



U.S. Department  
of Transportation

**Federal Aviation  
Administration**

Office of the Administrator

800 Independence Ave., S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20591

October 6, 2014

The Honorable John D. Rockefeller, IV  
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,  
Science, and Transportation  
United States Senate  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

As required by the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, Section 343, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is pleased to provide the enclosed report.

The Act directs the FAA to submit biannual reports on the results of the reviews of the Air Transportation Oversight System database conducted under section 343, including copies of the monthly team reports required by subsection (b).

The enclosed report delineates the results for the 9-month period from February 2012 through October 2012 and the 6-month period from November 2012 through April 2013. A synopsis of each region's review is included as an appendix.

We have sent identical letters to Chairman Shuster, Senator Thune, and Congressman Rahall.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael P. Huerta", with a large circular flourish at the end.

Michael P. Huerta  
Administrator

Enclosure



U.S. Department  
of Transportation

**Federal Aviation  
Administration**

Office of the Administrator

800 Independence Ave., S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20591

October 6, 2014

The Honorable John Thune  
Committee on Commerce,  
Science, and Transportation  
United States Senate  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Thune:

As required by the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, Section 343, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is pleased to provide the enclosed report.

The Act directs the FAA to submit biannual reports on the results of the reviews of the Air Transportation Oversight System database conducted under section 343, including copies of the monthly team reports required by subsection (b).

The enclosed report delineates the results for the 9-month period from February 2012 through October 2012 and the 6-month period from November 2012 through April 2013. A synopsis of each region's review is included as an appendix.

We have sent identical letters to Chairman Rockefeller and Shuster and Congressman Rahall.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael P. Huerta", with a circled number "1" next to it.

Michael P. Huerta  
Administrator

Enclosure



U.S. Department  
of Transportation

**Federal Aviation  
Administration**

Office of the Administrator

800 Independence Ave., S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20591

October 6, 2014

The Honorable Bill Shuster  
Chairman, Committee on Transportation  
and Infrastructure  
House of Representatives  
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

As required by the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, Section 343, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is pleased to provide the enclosed report.

The Act directs the FAA to submit biannual reports on the results of the reviews of the Air Transportation Oversight System database conducted under section 343, including copies of the monthly team reports required by subsection (b).

The enclosed report delineates the results for the 9-month period from February 2012 through October 2012 and the 6-month period from November 2012 through April 2013. A synopsis of each region's review is included as an appendix.

We have sent identical letters to Chairman Rockefeller, Senator Thune, and Congressman Rahall.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael P. Huerta", with a circled number "1" next to it.

Michael P. Huerta  
Administrator

Enclosure



U.S. Department  
of Transportation

**Federal Aviation  
Administration**

Office of the Administrator

800 Independence Ave., S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20591

October 6, 2014

The Honorable Nick J. Rahall, II  
Committee on Transportation  
and Infrastructure  
House of Representatives  
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman Rahall:

As required by the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, Section 343, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is pleased to provide the enclosed report.

The Act directs the FAA to submit biannual reports on the results of the reviews of the Air Transportation Oversight System database conducted under section 343, including copies of the monthly team reports required by subsection (b).

The enclosed report delineates the results for the 9-month period from February 2012 through October 2012 and the 6-month period from November 2012 through April 2013. A synopsis of each region's review is included as an appendix.

We have sent identical letters to Chairman Rockefeller and Shuster and Senator Thune.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael P. Huerta", with a circled number "1" to the right.

Michael P. Huerta  
Administrator

Enclosure



FAA  
Aviation Safety

# ATOS

Biannual Report to Congress:  
Results of Monthly Reviews of Air  
Transportation Oversight System (ATOS)  
Data by FAA Flight Standards Regions  
*Data from February 2012 to April 2013*



*This page intentionally left blank*

## Executive Summary

The FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (hereafter referred to as the Act) was signed on February 14, 2012. Section 343 of the Act addressed "Review of Air Transportation Oversight System Database" and requires that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Administrator establish a process whereby the FAA Flight Standards (AFS) Regions use the Air Transportation Oversight System (ATOS) database to identify adverse trends in regulatory compliance, take appropriate corrective actions where necessary, and submit their findings to the FAA Administrator, the Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety (AVS-1), and the Director of Flight Standards Service (AFS-1) on a monthly basis. Also, the Act requires that the Administrator submit a biannual report to Congress on the results of Regional reviews to include copies of the monthly regional reports. While the regions are required to identify trends and take the appropriate corrective actions, the Flight Standards National Field Office (AFS-900) was designated as project coordinator for Flight Standards. Within AFS-900, the Analysis and Information Program Office (AIPO) is the office responsible for facilitating and coordinating the law's implementation.

The FAA would like to highlight several fundamental concepts in this initial report to provide an understanding of challenges associated with compiling the data for this baseline assessment of ATOS trends. ATOS was designed to allow FAA Aviation Safety Inspectors (ASIs) to perform surveillance and oversight at their individual air carrier at the local level, not to facilitate FAA system-wide or region-wide analysis. Secondly, the ATOS process uses periodic assessments of the different elements of the operator's program, at different intervals depending on risk, which span a five year time frame. Lastly, ATOS policy directs the Certificate Management Team (CMT) for each air carrier to prioritize their surveillance activities based on areas of greatest risk; since different carriers have different risks, CMTs may not be evaluating the same elements during a given quarter or year. For these reasons it is difficult for the Regions to identify regional trends in this very short time period. Despite the original design of ATOS, as time passes and the amount of accumulated data increases, FAA anticipates it will become easier to identify trends at the regional level.

