic is found to be deficient or non-existent, recommendations with justification should be made to the IMRBPB through the MRB Chair’s regulatory authority to undertake a review and amendment of the analytical logic.

Ref IP’s 018, 021,022,023,037,038,
**IMRBPB Position:**

**Aug 20, 2003**

With reference to Section 1-1, third paragraph of MSG-3, additional requirements developed using different ground rules and procedures from MSG-3 must be submitted with selection criteria to the Industry Steering Committee for consideration and inclusion in the MRB Report recommendation. Notwithstanding this section, the IMRBPB supports the concept that MSG-3 should be sufficient to develop the initial scheduled maintenance program. Any need for inclusion of tasks and Intervals within an MRB Report when developed from a process other than the accepted MRB analytical logic should be developed using the latest version of MSG-3 taking into consideration the recommendations as stated above.

**October 20th, 2005**

Duplicated with IP 62.
The board decision can be found in IP 62.

Status: Closed

**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)