

**Aging Transport Systems Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ATSRAC)
Meeting Minutes**

Date: January 12-13, 2005
Place: Sheraton Tucson Hotel
Tucson, Arizona

Administrative

Mr. Kent Hollinger (the ATSRAC Chair) called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM, after which Mr. Charles Huber (the ATSRAC Executive Director) read the advisory committee briefing statement. Mr. Hollinger welcomed the attendees and commented that this is the 6th anniversary of ATSRAC. Mr. Hollinger asked attendees to introduce themselves. The names of those present are listed in the meeting sign-in sheet (**Handout #1**).

Mr. Hollinger commented that a representative from Lockheed had called him and discussed representing Lockheed at the ATSRAC meeting. Mr. Hollinger said he had invited the Lockheed representative to attend. Mr. Hollinger then reviewed the agenda (**Handout #2**) for the meeting, and then he made some general comments on the scheduling of presentations.

Approval of October 2004 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Hollinger opened the floor for comments and discussion on the meeting minutes from the October 21, 2004 ATSRAC meeting, which had been conducted by teleconference. Mr. Bill Schultz (GAMA) asked that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) place more emphasis on defining the terms in the recommendations from Harmonization Working Group (HWG) 11. Mr. Huber commented that when the FAA issues the Advisory Circular (AC) from HWG 9, the FAA will clarify those terms and will also attempt to provide more clarification in future publications.

Mr. Jon Haag (ALCS, Inc) asked that current figures from his presentation at the October 2004 meeting be added, so the reader could have information that is current as of January 2005. Mr. Hollinger asked for a vote on the approval of the minutes with the agreed-upon changes, and the committee voted unanimously to accept the minutes with the changes. There were no abstentions.

European Aging Systems Coordination Group (EASCG) (Handout #3)

Mr. Heather gave an update of the EASCG. He commented on the group's membership and on new Terms of Reference. He discussed recent meetings, and commented on progress with the rules that EASCG is drafting. He commented that § 25.1529 of the Code of Federal Regulations is the equivalent to Certification Specification 25 (CS-25) in the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA). Mr. Kirk Thornburg (AirTran Airways) asked if the coordination group has good operator participation. Mr. Heather responded,

Docs #23267:

1

Approved October 12, 2005

JL/

**Aging Transport Systems Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ATSRAC)
Meeting Minutes**

saying they had asked for industry participation. However, only Airbus is currently represented.

Status of Safety Information Letters (SILs) for Cycling of Circuit Breakers

Mr. Hollinger commented that ATSRAC had previously agreed to encourage manufacturers to issue SILs on cycling of circuit breakers. He reported that the SIL from Airbus is already out, and the SIL for Boeing has been released for publication. He asked for the status of SIL issuance from other manufacturers. The representative from Dassault Aviation (Mr. Jean-Claude Laugeois) reported that Dassault will release their SIL in February 2005, and updates to the manual will be included in the normal revision process, depending on each specific model.

Mr. Hollinger commented that Mr. Huber had agreed to discuss the issue with Embraer. Mr. Huber said the letter to Embraer is currently being translated into Portuguese. Mr. Cliff Neudorf (TCCA) commented that he was in communication with Embraer and he found that Embraer was not aware of the SIL issue. Mr. Hollinger said Airbus and Boeing had agreed to provide their SILs to Embraer as examples.

Mr. Mike Sevigny (Bombardier) commented that the circuit breaker MPD manual has been updated for the CL-600/601/604 aircraft and for the Global Express aircraft. Mr. Hollinger asked if the Transport Aircraft division of Bombardier had done the same, and Mr. Sevigny said the transport division hadn't yet responded.

Mr. Hollinger said the representative from Lockheed Martin had commented that Lockheed would work on the SIL for the L-1011 aircraft fleet, and would consider the SILs from Boeing and Airbus as examples.