The FAA has determined that the Assessment Determination and Implementation (ADI) scores generated in ATOS module seven is the most suitable for identifying trends. The ADI process is used by principal inspectors to determine if an air carrier's system is properly designed and if it performs as intended. Therefore ADI data is reported herein.

This is a combined report for the first and second biannual submissions, and covers monthly reviews of ATOS data from February 2012 to October 2012 and from November 2012 to April 2013. Each of the eight Flight Standards regional offices reviewed ADI scores for their operators, calculating possible trends, and reviewing all relevant underlying data when possible adverse trends were detected. Teams of FAA employees including Operations Research Analysts (ORAs) and ASIs reviewed inspection findings and corrective actions being worked by the Certificate Management Teams (CMTs) for the operators involved in the adverse trend. The regional office teams considered whether additional corrective actions were required to address the risk. Finally, the regional office team documented its findings and provided it to AIPO. The AIPO created a synopsis of monthly findings, with each Region's monthly report attached. Monthly reporting to AFS-1, AVS-1 and the Administrator commenced with the September 2012 report, when sufficient data had been assembled and a format for presentation refined. After the review of the October report, with the review process standardized, the FAA ended the first reporting period and assessed the combined findings. As such, the first reporting period includes the nine-month period between February 2012 and October 2012, while the second and future reporting periods will only include a six-month reporting period.

### First Reporting Period – February 2012 to October 2012

The eight Flight Standards regional offices documented a total of 155 adverse trends in regulatory compliance during the first nine-month reporting period, or about 2.1 trends found per region per month. The adverse trends identified were evenly distributed between airworthiness (AW) elements and operations (OP) elements. The element involved in adverse trends most frequently cited by the regions was 3.2.2 Flight / Load Manifest / Weight and Balance Control (OP), mentioned eight different times by three regions.

### Second Reporting Period – November 2012 to April 2013

During the second reporting period, the reporting process had matured and evolved as requirements were clarified and Regions became more versed with the process and program. There were no revisions to the reporting requirements; any changes made can be characterized as minor adjustments to the process. The regions reported fewer items during this six-month period as meeting the standards for “adverse trends in regulatory requirements.” The eight Flight Standards regional offices documented a total of 23 adverse trends in regulatory compliance during this six-month review, or about 0.5 trends per region per month.

It should be noted that the inherent nature of ATOS data does not lend itself to a comparative regional trend analysis program without significant manipulation of the data. As such, this has been an iterative activity that had been changed, updated, and improved over the first nine months of analysis and reporting, in order to develop a process that can effectively use ATOS data to meet the requirements of the Act. The information presented is an evolution based upon the collaborative development experience among the regions and between the regions and FAA headquarters.

# Table of Contents

<b>Public Law Requiring Air Transportation Oversight System (ATOS) Reviews.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Overview of ATOS.....</b>	<b>1</b>
ATOS Design Assessments and Performance Assessments .....	1
ATOS Assessment Determination and Implementation (ADI) Scores.....	2
<b>Analytical Process for Monthly Reviews of ATOS by the Regions.....</b>	<b>3</b>
Analytical Process Selected for Monthly Reviews of ATOS data .....	4
Method to Ensure Calibration and Consistency of the Effort.....	4
<b>Results of ATOS Reviews by Regions .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Adverse Trends Found In Regulatory Compliance.....	5
Discussion of Corrective Actions Taken .....	6
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>6</b>

**Appendix A - List of Acronyms**

**Appendix B - ATOS System/Subsystem/Elements**

**Appendix C - Process for Monthly Review of ATOS Data by FAA AFS Regions**

**Appendix D - Template for Transmittal Memo Used by AFS Regions to Document Findings from Monthly Section 343 Reviews of ATOS Data**

**Appendix E - Monthly Synopses of Findings from Section 343 Reviews of ATOS Data by AFS Regional Offices**

*This page intentionally blank*

## Public Law Requiring Air Transportation Oversight System (ATOS) Reviews

The FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (Reauthorization of The Federal Aviation Administration) was signed by the President on February 14, 2012. Section 343 of the law addressed "Review of Air Transportation Oversight System Database" and contained the following requirements:

**(a) REVIEWS.**—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall establish a process by which the air transportation oversight system database of the Administration is reviewed by regional teams of employees of the Administration, including at least one employee on each team representing aviation safety inspectors, on a monthly basis to ensure that—

- (1) any trends in regulatory compliance are identified; and
- (2) appropriate corrective actions are taken in accordance with Administration regulations, advisory directives, policies, and procedures.

**(b) MONTHLY TEAM REPORTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A regional team of employees conducting a monthly review of the air transportation oversight system database under subsection (a) shall submit to the Administrator, the Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety, and the Director of Flight Standards Service a report each month on the results of the review.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—A report submitted under paragraph (1) shall identify—

- (A) any trends in regulatory compliance discovered by the team of employees in conducting the monthly review; and
- (B) any corrective actions taken or proposed to be taken in response to the trends.

