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Impacts to FAA ADs

• FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018, Section 242
• Incorporation by Reference (IBR) the foreign AD/Mandatory Continuing Airworthiness Information (MCAI) AD
• Rescission of older FAA ADs (ADs terminated by a newer AD)
• Required for Compliance (RC) ADs
FAA Reauthorization

• FAA Reauthorization Act provides limitations for which foreign ADs (and AMOCs) may be accepted.
U.S. AD Process

The FAA must comply with the Administrative Procedure Act (APA):

- Requires notice and opportunity for comment; the AD preamble is “the heart of compliance with the Administrative Procedure Act.”
- Allows for no notice only if “good cause” exists.
- Requires reasonable responses to public comments.
- Must meet not only APA requirements, but also the Office of the Federal Register (OFR) and FAA policies and requirements.
U.S. AD Process, cont’d

Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)

5 U.S.C. 552(a) (FOIA) “Except to the extent that a person has actual and timely notice of the terms thereof, a person may not in any manner be required to resort to, or be adversely affected by, a matter required to be published in the Federal Register and not so published. For the purpose of this paragraph, matter reasonably available to the class of persons affected thereby is deemed published in the Federal Register when incorporated by reference therein with the approval of the Director of the Federal Register.”
Takeaway:
Currently, FAA legal and leadership teams are evaluating the impact of the Reauthorization Act and how implementation may affect these ADs and AMOCs.
IBR the MCAI AD

• First introduced in NPRM 2018-NM-043-AD
• Currently being used on a trial basis for certain EASA ADs that affect Airbus airplanes.

• Limitations:
  1) Few (if any) differences exist between MCAI and FAA ADs (US legal enforceability requirements).
  2) FAA needs to have manufacturer’s approval to post the required service information referenced in the MCAI in the FAA Docket after the AD is published.
Intent:

1) Expand process to other foreign ADs, provided trial is successful and we receive appropriate permission from foreign manufacturers to post service information.

2) Utilize foreign AD requirements as much as possible (w/ minor differences – if any)

3) Simplify and expedite FAA ADs

4) Set foundation for Reauthorization Act
Supersedure/Stand-Alone AD

Intent:

1) Simplify new FAA AD (w/o restating previous AD requirements).

2) Terminate requirements of older ADs after accomplishment of new AD actions.

Primary Downside:

   Adds another AD that affected operators need to track.

Question commonly asked:

Will the FAA ever remove the terminated AD?
Supersedure/Stand-Alone AD, cont’d

Answer:

Yes.

Requirements to Remove Terminated AD:

1) Compliance time has ended for new AD
2) Any terminating actions from older AD are addressed with new/other ADs (don’t want to lose the terminating action relief in the removed AD)
Evolution of ADs affecting U.S. airplanes:
- Extract required actions from published SBs
- Require actions identified as RC in SB
- Require actions identified as RC in Requirements Bulletin (RB) (i.e. 2 part SB)

Intent:
- Simplify FAA ADs by pointing to SB that only requires those actions necessary to address the unsafe condition.
Background

• In 2000, the agency met with major U.S. air carriers to get feedback on FAA transport ADs:
  – Are our ADs easy to read, and easy to understand?
  – How could we simplify our ADs?
  – What other suggestions did the operators have for ADs?

• The air carriers’ response was: “Just tell us to do the service bulletin (SB).”
“AD-Friendly” Service Bulletins

• In 2000, we began meeting with Boeing as the first “AD-Friendly (ADF) SB” team.

• FAA goal was to streamline the transport AD process by:
  – Identifying and implementing improvements to the format and usability of SBs.
  – Ensuring legally enforceable, “AD-friendly” language is used in SBs (i.e., it would be easier to adopt the SB language into the FAA AD).
ADF SBs, cont.

• (Goals, cont.)
  – Referencing (relying on) the SB as the primary source of information for compliance times and actions in an AD in lieu of interpreting and re-keying the SB information.
  – Minimizing differences between SBs and ADs.
  – Changing policies and procedures to increase both SB and AD usability.
Harmonizing FAA ADs

• In addition to ADF with other countries, we collaborated with EASA, ANAC, and TCCA on terminology used in transport ADs—for example:
  – Consistent and precise general terminology.
  – AD applicability.
  – Enforceable compliance times.
  – Required actions.
Advisory Circular (AC) 20-176A

• Design Approval Holder Best Practices for SBs related to ADs:
  – Making SBs more user-friendly (e.g., differentiating critical tasks)
  – Allowing later-approved parts
  – Promoting global AMOCs
  – Avoiding overlapping and conflicting SBs

Examples of ADF Elements

- Give clear explanations of the precipitating event, cause, unsafe condition, and end-level effect on the airplane.
- Use common and consistent descriptions and terminology throughout the SB.
- Use precise and enforceable compliance terminology (e.g., definitive compliance times, inclusion of grace periods).
Examples of ADF Elements, cont.

• Always provide corrective actions to address conditions that are found (e.g., a fix is given if cracking is found).

• Include reporting requirements only when essential.

• Provide repetitive inspections when appropriate (e.g., when the root cause is not yet identified).
Benefits of ADF SBs

• For the airlines:
  — Customer-oriented effort that supports FAA AD drafting.
  — Reduced paperwork and resources for airlines, i.e., no need to correlate between SB and AD if the AD simply references SB for compliance = less time preparing work cards.
  — Easier to determine compliance.
  — Less need for questions to authorities/manufacturers.
Benefits of ADF SBs, cont.

• For the manufacturer and the FAA:
  — Improved SB usability through commonality and consistency.
  — Decreased delay and rework to develop ADs.
  — Fewer questions among the manufacturer, authority, and operators.
  — Fewer AMOC requests.

• FAA has received positive feedback from operators.
AD Aviation Rulemaking Committee (ARC)

• **Background:**
  – AD ARC was chartered in 2009 to evaluate and address recommendations from two reviews following a compliance issue with a particular AD and a subsequent AD audit.

• **One key objective of the AD ARC:**
  – Revise the way SBs are written to avoid mandating actions that are not required to meet the safety intent of the AD; done by separating critical from non-critical tasks.
Questions?