Small Transport Aircraft (STA) Maintenance Program Development (Handout #4)

Mr. Eli Cotti (NBAA) delivered a report on the STA Maintenance Program Development. He commented that the presentation was originally scheduled for last July. The presentation began as a summary of the Task 3 report for HWG 13. He commented that there are three elements in the process: Federal Aviation Regulations (FARs), the Operator, and the original equipment manufacturer (OEM). He discussed each of these elements and their involvement in the process. Mr. Cotti addressed the individual regulations that will be affected, and said he will focus on Part 25 elements. He commented on the Instructions for Continuing Airworthiness (ICA) development process, and the involvement of the OEMs and the FAA, through the Maintenance Review Board (MRB), with Aircraft Evaluation Group (AEG) coordination.

Mr. Cotti commented that the National Business Aircraft Association (NBAA) has accepted a standard for measuring SDA information and has developed a program called "Forum for Enhanced Reliability and Maintainability Standards" (FERMS). This

Docs #23267:

Approved October 12, 2005

JL/

**Aging Transport Systems Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ATSRAC)
Meeting Minutes**

program is available only to NBAA members. The program will collect and exchange maintenance information, and will roll out in February 2005. Mr. Cotti said the program will have a pre-population of data, and is coordinated with the OEMs, which can validate entries against definitions. Mr. Cotti then finished his presentation by commenting on the Task 3 recommendations.

HWG #13 Report (Handout #5)

Mr. Haag presented HWG 13's draft final report to the ATSRAC. Mr. Haag said there are some changes since the last report. Mr. Haag commented that there were no changes to the participants of the HWG, and there is representation from regulators, OEMs, operators, and maintenance organizations. He also commented on the information they reviewed for Electrical Wiring Interconnection System (EWIS). He said that many aircraft models are adopting the requirements of Maintenance Steering Group-3 (MSG-3), and thus will need the MSG-3 analysis, of which Enhanced Zonal Analysis Program (EZAP) will be a part.

Regarding the ICA review, Mr. Neudorf commented that the "Inadequate Clearance to Structure" issue was an installation issue, not an ICA issue. Mr. Haag said there are required inspections for aircraft in service, and so it is an ICA issue. On this point, Mr. Cotti commented that the ICA requires that the inspections review all wiring, from OEM and STC installation. Mr. Haag said awareness and training is a significant concern to the HWG.

Mr. Neudorf commented on the relationship between the ICA and AC 43.13-1B; during production and certification, and when complying with Part 25, AC 43.13-1B seems to detract from attempts to make the ICA complete. Mr. Neudorf asked if ATSRAC is keeping in place a system that isn't working well. Mr. Haag commented that the HWG's position is that the guidance available is good for when there isn't guidance from the OEM, and that AC 43.13-1B is not designed to "fill in the holes" left by the ICA. Mr. Schultz commented that even though there is more information available, the quality of the inspection isn't necessarily improved.

Mr. Elias asked Mr. Heather if EASA has an equivalent to AC 43.13-1B, and Mr. Heather responded that there is not. He said there is voluntary compliance with the "spirit" of AC 43.13-1B in Europe. Mr. Neudorf commented that in Canada, AC 43.13-1B provides too much latitude, and they find that limiting compliance with the requirements of AC is not sufficient.

Mr. Huber asked if there was a system in place that would assure the revisions to the OEM ICAs are captured. Mr. Haag commented that the Principal Maintenance Inspector (PMI) of any given operator will normally check this. Mr. Huber asked if there needs to be a revision to the HWG 9 AC to ensure compliance with the new ICA and EZAP requirements, and Mr. Haag said he didn't feel it is necessary.

Docs #23267:

3

Approved October 12, 2005

JL/

**Aging Transport Systems Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ATSRAC)
Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Haag said that WG 13 had held a roundtable discussion at the recent NBAA convention and he had informed those present about the progress with ATSRAC. He said those in attendance received the information positively. He said Mr. Rick Peri was able to provide information about what he had learned while visiting maintenance facilities.