**(c) BIENNIAL REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**—The Administrator, on a biennial basis, shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the results of the reviews of the air transportation oversight system database conducted under this section, including copies of reports received under subsection (b).

## Overview of ATOS

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) inspectors use ATOS to conduct surveillance of air carrier maintenance and operations at all Part 121 U.S. air carriers. FAA inspectors apply system safety principles and use data analysis to focus their inspections on areas that pose the greatest risk and identify potential problems before accidents occur. ATOS has three primary functions: assessments of air carrier system design, assessments of air carrier system performance, and risk management. All three of these functions require decisions by FAA inspectors and managers; therefore, ATOS is considered a decision support system.

Under ATOS, FAA's primary responsibilities are: (1) to verify that an air carrier is capable of operating safely and complies with the regulations and standards prescribed by the Administrator before issuing an air carrier operating certificate and before approving or accepting air carrier programs; (2) to verify that an air carrier continues to meet regulatory requirements when environmental changes occur by conducting periodic reviews; and (3) to continually validate the performance of an air carrier's approved and accepted programs for the purpose of continued operational safety.

## ATOS Design Assessments and Performance Assessments

The Design Assessment (DA) is the ATOS function that ensures an air carrier's operating systems comply with regulations and safety standards, including the requirement to provide

service at the highest level of safety in the public interest. DA is an extremely important function of ATOS because safety is the outcome of a properly designed system.

The Performance Assessment (PA) is used by FAA inspectors to confirm that an air carrier's operating systems produce intended results, including mitigation or control of hazards and associated risks. ATOS uses time-based PAs to detect latent, systemic failures that may occur due to subtle environmental changes. PA schedules are also adjustable based on known risks or safety priorities. Surveillance provides information for PAs and risk management.

ATOS uses a structured process to analyze how systems, subsystems, and elements interact. Seven air carrier systems form the basis for the ATOS system-based approach. Each of these systems has a defined set of subsystems and elements. Elements are interrelated activities or actions completed to support air carrier subsystems and systems. These ATOS elements are shown in Appendix B. A DA for each element, which is an assessment of the element or program's design, must be accomplished every five years, unless a risk-based reason for doing otherwise is documented." The baseline interval for PAs, which is an evaluation of the element's performance, is once every 6 months for high-criticality elements, once a year for medium-criticality elements, and once every 3 years for low-criticality elements. After completing the initial PA for an element, the PI or CPM must schedule another assessment within the applicable baseline intervals. It is important to understand that the FAA does not collect all of the requisite data for an air carrier until a full five year cycle is completed.

### **ATOS Assessment Determination and Implementation (ADI) Scores**

One of the outputs of the ATOS business process are the Assessment Determination and Implementation (ADI) Scores generated in Module 7 of the ATOS process, Design Analysis and Assessment (for Design Assessments) and Performance Analysis and Assessment (for Performance Assessments). The analysis and assessment process modules are used by the principal inspector (PI) to make a bottom-line assessment about whether the air carrier's system design meets the standards for acceptance or approval (for DAs), or to determine whether the air carrier's system performs as intended by regulations in such a way that it controls environmental hazards (for PAs).

The ATOS analysis and assessment process requires analysis of the Safety Attribute Inspection (SAI) data by element (for DAs) or Element Performance Inspection (EPI) data by element (for PAs). The PI assesses the data analysis package, comparing analyzed and assessed SAI/EPI data for the current DA or PA with historical data and other data for the Element. After assessing the ATOS data analysis package with input from other Certificate Management Team (CMT) members, as required, the PI determines whether the air carrier system design for that element meets the requirements for either continued approval or acceptance, or initial approval or acceptance.

For a DA, once the PI completes the bottom-line assessment, he or she decides to accept or reject the design and assigns a numerical ADI score from 1 to 6, as described in Table 1.

- No rationale is required for bottom-line assessment category 1 (green) for "No issues observed."
- If the design is accepted, the PI includes the rationale for bottom-line assessments categories 2 through 5 (green or yellow).
- If the PI determines that the air carrier's system design does not meet the requirements for approval, he or she assigns an ADI score of 6 (red) and documents the rationale for the decision and any issues or concerns.

**Table 1: Bottom-line Design Assessment ADI Scores**

ADI Score	Assessment Result		Action Required
1	Design Approved	No issues observed	No action required
2	Design Approved	Minor issues observed	No action required
3	Design Approved	Minor issues observed	Mitigation required
4	Design Approved	Major issues observed	Mitigation required
5	Design Approved	Safety and/or regulatory issues observed	Mitigation required
6	Design Rejected	Systemic safety and/or regulatory issues observed	System reconfiguration by air carrier or applicant required

For a PA, once the PI completes the bottom-line assessment, he or she decides whether or not to affirm performance and assigns a numerical ADI score from 1 to 6, as described in Table 2.

- No rationale is required for bottom-line assessment category 1 (green) for “No issues observed.”
- If performance is affirmed, the PI includes the rationale for bottom-line assessments categories 2 through 4 (green or yellow).
- If the PI determines that the applicant’s or air carrier’s system performance is not affirmed, he or she assigns an ADI score of 5 (yellow) or 6 (red), as applicable, and documents the rationale for the decision and any issues or concerns.

