



Questions and Answers Session

Organisation	Subject	Reply
QUESTIONS RAISED BEFORE THE WORKSHOP		
RUAG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>AMC & GM:</u> 	
	Q: Availability and content of AMC & GM for the changes implemented in new EU regulation 748/2012	See EASA website .
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Standard Changes and Repairs:</u> 	
	<p>21.A.90B(a)(2) refers to Certification Specification containing acceptable methods, techniques and practices for carrying out and identifying standard changes.</p> <p>These Certification Specifications do not exist yet and are part of a separate rulemaking project. Information about availability, content and limitations (i.e. for ELA 1, ELA2 aircraft) for that kind of Certification Specifications would be important.</p> <p>Q: Who is responsible for handling "Failures, malfunctions and defects" resulting in standard changes and repairs not covered by a DOA?</p>	This issue will be taken onboard in the rulemaking task RMT.0245 (MDM.048) Standard changes/repairs.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Changes to DOA privileges:</u> 	
	In line with EU regulation 748/2012, some changes to DOA privileges were introduced (minor revisions to AFM, extension of the	See GM 21.A.263(c)(4) on EASA website .



Organisation	Subject	Reply
	applicability of the flight conditions privilege). Q: Need of Information about the definition of what minor revisions are and what is to be expected with regard to the content of the required procedure.	
Finnair Design Organisation	• <u>Flammability testing policy</u>	
	In the CRD for Certification Memorandum CM-CS-001 it is mentioned that EASA will issue a new CM equivalent to FAA policy ANM-115-09-XXX (now published as PS-ANM-25.853-01). Q1: What is the status of preparation of this new CM?	This CM is in preparation.
	In the same CRD it is also mentioned that the FAA draft policy has been already accepted by the Agency through Certification Review Items. Q 2: Is there already a policy by the Agency for design organisations to use this FAA PS? See FAA Refs: http://www.fire.tc.faa.gov/pdf/FlammabilityTestingofInteriorMaterialsFinal.pdf http://www.fire.tc.faa.gov/pdf/materials/Oct12Meeting/FSTG-1012-Final_Policy_Statement.pdf	The FAA PS is acceptable to the Agency in a certification project.



Organisation	Subject	Reply
QUESTIONS RAISED DURING THE WORKSHOP		
	Rulemaking activities affecting Part 21: Update	
	Privilege for DOAs to make major changes to OSD?	The way to deal with changes to OSD is not fully elaborated yet. For this reason the implementation of OSD for changes (stand alone and changes with impact on OSD) is envisaged to be delayed, in order to gain experience and produce the respective AMC/GM for the use of the privilege. The privilege is intended in principle to minor changes only.
	In the framework of a STC approval, how shall we deal with the associated avionics major change to OSD?	As already commented, we will need to gain experience in the approval of initial OSD to see how changes to the type design affect the OSD in the case of STC applicant. A delay of 3 years in the implementations for STC applicants is included in the proposal
	Timeframe for DOAs and TC holders in respect to OSD?	<p>Publication of the Regulations related to OSD is estimated for September 2013. From then onwards new applications for TC should include OSD elements .</p> <p>For TC Holders, there will be a 2 years delay to incorporate the OSD elements in their DOA, and a 3 years delay for changes to OSD.</p> <p>A catch-up process is envisaged for types still in production: the TC holder will have a 2 years period to establish the OSD. There will be also a grandfathering of the old operational evaluations done under OEBs which will be automatically accepted as OSD. Finally, there will be a 2 years transition period for operators to catch up of new TCs.</p>
	Standard repairs. Why is not AC 43.13 directly approved instead of EASA developing its own material?	Part of AC 43.13 could be accepted but not all the content because the concept behind is slightly different. The concept of AC 43.13 is that maintenance people develop their own repairs, while this is not



Organisation	Subject	Reply
		<p>the case in CS-standard repairs.</p> <p>The development of the CS will be done in 2 phases: an initial quick exercise to identify what it is acceptable in AC 43.13 and directly incorporate it in CS, and a second one involving a more detailed review which will take more time.</p>
	Rulemaking task on use of commercial parts. Why the approach of FAA and TCC on this topic is not harmonized?	The first phase of this rulemaking task will be to harmonise with the FAA concept of 'commercial parts'. The second phase will go broader and try to identify possible other parts that would not need a Form 1.
	Expectations from EASA in respect of use of standard changes and repairs by operators. Will it make sense to include them in the SRM and the MM? In the procedures of the operator?	This concept is only applicable to small aircraft and cannot be used for other aircraft. Operators dealing with small aircraft or independent maintenance technicians should have access to CSs for standard changes and standard repairs as they are expected to find out if a given data extracted from the CS is in conflict with the information provided by the TC holder or not. The idea is the maintenance technician in the field has direct access to the CSs and implements them directly.
	Cabin Safety Topic: Review of Existing and Planned Certification Memorandum	
	Update on NPA for executive interiors?	The expected time for completion is end 2013.
	Flammability Certification Memo. For segregate panels, FAA has issued AC 20-178 in addition to their policy Statement PS-ANM-25.853-01. Does EASA intend to cover the content of this AC in the CM?	EASA is planning to create a new AMC in CS25 to formally accept this FAA AC.