Mr. Haag presented the HWG 13 recommendations. Mr. Neudorf commented that, in HWG 13 recommendation 2(c), the committee should clarify that the Standard Practice Manuals (SPMs) should be considered to be included in the ICA, and that the SPM would not be applicable if it was not part of the ICA. Mr. Glapa asked if the FAA has considered certification of individuals who have passed the EWIS training. Mr. Glenn White (FAA) commented there is no specific certification, and training would be limited to individual aircraft types, and also limited to individual operators. Mr. Glapa asked if the training will include differences from operator to operator and airplane to airplane. Mr. Harry Soestbergen (Garrett Aviation) commented that it's up to the PMI to make sure the operator of a maintenance facility is staffed with appropriately certificated and trained persons.

Mr. Hollinger led a discussion about whether the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) would apply to Part 25 aircraft of greater than 30 seats. Mr. Huber said that his position is that the NPRM for Part 25 will be for all Part 25 aircraft, without distinction on the number of seats. Mr. Hollinger asked if the 6-30 seat OEMs should be required to go back and develop ICAs. He asked Mr. Huber if the OEM should be required to perform a retroactive task analysis for Small Transport-category aircraft. Mr. Elias commented that the small transport aircraft are often used for purposes other than Part 121 operations, and therefore shouldn't be regulated as extensively as an aircraft that will be used for Part 121 operations.

Mr. Cotti proposed that the OEM retroactive task analysis for small transport aircraft be voluntary, because the training is sufficient. Mr. Don Andersen (Boeing) commented that sometimes, even under voluntary compliance, the FAA may not accept the voluntary program.

Mr. Vic Card (EASA) commented that only "several" of the OEMs had complied voluntarily. He said asking for voluntary compliance does not automatically mean the small transport aircraft manufacturers would comply. Mr. Elias suggested that if the cost/benefit analysis for the small aircraft manufacturers shows an unreasonable cost, then the FAA won't make it mandatory for the large aircraft manufacturers. Mr. Ric Anderson said the FAA is imposing an expense on a struggling industry for a problem that doesn't exist yet. Mr. Huber responded that the action will preempt accidents. Ms. Negroni asked why it is a problem to make it mandatory if the manufacturers are going to comply voluntarily near 100% anyway. Mr. Mike Richardson (Cessna Aircraft) said the costs of mandatory documentation to the FAA makes a significant difference

Docs #23267:

4

Approved October 12, 2005

JL/

**Aging Transport Systems Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ATSRAC)
Meeting Minutes**

between voluntary and mandatory compliance. Ms. Negroni suggested that the data would be retained and tracked anyway. Mr. Shultz argued that the resources required for mandatory documentation are far greater than for a voluntary program.

Mr. Hollinger called for a vote on the issue of whether the STA OEM retroactive task analysis should be mandatory. Eight members voted for voluntary task analysis, and seven members voted for mandatory task analysis. There was one abstention. Mr. Hollinger suggested to HWG 13 that a paragraph be inserted into the HWG 13 recommendation describing the result of this vote from the ATSRAC committee.

The committee then reviewed the HWG 13 report (**Handout #6**). It is slightly different from what had been distributed before the meeting, and Mr. Haag discussed the changes the HWG had made to the report. The committee discussed the specifics of the report. Mr. Card suggested that if the plan fails the cost/benefit analysis test and the FAA decides to make the issue voluntary, how can the OEMs be persuaded to adopt the issue voluntarily. Mr. Card referred to a list of comments that he had distributed before the meeting (**Handout #7**), specifically items 3, 4, 5, and 6. Mr. Card said that he suggested the changes outlined in his handout to make the language in the HWG 13 recommendations stronger.

Mr. Hollinger called for a vote on the adoption of Mr. Card's changes, outlined in items 3, 4, 5, and 6 of his handout, to replace items 2(a), 2(b), 2(c), and 3 on page 28 of the HWG 13 recommendation. The committee voted unanimously to accept Mr. Card's changes. Mr. Keefer and Mr. Haag (who are not members of the ATSRAC committee) said they disagreed with the adoption of Mr. Card's changes.