**Table 2: Bottom-line Performance Assessment ADI Scores**

ADI Score	Assessment Result		Action Required
1	Performance Affirmed	No issues observed	No action required
2	Performance Affirmed	Minor issues observed	No action required
3	Performance Affirmed	Minor issues observed	Action Required
4	Performance Affirmed	Issues of concern observed	Action Required
5	Performance Not Affirmed	Safety and/or regulatory issues observed	Action Required
6	Performance Not Affirmed	Systemic safety and/or regulatory issues observed	System reconfiguration by air carrier or applicant is required

### Analytical Process for Monthly Reviews of ATOS by the Regions

This section describes the process and methodology used to determine trends and corrective actions required by the Act.

#### Development of Analytical Process

AFS-900, the project coordinator, and the regions developed the process used by the regional offices to meet the requirements of Section 343. AIPO met with regional teams in developing this project. Each individual regional team is composed of the manager of the Safety Analysis & Evaluation Branch, one or more ORAs, and one or more ASIs. This working group is referred to as the "Section 343 Project Team."

Regulatory compliance (or non-compliance) has been determined by the Project Team to include items noted by inspectors that related to regulatory issues, but not limited to issues being pursued under the FAA Compliance and Enforcement Program. It was also determined that ATOS issues would not be limited to those questions in the ATOS Data Collection Tools (DCTs) flagged with "Specific Regulatory Requirements" because ATOS as a whole is designed to ensure regulatory compliance.

The Section 343 Project Team agreed that items identified for tracking would meet the following criteria:

- They can be consistently applied across all AFS regions
- The analysis will be limited to analysis of ATOS data
- The item was identified more than once (more than one data point)
- Agreed-upon definition of an "adverse trend" (see Appendix C).

### **Analytical Process Selected for Monthly Reviews of ATOS data**

The final process for monthly reviews of ATOS data by each AFS regional office was set forth by AFS-900 in the document "Process for Monthly Review of ATOS Data v.5-5" (11/15/2012). The details of this process are included as Appendix C. A template for the memo used by the regions to transmit their findings from this process to AFS-900 is included as Appendix D.

### **Method to Ensure Calibration and Consistency of the Effort**

The AIPO Staff reviews each region's submittals for adherence to the analytical protocols and requests revision of those submittals as needed. AIPO also hosts a monthly telecon with the regional points-of-contact (POCs) where issues and concerns with the data or the process can be discussed to help ensure calibration and consistency.

### **Results of ATOS Reviews by Regions**

This is a combined report for the first and second biannual submissions, so it covers monthly reviews of ATOS data from February 2012 to October 2012 and from November 2012 to April 2013. Each of the eight Flight Standards regional offices reviewed ADI scores for their operators, calculating possible trends, and reviewing all relevant underlying data when possible adverse trends were detected. Teams of FAA employees including Operations Research Analysts (ORAs) and ASIs reviewed inspection findings and corrective actions being worked by the Certificate Management Teams (CMTs) for the operators involved in the adverse trend. The regional office teams considered whether additional corrective actions were required to address the risk. Finally, the regional office team documented their findings using the findings, and transmitted that memo to AIPO in AFS-900, The AIPO created a synopsis of monthly findings, with each Region's monthly report attached. Monthly reporting to AFS-1, AVS-1 and the Administrator commenced with the September 2012 report, when sufficient data had been assembled and a format for presentation refined. After AFS completed the process for one more month without revisions from upper management (completing the monthly report with October data) we ended the first reporting period and assessed the combined findings. The established process functioned smoothly during the second reporting period, so there were no revisions to the reporting requirements covering the review of ATOS data by the AFS regions for the months November 2012 to April 2013.

Appendix E presents the synopses of findings from the regions for each of the months of data from February 2012 through April 2013. It is important to note the following when reviewing the results being presented:

- ATOS is designed for the CMT to identify hazards and risks at the local level and work with the certificate holder to develop and track corrective actions. The process does not lend itself to a comparative regional trend analysis program without significant manipulation of the data.

- The ATOS process is based upon periodic assessments of different elements of the operator's program. These assessments occur at various intervals based on criticality of the element. Performance Assessments can occur at 6 month, 1 year, or 3 year intervals while a Design Assessment occurs at a 5 year interval.
- Trends are slow to develop due to the periodic nature of the ATOS assessment program.
- Some regions modified their approach to reviewing their ATOS data as they gained experience and insights, so their reports on February and March 2012 data may be somewhat different from those from later months.

**Adverse Trends Found In Regulatory Compliance**

First Reporting Period – February 2012 to October 2012

The eight Flight Standards regional offices documented a total of 155 regional adverse trends in regulatory compliance in the first reporting period (covering nine months of ATOS data), or about 2.1 trends found per region per month. The adverse trends identified were approximately evenly distributed between airworthiness (AW) elements and operations (OP) elements. The element involved in adverse trends most frequently cited by the regions was 3.2.2 Flight / Load Manifest / Weight and Balance Control (OP), mentioned eight different times by three regions. Table 3 summarizes the elements most often noted in February to October 2012 ATOS data reviews.