Organisation	Subject	Reply
	New Regulation 748/2012 and impact on DOA or AP to DOA	
	The current practice of PCMs is that they do not reply to the Certification Programme until all the elements are submitted to them. We would like to suggest a quick reply following the first submission to have the possibility of discussing the CP with EASA.	Currently the regulation only requires that the DOA sends the CP to the Agency. With the new LOI concept, something additional will be added. This topic is related to the past controversy on NPA 16/2006 which included the approval of the CP by EASA. In the future, the role of the Agency should be clearly defined in the Regulation and it is expected that if a DOA produces a CP and sends it to the Agency, a feedback should be available as soon as possible. Nevertheless, with the new Regulation (748/2012), if the DOA can produce all the required information at the same time as the CP, this can be send to the Agency in a single package.
	Role of the Agency in respect to the CP? Request of making changes to the CP late in the program has negative implications.	The idea is that the Agency provides feedback after the review of the CP (a kind of formal acceptance and discussion on the content).
	Entry into force of 748/2012 was 10.09.2012. Was it mandatory for every DOA to have all their documents updated by that date?	Regulation 748/2012 is not impacting DOAs immediately. The surveillance of the already approved DOAs continues and the differences with the new Regulation will be dealt by means of findings to have traceability, as needed. However, the requirement to submit a certification programme is immediately applicable for new projects.
	When the DOA wants to apply for a new privilege, does this means that the DOA need to update their system?	Yes, in order to show that the necessary design assurance system elements are in place.
	Impact on the industry of the new deadline for findings?	It is acknowledged that for some organisations the move of the deadline for closing a level 2 finding from a maximum of 6 months to a 3 months can have some impact. Experience has shown that in many cases an extension was necessary even having a 6 months



Organisation	Subject	Reply
		deadline. The new maximum time of 3 months is in the Regulation now and it must be complied with, but practical solutions can be found for extending the initial deadline. Should industry find this provision difficult to accept, they have the possibility to lobby for the change of Part 21.
	Rulemaking process takes years from first discussions until rules are amended. Will it be possible to improve the efficiency of the process? Why not changing rules in a similar way as changes to AFM or MM?	The EU rulemaking process needs to follow certain steps that cannot be skipped. This introduces some constraints in the timing of the process. With the creation of EASA a compromise was reached between the rules that should be processed as hard law and those to be handled as soft law. If this is considered still inefficient, it is up to the stakeholders to raise the issue with our legislator. We are now implementing a 'fast-track' process that will allow skipping certain steps in the process for non-controversial or simple tasks.
	For the initial certification of an ELA1 new type, only a CP is requested. How will the continued airworthiness be handled later on? Will you need a DOA for that?	At the moment the only requirement is the CP. Nevertheless the general aviation section in the EASA certification directorate has suggested that the CP should include some visibility about how the applicant will be dealing with continuing airworthiness issues. A DOA is not required but could be an option if the organization considers it as an added value.
	Privileges granted to a DOA means that the DOA can make use of them. Why is requested that a DOA submits to EASA certification documents?	For certification documents, the existing privilege is linked to 21.A.257(b), which include the right for the Agency to check. This is why some documents must be submitted to EASA for verification.
	DO: Update	
	Does EASA have any internal policy to establish the priority while handling an application for DOA depending on, for ex., whether it is an EU	No, all applications are treated the same, and taken as they come. Non EU applicants have also the possibility to use 748/2012, article 8.2 provisions (previously, 1702/2003, article 3.2), under which a



Organisation	Subject	Reply
	applicant or a non-EU applicant? Any specific workshop for them?	DOA is not required when EASA has determined that the local Aviation Authority system provides the same results as Part 21. There seems to be no need for a specific workshop for non-EU DOAs, as they are treated the same as EU DOAs and they are invited and present to this workshop.
	Is there any budgetary constraint in the involvement of certification experts in the surveillance of DOAs?	There is no constraint at the moment. Technically speaking the surveillance activities are always organized to have a process as effective as reasonably achievable. In the future, budgetary constraints may impact the process, but up to now we have never faced such difficulties.
	Is DO section involved in the SMS rulemaking activity?	There is no direct involvement of the DO section now. Later in the process the DO section will take part in the task.
	EASA Level of involvement (LOI) in certification project	
	Is LOI limited to product certification?	No. The project aims to cover all aspects of certification: TC, STC, design changes, repairs, ETSOs, etc.
	What is a domain in relation to LOI?	A domain is an element associated to an item in the CP. The name will be used to refer to technical disciplines. Nevertheless, domains will be different for different products, e.g. airplane, rotorcraft,...We would like to establish the GM on this topic using current best practices because the concept already exists at the level of panel of experts. Incidentally, the guidance can be published initially as certification memorandum and then upgraded as AMC or GM.
	The categorization of DOAs remains frozen once done? In example, if a DOA is in category A,	No. This is a dynamic mechanism which includes feedback from certification applications and DOA surveillance. If something goes



