International Maintenance Review Board Policy Board (IMRBPB)

Issue Paper (IP)

IP Number: 188
Initial Date (DD/MMM/YYYY): 10/May/2019
Revision / Date (DD/MMM/YYYY): Rev. 0 / 10/May/2019
Effective Date (DD/MMM/YYYY): 09/Jul/2019
Retroactivity (Y/N): N

Title:	Use of the term 'operator' instead of 'airline'
Submitter:	Dassault-Aviation

Applies To:	
MSG-3 Vol 1	X
MSG-3 Vol 2	
IMPS	

Issue:

As defined in "Objective" section of MSG-3 Vol 1 document, "Operators" are involved to develop scheduled maintenance:

Chapter 1. General

1-1. Objective

It is the objective of this document to present a means for developing the scheduled maintenance tasks and intervals which will be acceptable to the regulatory authorities, the operators, and the manufacturers. The scheduled maintenance task and interval details will be developed by coordination with specialists from the operators, manufacturers, and the Regulatory Authority of the country of manufacture. Specifically, this document outlines the general organization and decision processes for determining scheduled maintenance requirements initially projected for the life of the aircraft and/or powerplant.

As reminded in "Preface", "MSG-3, Original Revision", "MSG-3, Revision 1"…sections of MSG-3 Vol 1 document, "Airlines" actively participated to the MSG-3 document:

Preface

Airline and manufacturer experience in developing scheduled maintenance for new aircraft has shown that more efficient programs can be developed through the use of logical decision processes.

In July, 1968, representatives of various airlines developed Handbook MSG-1, "Maintenance Evaluation and Program Development," which included decision logic and inter-airline/manufacturer procedures for developing scheduled maintenance for the new Boeing 747 aircraft.

MSG-3, Original Revision

Against this background, ATA airlines decided that a revision to existing MSG-2 procedures was both timely and appropriate. The active participation and combined efforts of the FAA, CAA/UK, AEA, U.S. and European aircraft and engine manufacturers, U.S. and foreign airlines, and the U.S. Navy generated the document, MSG-3. As a result there were a number of differences between MSG-2 and MSG-3, which appeared both in the organization/presentation of the material and in the detailed procedural content. However, MSG-3 did not constitute a fundamental departure from the previous version, but was built upon the existing framework of MSG-2 which had been validated by ten years of reliable aircraft operation using maintenance based thereon.

International Maintenance Review Board Policy Board (IMRBPB)

Issue Paper (IP)

IP Number: 188
Initial Date (DD/MMM/YYYY): 10/May/2019
Revision / Date (DD/MMM/YYYY): Rev. 0 / 10/May/2019
Effective Date (DD/MMM/YYYY): 09/Jul/2019
Retroactivity (Y/N): N

MSG-3, Revision 1

In 1987, after using MSG-3 procedures on a number of new aircraft and powerplants in the first half of the 1980's, it was decided that the benefits of the experience so gained should be used to improve the document for future application; thus, Revision 1 was undertaken.

This revised document includes changes developed by American and European airframe manufacturers, American and European airworthiness authorities, supplemented and agreed to by the Air Transport Association of America and other airline representatives.

Consequently, the term “Operators” has previously been used synonymously with the term “Airlines” within MSG-3 Vol 1 document.

Problem:

Having been available for many years, MSG-3 methodology has become a “Standard” used for scheduled maintenance development for not only Commercial Civil Aircraft but also for some Business Jet Aircraft and some Military Aircraft.

Consequently, the term “Operators” should not be limited to “Airlines” in MSG-3 Vol 1 document.

Recommendation (including Implementation):

Update the following paragraphs as below:

1-3. Organization

The organization to carry out the scheduled maintenance development for a specific type aircraft shall be staffed by representatives of the ~~airline~~ operators purchasing the equipment, the prime manufacturers of the airframe and powerplant, and the Regulatory Authority.

2-1. General

It is necessary to develop scheduled maintenance for each new type of aircraft prior to its introduction into ~~airline~~ service.

2-1-1. Purpose

The primary purpose of this document is to develop a proposal to assist the Regulatory Authority in establishing initial scheduled maintenance tasks and intervals for new types of aircraft and/or powerplant. The intent is to maintain the inherent safety and reliability levels of the aircraft. These tasks and intervals become the basis for the first issue of each ~~airline~~ operator's maintenance requirements to govern its initial maintenance policy. Initial adjustments may be necessary to address operational and/or environmental conditions unique to the operator. As operating experience is accumulated, additional adjustments may be made by the operator to maintain efficient scheduled maintenance.

International Maintenance Review Board Policy Board (IMRBPB)

Issue Paper (IP)

IP Number: 188
Initial Date (DD/MMM/YYYY): 10/May/2019
Revision / Date (DD/MMM/YYYY): Rev. 0 / 10/May/2019
Effective Date (DD/MMM/YYYY): 09/Jul/2019
Retroactivity (Y/N): N

IMRBPB Position:	
Date:	10 May 2019
Position:	Agreed, closed in 2019 meeting as IP188
Recommendation for Implementation:	As per effective date

Status of the Issue Paper:	X	Active
		Incorporated in MSG-3 / IMPS (with details)
		Archived