**Table 3  
Most Mentions for Adverse Trends in ATOS Monthly Reviews by AFS Regions  
February to October 2012**

Element	Total Regions	Total Mentions
3.2.2 Flight / Load Manifest / Weight and Balance Control (OP)	3	8
1.3.9 Major Repairs and Alterations (AW)	3	7
3.1.3 Airman Duties / Flightdeck Procedures (OP)	3	6
4.2.4 Training of Flight Attendants (OP)	3	6
1.3.11 Continuous Analysis and Surveillance System (CASS) (AW)	3	5
1.3.2 Maintenance / Inspection Schedule (AW)	3	5
1.3.6 Airworthiness Directives and Maintenance Record Requirements (AW)	3	5
3.1.7 De-Icing Program (OP)	2	5
4.2.7 Training of Check Airmen and Instructors (OP)	2	5
5.1.8 Extended Operations (ETOPS) (OP)	4	5

Second Reporting Period – November 2012 to April 2013

The eight Flight Standards regional offices documented a total of 23 regional adverse trends in regulatory compliance in the second reporting period (covering six months of ATOS data), involving 17 airworthiness (AW) elements and six operations (OP) elements. The element involved in adverse trends most frequently cited by the regions was 1.2.1 Airworthiness Release/Maintenance Log Recording Requirements (AW), mentioned three times by three regions. Table 4 summarizes the elements most often noted in November 2012 to April 2013 ATOS data reviews.

**Table 4  
Most Mentions for Adverse Trends in ATOS Monthly Reviews by AFS Regions  
November 2012 to April 2013**

<b>Element</b>	<b>Total Regions</b>	<b>Total Mentions</b>
1.2.1 Airworthiness Release / Maintenance Log Recording Requirements (A)	3	3
1.3.16 Fueling (A)	2	2
1.3.19 Lower Landing Minimums (A)	2	2
1.3.7 Maintenance Providers (A)	2	2
5.1.9 RVSM Authorization (A)	2	2

**Discussion of Corrective Actions Taken**

Once an adverse trend is identified by an AFS regional office as part of the Section 343 review of ATOS data, the Section 343 Project Team within that office reviews any corrective actions already initiated by the relevant CMT(s) for the operator(s) involved in the adverse trend, as well as other relevant data. The project team then determines whether additional corrective action is needed to address the risk area.

Corrective actions taken by the regional offices in response to the adverse trends identified in the reviews of data from February 2012 through April 2013 were limited to "continue to monitor this trend." In each case where adverse trends were identified, the responsible regional office determined that the corrective actions being taken by the responsible CMT were appropriate and no further action (other than monitoring the issue) was required. Most regions have reported their findings in language such as "Actions by CMT(s) are appropriate and Region will continue to monitor."

**Conclusion**

AFS will continue to develop and refine the Section 343 analyses and reporting process as we identify hazards and risks across the regions. The five-year ATOS process will require additional time and data before AFS can draw meaningful conclusions that can be applied across the specific regions and the FAA.

## Appendix A: List of Acronyms

ACEP	Air Carrier Evaluation Process
ADI	Assessment Determination and Implementation
AFS-1	Director of Flight Standards Service
AFS-900	Flight Standards National Field Office
AIPO	Analysis and Information Program Office (part of AFS-900)
ASI	Aviation Safety Inspector
ATOS	Air Transportation Oversight System
AW	Airworthiness
AVS-1	Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety
CATT	Corrective Action Tracking Tool
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CMT	Certificate Management Team
ConDOR	Constructed Dynamic Observation Report
CPM	Certification Project Manager
DA	Design Assessment
DCT	Data Collection Tool
DOR	Dynamic Observation Report
DR	Design (Assessment) Result
EIP	Enforcement Investigation Program
EPI	Element Performance Inspection
OP	Operations
ORA	Operations Research Analysts
PA	Performance Assessment
PI	Principal Inspector
PR	Performance (Assessment) Result
SAI	System Attribute Inspection
SAT	System Analysis Team