Mr. Cotti suggested that the comments of Mr. Wilfred Cotè from Transport Canada (and HWG 13 member) be added to the HWG report as an appendix. Mr. Hollinger suggested some other changes, including removal of some sections from the executive summary and other places for clarity and brevity.

Mr. Huber asked the committee if anyone wanted to volunteer to write position statements for the positions for and against making the STA OEM retroactive task analysis mandatory. Ms. Negroni said she would write a position paper representing those in favor of making the requirement mandatory, and Mr. Schultz volunteered to write a position paper for those who felt that the requirement should be voluntary. They agreed to send those position papers to Mr. Hollinger by January 21, 2005. Mr. David Harper (DoD) suggested that the position papers be reflected in Mr. Hollinger's forthcoming cover letter to Mr. Nick Sabatini (the FAA Associate Administrator for Regulation and Certification) outlining the recommendation of ATSRAC.

Mr. Hollinger called for a vote on the ASTRAC acceptance of the report from HWG 13, and the committee voted unanimously to accept the report.

**Aging Transport Systems Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ATSRAC)
Meeting Minutes**

Day Two, 8:00 AM

MMEL Analysis and Development (Handout #8)

Mr. Carl Stockamp (Boeing Flight Operations Engineering) commented on MMEL development and the Master Minimum Equipment List (MMEL) HWG. One product of the working group was a harmonized process for MMEL development. He commented that each MMEL is periodically reviewed at the Flight Operations and Evaluation Board (FOEB) meetings. He mentioned an industry group that deals with MMELs. He said this industry group consists of several FAA organizations, such as AFS-260, AFS-300, AEG, FSDO, CMOs, and also other groups such as regional airlines, ATA, ALPA, IAM, Airbus, Boeing, and Bombardier. JAA (Joint Aviation Authority) had started an MMEL working group, which will be continued during the transition to EASA.

Mr. Tom Atzert (Delta Air Lines) provided a report on wiring issues with MMELs and Minimum Equipment Lists (MELs). Mr. Atzert commented that the Dispatch Deviation Guide (DDG) does not always agree with the intent of the MMEL, and the DDG varies from operator to operator. He commented on the membership of the industry MMEL group, and said that it is diverse and staffed with knowledgeable people, and it is open to the public. He said the industry group develops MMEL policy letters, which provide guidance to the FOEB chairperson on how to revise MMELs.

Mr. Hollinger asked how an item gets on the agenda of the industry group meetings, and Mr. Atzert said the participant could contact the chairperson and ask that the item be added to the agenda for discussion. Mr. Atzert said there is a website called www.opspecs.com which provides MMEL information to FAA and operators.

Mr. Neudorf asked if the policy letter provides relief over and above the MMEL, and Mr. Atzert said the policy letter, once approved by the FAA, does provide that relief, but only when it is issued in the form of a global change.

Mr. Atzert said that MMEL development is an aircraft certification issue, and damaged wiring is not considered a failure mode for MMEL evaluation. The MMEL is based on the consideration of the next most critical failure and the workload of the pilot.

Mr. Atzert commented on the relationship between the MMEL and DDG, and said they are not meant to provide troubleshooting or fault isolation guidance. The MMEL does not allow operation with unrepaired or damaged wiring (without deactivation of the damaged wiring). Mr. Atzert commented that the fault is generally the component and not the wiring. Mr. Harper commented that operators don't seem to place emphasis on seeking wiring faults when an electrical fault is revealed.