Organisation	Subject	Reply
	should it remain in category A forever?	wrong in any of the domains, a downgrade is possible. Our intention is to use the LOI as a tool for continuous improvement of DOAs.
	LOI is a sophisticated and intelligent initiative. The right approach for a mature industry.	Thank you for your positive opinion and support.
	Is LOI coordinated with other Authorities, e.g. FAA?	The concept was presented to FAA one month ago. In fact, the FAA is working on a similar concept. We are confident that the final output of the FAA will be very similar to the LOI once developed. Furthermore, even if the two systems are not completely identical in the end, the bilateral will include mutual recognition.
	How can EASA ensure the industry that the Agency will not request a full LOI to all DOAs? The current situation is dependent on the expert allocated. How will deviations in the LOI handled? How will the transition period handled?	<p>The existence of conflicts in the certification projects is not new. Currently we are managing them in the usual way: escalation to the panel of experts and, if not satisfactory to the management. This means that the technical means to resolve conflicts are already there. In fact, there are some conflicts from time to time but not too many. Our understanding is that the LOI process will create even less conflicts because there will be GM available then.</p> <p>About the transition period, most of the provisions are now in place in Regulation 748/2012. The LOI needs to be put in place when the CP starts. Certification is aware about this, and the process will be launched with the pilot projects.</p>
	The process is a fair process, but the establishment of the level of performance of the DOAs is based on human perception. This will need standardization to establish a level playing field. How will EASA remove the human aspect in the establishment of the level of performance? Categorization may have an impact on the organisations.	<p>It is not expected to have an algorithm capable of producing a LOI out of pure data. Human aspect and discussion between peers to take decisions are the basis of the certification process and will continue to be the basis after the implementation of the LOI.</p> <p>The industry is supportive of the idea of categorization and considers that some companies have areas for improvement that should be highlighted with the categorization. There is no intention of punishment.</p>



Organisation	Subject	Reply
	Management of Changes to Jet Fuel Specifications	
	<p>When the TC holder of an airplane copy the new fuel specification in the AFM. Is it still a major change?</p> <p>Can it be considered minor if the change is evaluated and the evaluation shows no effect at aircraft level?</p>	<p>In this case there are 2 DOAs involved (airplane and engine TC holders). Both have to assess the impact and modify their documentation (it may be acceptable at engine level but not at aircraft level).</p> <p>If it is a totally new fuel the change is always major.</p>
	EASA Internal Occurrence Reporting System (IORS): Update	
	<p>Thank you for managing this project in an exemplary way; it is an example to follow!</p> <p>Have you evaluated if the reporting rate increases with the number of flight hours or due to a new product?</p>	<p>We have not evaluated the exposure date yet, but intend to do it in the future.</p>
	Flight Testing Activities	
	What specific course is acceptable for flight test engineers?	Until the new requirements are in place, the DOA shall establish the competence requirements for their FTEs adapted to their needs.
	Are restrictions to initial flights lifted with 748/2012	Yes, the restrictions put in the privilege 21.A.263(c)(6) have been cancelled. Some limitations could however be introduced in the DOA terms of approval, if investigation or surveillance activities are showing a need for it.
	About the transfer of aircraft from CAMO to DOA and back. How can this be done in	The purpose of the arrangement DOA-CAMO is to establish how the two organisations will work together, to allow the DOA to exercise its



Organisation	Subject	Reply
	practical terms? All maintenance of an aircraft is handled by the CAMO and controlled by the same system. Your interpretation would mean that the DOA should approve all CAMO processes, but this is not feasible	responsibilities related to the certification of changes.
	Best practices DO-145 implementation	
	What is the role of POA in the process?	When parts are produced by a POA, role is as usual: manufacture parts in accordance with design data and release them.
	Activities performed by P145 are done under the responsibility of the DOA. This is a surprise for me. Then, these activities should be surveyed by EASA, not by the NAA.	The idea we want to promote is to make use as much as possible of the existing approvals. P145 will work in their own environment in accordance with their procedures to demonstrate to the DOA that they control the process, and the DOA will take credit of the P145 MOA procedures.