*This page intentionally left blank*

## Appendix B: ATOS System/Subsystem/Elements

**ATOS System/Subsystem/Element Chart—Airworthiness Elements**

1.0 Aircraft Configuration Control		2.0 Manuals	
<b>1.1 Aircraft</b>		<b>2.1 Manual Management</b>	
1.1.3 (M)	Special Flight Permits	2.1.1 (M)	Manual Management
<b>1.2 Records and Reporting Systems</b>			
1.2.1 (M)	Airworthiness Release/Maintenance Log Recording Requirements		
1.2.4 (L)	Mechanical Interruption Summary (MIS)/Service Difficulty Report (SDR)	<b>4.0 Personnel Training and Qualifications</b>	
<b>1.3 Maintenance Organization</b>		<b>4.1 Maintenance Personnel Qualifications</b>	
1.3.1 (M)	Maintenance Program	4.1.1 (M)	RII Personnel
1.3.2 (M)	Maintenance/Inspection Schedule	4.1.2 (L)	Maintenance Certificate Requirements
1.3.3 (M)	Maintenance Facility/Main Maintenance Base	<b>4.2 Training Program</b>	
1.3.4 (H)	Required Inspection Items (RII)	4.2.1 (M)	Maintenance/ RII Training Program
1.3.5 (H)	Minimum Equipment List (MEL)/Configuration Deviation List (CDL)/Deferred Maintenance		
1.3.6 (H)	Airworthiness Directives (AD) and Maintenance Record Requirements		
1.3.7 (H)	Maintenance Providers	<b>5.0 Route Structures</b>	
1.3.8 (M)	Control of Calibrated Tools and Test Equipment	<b>5.1 Approved Routes and Areas</b>	
1.3.9 (H)	Major Repairs and Alterations	5.1.1 (H)	Line Stations
1.3.10 (M)	Aircraft Parts/Material Control	5.1.8 (H)	Extended Operations (ETOPS)
1.3.11 (H)	Continuing Analysis and Surveillance System (CASS)	5.1.9 (M)	Reduced Vertical Separation Minimum (RVSM) Authorization
1.3.15 (H)	Reliability Program		
1.3.16 (M)	Fueling		
1.3.17(M)	Weight and Balance (W&B) Program	<b>7.0 Technical Administration</b>	
1.3.18 (M)	Deicing Program	<b>7.1 Key Personnel</b>	
1.3.19 (M)	Lower Landing Minimums	7.1.1 (L)	Part 119 Required Personnel
1.3.23 (M)	Short-Term Escalations	7.1.6 (H)	Maintenance Control
1.3.24 (L)	Coordinating Agencies for Supplier's Evaluation (C.A.S.E.)		
1.3.25 (H)	Cargo Handling Equipment, Systems and Appliances		

**(H):** High Criticality Elements.

**(M):** Medium Criticality Elements.

**(L):** Low Criticality Elements.

**ATOS System/Subsystem/Element Chart—Operations Elements**

1.0 Aircraft Configuration Control		4.0 Personnel Training and Qualifications	
<b>1.1 Aircraft</b>		<b>4.2 Training Program</b>	
1.1.2 (L)	Appropriate Operational Equipment	4.2.3 (M)	Training of Flightcrew Members
<b>2.0 Manuals</b>		4.2.4 (M)	Training of Flight Attendants (F/A)
<b>2.1 Manual Management</b>		4.2.5 (M)	Training and Qualification of Dispatchers/Flight Followers
2.1.1 (M)	Manual Management	4.2.6 (M)	Training of Station Personnel
<b>3.0 Flight Operations</b>		4.2.7 (M)	Training of Check Airman and Instructors
<b>3.1 Air Carrier Programs and Procedures</b>		4.2.8 (M)	Simulators/Training Devices
3.1.1 (M)	Passenger Handling	4.2.9 (M)	Outsource Crewmember Training
3.1.2 (M)	Crewmember Duties/Cabin Procedures	4.2.12 (L)	Hazardous Materials (hazmat) Training Program
3.1.3 (H)	Airman Duties/Flight Deck Procedures	<b>4.3 Crewmember and Dispatch Qualifications</b>	
3.1.4 (M)	Operational Control	4.3.1 (M)	Pilot Operating Limitations/Recent Experience
3.1.5 (M)	Carry-on Baggage Program	4.3.2 (M)	Appropriate Airmen/Crewmember Checks and Qualifications
3.1.6 (M)	Exit Seating Program	4.3.3 (M)	Advanced Qualification Program (AQP)
3.1.7 (M)	Deicing Program	<b>5.0 Route Structures</b>	
3.1.8 (M)	Carriage of Cargo	<b>5.1 Approved Routes and Areas</b>	
3.1.9 (M)	Airplane Performance Operating Limitations	5.1.5 (H)	Line Station Operations/Ground Personnel Duties
3.1.10 (L)	Category (CAT) II & III Operations	5.1.6 (L)	Use of Approved Areas, Routes, and Airports
3.1.11(L)	Computer Based Recordkeeping	5.1.7 (L)	Special Navigation Areas of Operation
3.1.12 (M)	Hazmat	5.1.8 (H)	Extended Operations (ETOPS)
<b>3.2 Operational Release</b>		5.1.9 (L)	Reduced Vertical Separation Minimum (RVSM) Authorization
3.2.1 (H)	Dispatch/Flight Release	<b>6.0 Airman and Crewmember Flight, Rest and Duty Time</b>	
3.2.2 (H)	Flight/Load Manifest/Weight and Balance (W&B) Control	<b>6.1 Airman and Crewmember Limitations</b>	
3.2.3 (H)	Minimum Equipment List (MEL)/Configuration Deviation List (CDL)/nonessential equipment and furnishings (NEF) Procedures	6.1.2 (M)	Flightcrew Member Flight/Duty/Rest Time
		6.1.3 (M)	F/A Duty/Rest Time
		6.1.4 (M)	Dispatcher Duty/Rest Time
		<b>7.0 Technical Administration</b>	
		<b>7.1 Key Personnel</b>	
		7.1.3 (L)	Part 119 Required Personnel
		<b>7.2 Other Programs</b>	
		7.2.1 (M)	Safety Program (Ground and Flight)

**(H):** High Criticality Elements.

**(M):** Medium Criticality Elements.

**(L):** Low Criticality Elements.

## Appendix C

### Process for Monthly Review of ATOS Data by FAA AFS Regions

1. On a continuing basis (at least once each month) each AFS region will convene a regional team of employees (RT), including at least one employee representing aviation safety inspectors (ASIs), that will review the ATOS data for the 14 CFR Part 121 certificate holders based in that region to identify Regional Adverse Trends In Regulatory Compliance. All ATOS elements will be reviewed, at a minimum of once per month, consisting of the following:

- Data: The latest Assessment Determination and Implementation (ADI) scores that have been "saved final" for all Design Assessments (DAs) and Performance Assessments (PAs) within each ATOS element, for each operator based within the AFS region. Some of these scores will be "new" each month, as a new ADI was completed by the CMT or ACEP (Air Carrier Evaluation Process) team, and some will represent the ADI score that was last completed by the CMT or ACEP team.
- Metric for trending: Average ADI score for each ATOS element across all Part 121 operators within the region, for each month of data<sup>1</sup>.
- Time period: The initial data reviewed will be for the month of February 2012 and will continue until the requirement is no longer required. ADI scores from April 2011 will be used to establish historical averages and standard deviations. Note that the monthly regional trend analysis will be a cumulative process which will include all data previously reviewed.

The AFS regions can obtain this data set via a query-and-processing tool that pulls the latest ATOS data and calculates regional and national average scores for each element. The tool can be found at <http://fsaic-info.avs.faa.gov/fsaic-wizard/section343>.

2. Elements requiring further analysis to determine if they exhibit adverse trends will be defined as having either one of two characteristics:

- (1) The average ADI score exhibits an adverse upward trend over the months (i.e., rising over time) and/or
- (2) The average ADI score exhibits a relatively flat trend with average values greater than or equal to an ADI score of 4 ("Design or Performance Accepted/Approved with Mitigation, Major Issues Observed").

Such elements will be subject to the analysis of Step 3 below. Elements with neither characteristic require no further action by the Region for the purpose of this report.

3. The Region shall report its findings in one of the following categories:

- Identified Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance
- Potential Adverse Trends Being Monitored.

For each element requiring further analysis based on the criteria in Item (2) above, the RT shall review relevant ATOS data, including SAI and EPI questions with "no" responses (as needed), relevant DORs (including ConDORs and Random Inspections), enforcement actions initiated as a result of any inspections, items in the Corrective Action Tracking Tool (CATT) and other information as needed to understand the potential causes of the trend in ADI scores. The RT shall determine if the specific issues driving the trend are related to regulatory compliance or are ATOS non-compliance items without linkage to rules and/or regulations. If the trend involves two or more operators within the region and relates to regulatory compliance, the trend should be documented as an "Identified Regional Adverse Trend in Regulatory Compliance." If the trend does not relate to regulatory compliance, only involves a single operator, or it has not yet been determined which category it belongs in, it should be documented as a "Potential Adverse Trend Being Monitored."

---

<sup>1</sup> Quarters of the fiscal year have no bearing on this methodology.

4. For each Regional Adverse Trend in Regulatory Compliance identified, the Region shall determine appropriate corrective action or actions to be taken to address the adverse situation. These corrective actions might include such things as requesting additional surveillance activities, proposing changes to FAA policy or guidance, distribution of notifications to all CMTs in the region alerting them to the issue, continuing to monitor the trend (if it represents an acceptably low risk), or other actions as needed. Standard phraseology shall be used in the "Corrective Actions Taken by Region" column using one of the following phrases (recognizing that various other actions planned by the Region will require different responses in the table):

- (1) "Actions by CMT(s) are appropriate and Region will continue to monitor."
- (2) "Issue reviewed by region and no corrective action is necessary at this time. Region will continue to monitor."
- (3) "Not applicable" (if no Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance have been identified in that month of data).

5. Each region will use a memo<sup>2</sup> (attached here as Appendix D) to transmit their findings via e-mail to the AFS-900 POC by the 15<sup>th</sup> of each month. In an effort to reduce waste please DO NOT mail these findings or memos to AFS-900. Findings will not identify specific carriers involved. Please note that all findings memos will be forwarded to AFS-1 and AVS-1 monthly.

- a) Only "new" Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance should be noted in the table. If there have been no new ADI assessments completed for that element in the month being reviewed, the element should be moved into a bulleted list of "Status of Previously Identified Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance" that includes a status update to include the month in which the trend was first noted, what has been done by the region to correct the trend, and any new findings through analysis of new ATOS data relevant to the issue. Previously identified trends will normally be tracked by the region for at least six months.
- b) If the region finds no Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance in a particular month, the findings table should indicate "No trends identified."
- c) Each month, each region is expected to document their most significant "Potential Adverse Trends Being Monitored" identified through the ATOS data review process. An ATOS element might belong in this bin because the issues involved are not regulatory in nature or do not constitute a region-wide trend because the ADI score at one operator is causing the trend. The Potential Adverse Trends Being Monitored must be identified by ATOS element and must not exceed ten in number per month.

---

<sup>2</sup> The table headings used in each region's transmittal memo must match the template's, and only "Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance" should be listed within the table.



Status of Previously Identified Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance *(as needed)*

- *item one, etc.*

**Appendix E**  
**Monthly Synopses of Findings from Section 343 Reviews of ATOS Data by**  
**AFS Regional Offices**

*This page intentionally left blank*

**Section 343 Monthly Synopsis of  
Flight Standards Regional Offices  
Air Transportation Oversight System (ATOS) Data  
Month: February 2012**

In accordance with section 343 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, each region is required to submit a monthly report to the Administrator, the Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety, and the Director of Flight Standards Service. The regions shall use the ATOS data base to identify adverse trends for their regions. The specific findings from each region, along with the corrective actions planned or being taken to address each adverse trend is attached. This cover page is a synopsis of these findings.