Mr. Card asked if ATSRAC could recommend that an extra step be added to the MMEL maintenance procedure for component deferral, to make sure maintenance personnel address the issue of a potential wiring fault before releasing the aircraft for return to

Docs #23267:

6

Approved October 12, 2005

JL/

**Aging Transport Systems Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ATSRAC)
Meeting Minutes**

service. Mr. Hollinger asked if there was anyone in the ATSRAC who felt there was a disadvantage to asking that consideration be given (during development of the MMEL) to wiring faults during MEL deferral of an electrical component. The committee discussed and then voted on issuing the following recommendation:

“The FAA should consider guidance to developers of future MMELs to consider that damaged wiring may be the cause of system failures, and to consider (along with Standard Maintenance Practices) if it is advisable to electrically isolate failed systems prior to dispatch under the MMEL. The intent is to preclude potentially damaged wiring associated with an inoperable system of being able to produce damage to the aircraft.”

The vote was 11 in favor, 5 in opposition, with no abstentions. Mr. Doug Hill (Northwest Airlines) and Mr. Wayne Cummings (Lockheed) said they are opposed to the proposal for the above paragraph because they don't see this issue as a problem. They consider the recommendation to be unnecessary and said the issue is already covered in the FOEB process. Further, it is difficult to consider service experience when drafting MMELs, and increasing the MMEL-required maintenance procedures will interfere with aircraft in service. Mr. Soestbergen commented that operators would be forced to investigate simple faults, and would have to explore those faults without knowing the failure mode.

Future of ATSRAC

Mr. Huber commented on the future of ATSRAC. He said there is a new charter for two more years of activity and there is only one meeting scheduled for the next two years. He said at the next ATSRAC meeting, the committee would address comments to the forthcoming NPRM related to aging aircraft issues. Mr. Hollinger commented that at the October 2005 meeting, they will consider as a committee how to handle the disposition of the comments from the NPRM. Mr. Hollinger asked how long it would take to dispose of the comments. Mr. Huber said it depends on the number and type of comments received. Mr. Huber said he thought that six months would be the longest the process would take, and the NPRM should be released in April 2005. Mr. Huber said he didn't know how long it would take for the Office of the Secretary of Transportation and the Office of Management and Budget to process the rulemaking. The rules will consist of the EPAS rule (with fuel tank safety), WFD, and the Aging Aircraft Safety Rule.

Future Meeting Dates and Locations

Mr. Hollinger asked for comments on scheduling the next ATSRAC meeting. He suggested the committee should plan on two ATSRAC meetings after the October meeting (in January and April 2006), and he suggested that those meetings be scheduled now. Mr. Hollinger said the October 2005 meeting may need to be canceled if there are delays with the issuance of the NPRM or if the FAA approves an extended comment period. The committee discussed and agreed to the following schedule for future ATSRAC meetings:

Docs #23267:
Approved October 12, 2005
JL/

**Aging Transport Systems Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ATSRAC)
Meeting Minutes**

Date	Location
April 13-14, 2005	Canceled
May 11-12, 2005	Canceled
June 29-30, 2005	Canceled
October 12-13, 2005 (tentative)	Location: Augusta, Georgia
January 10-12, 2006 (tentative) (three-day meeting)	Tentative Location: Washington DC (ATA or Mitre)
April 4-6, 2006 (tentative)(three-day meeting)	Tentative Location: Herndon, VA (Airbus)

SDR Information (Handouts #9 and #10)

Mr. Huber showed the committee two charts about SDR reports for wiring issues. He said there have been recent decreases in the number of SDR reports. He commented that electrical systems tend to show the most SDR reports. Mr. Don Andersen commented that the data presented does not show aircraft operated in other countries. He said he also had noticed in his data a decrease in reports from Boeing. He said the numbers are decreasing because OEMs and maintenance organizations are getting better at fixing problems and they tend to not recur at the same rate as they used to.

New Requirements for Design Approval Holders (Handout #11)

Mr. Huber commented on the “Tiger Team” notice that was issued on July 30, 2004. He said he appreciates the work of the Tiger Team for EZAP/EPAS. Regarding fuel tank safety, Mr. Huber said there was going to be more guidance issued on three issues, including the compliance plan.

Mr. Schultz commented on the Aging Aircraft Safety rule. He said that this type of rule is disturbing because the aircraft design approval holder will be required to support a program that involves operating the aircraft beyond the design limits. He commented that there are many unanswered questions about the document released by the FAA in July 2004, including availability of certain data.

Mr. Cummings said he had already submitted comments to the FAA in support of Mr. Schultz’s position. Mr. Elias asked Mr. Schultz if he knows of any manufacturer ever surrendering an aircraft type certificate. Mr. Schultz said one OEM attempted it. There have been problems with maintenance tracking and quality of inspections. The OEM withdrew its request based on AD action by the FAA. Mr. Schultz said the issue is the old “legacy” airplanes that are currently flying.

Regarding Widespread Fatigue Damage (WFD), Mr. Schultz said the rule is being applied to all aircraft, which involve many types of components. Mr. Huber defended the

**Aging Transport Systems Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ATSRAC)
Meeting Minutes**

rule by stating that the FAA is tasked with enhancing the safety of aircraft regarding fatigue damage. Mr. Don Andersen said the issue doesn't seem to be continued operational safety, but continued airworthiness. He suggested the committee members go to the Docket Management System for the Department of Transportation and look at docket number 17681 for more information. Mr. Schultz said the data required by the FAA is expensive to produce, and asked if the FAA could consider engaging a third party to coordinate the data from operators and OEMs. Mr. Huber said that he would pass Mr. Schultz's suggestion to the persons working on the issue.

Mr. Ric Anderson said he thought the FAA tasked the AAWG on widespread fatigue damage. Mr. Huber said he couldn't remember if it had actually been tasked or not. Mr. Don Andersen suggested that positive comments are generally not from design approval holders. Mr. Schultz said he had asked for a public meeting on the issue, and he asked Mr. Huber if the FAA was going to offer a public meeting. Mr. Huber said he didn't know if there would be a public meeting, but they might decide after they issue the policy memo.

Arc Fault Circuit Breakers (Handout #12)

Mr. Huber presented a report on Arc Fault Circuit Breakers (AFCBs). He said he was in favor of increased use of these products, and he was promoting them to manufacturers and others. He showed pictures of arcing events on transport aircraft and discussed why typical thermal breakers don't provide the same protection as an AFCB. He described the implementation approach for AFCBs and said the FAA is going to issue an AC (in draft form) supporting the AFCBs. Mr. Card asked if the FAA would consider adopting European airlines into the in-service program for AFCB installation. Mr. Huber said the FAA is receiving a positive response from European and Asian operators, and asked if Mr. Card would be available to work on European operations integration to the installation programs. Mr. Card said he would help with integration.

HWG #12 Status Report and recommendations (Handout #13)

Mr. Hollinger presented a report on the status of HWG #12. He discussed the membership and the schedule of the HWG. He addressed the HWG work plan, and itemized completed tasks and those tasks still in progress. Mr. Hollinger presented the HWG's recommendations, beginning with the AFCB issue. He distributed a list of AFCB considerations (**Handout #14**) and said it wasn't necessarily a recommendation to the FAA, just a list of items to consider when debating the AFCB issue. Mr. Don Andersen asked if the pilots were going to be able to decide whether or not to reset the circuit breaker, as is the current practice, and Mr. Hollinger said they would.

Mr. Hollinger discussed the advantages and disadvantages to the FAA's implementation of a Technical Standard Order (TSO) for aircraft wiring. He said one of the advantages is it would provide a minimum level of safety for aircraft wires. Mr. Hollinger commented

Docs #23267:

9

Approved October 12, 2005

JL/

**Aging Transport Systems Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ATSRAC)
Meeting Minutes**

that the HWG had concluded that installers might inappropriately perceive approval to install the wiring in any aircraft because the wires hold a TSO. Further, he said there would be problems in testing the wiring for TSO design standards. Mr. Hollinger said, in consideration of the negative aspects of the proposal shown in his presentation, HWG 12 does not believe a wiring TSO would enhance aviation safety. However, the HWG decided to recommend that the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) consider the new performance standards in the draft AC for inclusion into their wiring performance standards that are listed in AC 43.13-1B. Mr. Hollinger distributed a proposed letter for SAE International regarding revising their specifications in light of these new wire performance standards (**Handout #15**). Mr. Hollinger called for a vote on the HWG recommendation that the FAA adopt new ACs regarding wiring standards for all aircraft, similar to the existing AC for Part 25 aircraft. The vote was unanimous. Mr. Hollinger also proposed a vote on sending his letter to the SAE. The vote was unanimous, with one abstention.

Regarding "Maintenance Effects and Mixed Wire Types," the committee discussed the issue of training requirements and records retention for EWIS training (**Handout #16**). Mr. Don Andersen suggested that this represents an added requirement for operators. Mr. Hollinger agreed to change the wording of the Training subject in his report to place a period after "kept" in the last sentence. Regarding inspections, Mr. Hollinger said the chief problem was with clamping and routing of wires. Mr. Ric Anderson suggested that if the FAA causes OEMs to focus on clamping and routing, the OEM may place less emphasis on other areas. Mr. Neudorf agreed that the new emphasis on clamping and routing would drive the focus away from zonal analysis. Mr. Card suggested that the subject did not require more emphasis because it is redundant to what is already provided. Mr. Hollinger called for a vote for removing item (2)(Inspection) from the HWG's recommendation. The committee voted 10 in favor of removing item (2), 0 opposed to removing item (2), with one abstention.

Mr. Hollinger introduced another draft letter to SAE International from ATSRAC (**Handout #17**) providing recommendations to SAE about Effects of Related and Unrelated Maintenance on the Integrity of Aircraft Electrical Interconnect Systems (EWIS). Mr. Hollinger called for a vote on the issuance of the letter to the SAE. The committee voted unanimously to issue the letter, with two abstentions.

Mr. Hollinger remarked on a proposal to use digital photographs to document wiring damage for maintenance records. He suggested that it was a best practice idea, and would also be useful for training. He said it would not be a formal recommendation, but perhaps an informal proposal or suggestion to the FAA. Mr. Ric Anderson suggested the committee not refer to it as a best practice, because not using the photographs does not constitute nonadherence to best practices. Mr. Don Andersen said that images are already widely used to record structural damage and other issues. Mr. Wayne Maxey (Boeing) said operators may find that it is in their best interests and the OEMs that photos of this kind be kept private. In response to the discussion, Mr. Hollinger proposed

Docs #23267:

10

Approved October 12, 2005

JL/

**Aging Transport Systems Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ATSRAC)
Meeting Minutes**

removing this item from the recommendation because it is already covered in the training AC. Two ATSRAC members voted to keep the proposal as written, and the remaining members voted to remove the item from the recommendation.

Mr. Hollinger closed his report by listing the remaining tasks for HWG 12. He suggested various plans for completing the work of HWG 12, and asked for discussion on the future of HWG 12. He commented that HWG is dependent on the FAA to provide taskings, and asked if the HWG should identify its own tasks. Alternatives are to “sunset” the HWG and dissolve it at the October 2005 ATSRAC meeting, or to continue the HWG with FAA tasks, or tasks of the HWG’s own choosing. Those tasks could also come from ATSRAC. These items were discussed by the committee. Mr. Ric Anderson suggested the HWG should not endeavor to self-task on the issues that Mr. Hollinger had suggested. Mr. Hollinger said the HWG is not trying to justify its existence by tasking itself indefinitely. Mr. Don Andersen suggested that HWG is empowered to review new items of significance, and suggested the HWG examine a recent wire flammability report. He said the report is relevant and the HWG 12 is particularly suited to review documents like the wire flammability report.

Mr. Card suggested that ATSRAC seems to be moving away from ~~its~~ original purpose of studying Aging Aircraft Systems, and for HWG 12 to move into other areas departs from the original purpose of ATSRAC. He proposed that once the comments are reviewed from the NPRM, ATSRAC is finished and should be dissolved. He said that HWG 12 should end or be reassigned to another purpose, perhaps with a new mission. Mr. Huber said he would like to keep up the work of HWG 12 because the product is valuable.

Deleted: it's

Mr. Card proposed HWG 12 and ATSRAC complete their work and then end. Mr. Hollinger called for discussion on Mr. Card’s proposal. Ms. Luci Crittenden (NASA) said the research work of HWG 12 should continue, whether through ATSRAC or through some other vehicle. She said the FAA couldn’t do the research itself because it is not a research center (like NASA), and HWG 12 is the tool to do this.

Mr. Hollinger suggested that HWG 12 couldn’t exist on its own, because it would be an “orphan” and needs an organization to report to. He said that HWG 12 is a valuable research group and needs a body to report to. Mr. Card agreed that HWG 12 is valuable, but needs to exist in a different form.

Mr. Hollinger called for a vote on a recommendation from ATSRAC to the FAA that the FAA should develop a transition plan for a new industry-wide body to:

“identify, review, screen, transfer, and implement technologies and knowledge that enhance the safety and continued airworthiness of aircraft systems. The scope of this body would include procedures, equipment and systems to design, monitor, analyze inspect, test and maintain aircraft systems. This body should be in place by October 2005 so that it may commence upon the completion of HWG 12’s tasking.”

Docs #23267:

11

Approved October 12, 2005

JL/

**Aging Transport Systems Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ATSRAC)
Meeting Minutes**

The vote was unanimous with no abstentions.

Mr. Hollinger began a discussion about further tasking of HWG 12 and the completion of current tasks. He suggested the HWG address the report on wiring flammability presented by Mr. Don Andersen, with a report to be presented at the October 2005 ATSRAC meeting. After a short discussion he called for a vote on tasking HWG 12 to make recommendations on the wiring flammability report presented to the ATSRAC committee by Mr. Don Andersen. The majority of the ATSRAC members voted to the affirmative. Mr. Hollinger asked if any other ATSRAC members had suggestions for tasks that should be addressed by HWG 12 by October 2005. None were suggested.

Other Business

Mr. Hollinger reviewed the future meeting times and locations. Mr. Huber reviewed the dates for the Aging Aircraft Conference. Mr. Hollinger reported that DuPont was sponsoring a wiring conference at the Paris Airshow in June 2005.

Mr. Hollinger closed the meeting by asking for a summary of the Action Items:

Action Items

Open Action Item From July 2004 Meeting

1. Send Mr. Huber information about wire system metrics (Mr. Robert Ernst, JCAA Chairman). [Mr. Huber will send a reminder e-mail to Mr. Ernst to send this information.]

Open Action Items from October 2004 Meeting

1. Arrange workshop for STC holders on the EZAP process. (Mr. Huber)
2. Send information to Mr. Huber on small manufacturers' voluntary compliance with EZAP process. (Mr. Haag)[Mr. Huber will send a reminder to Mr. Haag.]

Action items for the January 2005 ATSRAC Meeting

1. Mr. Huber will provide information to the CTA about issuance of SILs regarding cycling of circuit breakers.
2. Ms. Negroni and Mr. Schultz will draft position papers on making retroactive task analysis for STA OEMs mandatory or voluntary (respectively), limited to points brought up at the ATSRAC meeting, by January 21, 2005.
3. Mr. Huber will provide a summary of the FAA's dispositions of the ATSRAC recommendations to the FAA since the last update.
4. Mr. Franz Frank (Airbus), Mr. Hollinger, and Mr. Ric Anderson will follow up with confirmation of the future meeting locations.

Docs #23267:

12

Approved October 12, 2005

JL/

**Aging Transport Systems Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ATSRAC)
Meeting Minutes**

Adjourn at 4:00 PM

Docs #23267:
Approved October 12, 2005
JL/