It is important to note the following when reviewing the data being presented:

- ATOS is designed for the Certificate Management Team (CMT) to identify hazards and risks at the local level and work with the certificate holder to develop and track corrective actions. The process does not lend itself to a comparative national trend analysis program without significant manipulation of the data.
- The ATOS process is based upon periodic assessments of different elements of the operator's program. These assessments occur at various intervals based on criticality of the element. Performance Assessments (PAs) can occur at 6 month, 1 year, or 3 year intervals while a Design Assessment (DA) occurs at a 5 year interval.
- Trends are slow to develop due to the periodic nature of the ATOS assessment program.
- The required Administrator's biannual report with the roll-up of data has the potential to provide more useful analytical information in the long term.

**Synopsis of Findings and Planned Actions from February 2012 ATOS Data Review**

Region	ATOS Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance	Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region
Alaska (AAL)	None found	N/A
Central (ACE)	None found	N/A
Eastern (AEA)	Regulatory compliance issues were identified with at least one operator in the region for 17 PA elements and 7 DA elements	Actions taken by the CMTs were reviewed by the region and appear to be appropriate. No further CAs required by Region.
Great Lakes (AGL)	Three adverse trends identified	Region will continue to monitor these elements
Northwest Mountain (ANM)	One adverse trend identified	Actions by local CMTs appear appropriate and Region will continue to monitor
Southern (ASO)	One adverse trend in regulatory compliance identified	Actions by local CMTs appear appropriate and Region will continue to monitor
Southwest (ASW)	None found	N/A
Western-Pacific (AWP)	Possible trends in 22 elements	No CAs taken due to inconclusive regulatory and non-regulatory trends.

**Section 343 Monthly Synopsis of  
Flight Standards Regional Offices  
Air Transportation Oversight System (ATOS) Data  
Month: March 2012**

In accordance with section 343 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, each region is required to submit a monthly report to the Administrator, the Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety, and the Director of Flight Standards Service. The regions shall use the ATOS data base to identify adverse trends for their regions. The specific findings from each region, along with the corrective actions planned or being taken to address each adverse trend is attached. This cover page is a synopsis of these findings.

It is important to note the following when reviewing the data being presented:

- ATOS is designed for the Certificate Management Team (CMT) to identify hazards and risks at the local level and work with the certificate holder to develop and track corrective actions. The process does not lend itself to a comparative national trend analysis program without significant manipulation of the data.
- The ATOS process is based upon periodic assessments of different elements of the operator's program. These assessments occur at various intervals based on criticality of the element. Performance Assessments (PAs) can occur at 6 month, 1 year, or 3 year intervals while a Design Assessment (DA) occurs at a 5 year interval.
- Trends are slow to develop due to the periodic nature of the ATOS assessment program.
- The required Administrator's biannual report with the roll-up of data has the potential to provide more useful analytical information in the long term.

**Synopsis of Findings and Planned Actions from March 2012 ATOS Data Review**

Region	ATOS Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance	Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region
Alaska (AAL)	None found	N/A
Central (ACE)	None found	N/A
Eastern (AEA)	Regulatory compliance issues were identified with at least one operator in the region for 13 PA elements and 6 DA elements	Actions taken by the CMTs were reviewed by the region and appear to be appropriate. No further CAs required by Region.
Great Lakes (AGL)	Two adverse trend identified	Region will continue to monitor these elements and three others identified in ATOS data from prior months
Northwest Mountain (ANM)	Two adverse trends identified	Actions by local CMTs appear appropriate and Region will continue to monitor
Southern (ASO)	Three adverse trends in regulatory non-compliance identified	Actions by local CMTs appear appropriate and Region will continue to monitor
Southwest (ASW)	None found	N/A
Western-Pacific (AWP)	Possible trends in 22 elements	No CAs taken due to inconclusive regulatory and non-regulatory trends.

**Section 343 Monthly Synopsis of  
Flight Standards Regional Offices  
Air Transportation Oversight System (ATOS) Data  
Month: April 2012**

In accordance with section 343 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, each region is required to submit a monthly report to the Administrator, the Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety, and the Director of Flight Standards Service. The regions shall use the ATOS data base to identify adverse trends for their regions. The specific findings from each region, along with the corrective actions planned or being taken to address each adverse trend is attached. This cover page is a synopsis of these findings.

It is important to note the following when reviewing the data being presented:

- ATOS is designed for the Certificate Management Team (CMT) to identify hazards and risks at the local level and work with the certificate holder to develop and track corrective actions. The process does not lend itself to a comparative national trend analysis program without significant manipulation of the data.
- The ATOS process is based upon periodic assessments of different elements of the operator's program. These assessments occur at various intervals based on criticality of the element. Performance Assessments (PAs) can occur at 6 month, 1 year, or 3 year intervals while a Design Assessment (DA) occurs at a 5 year interval.
- Trends are slow to develop due to the periodic nature of the ATOS assessment program.
- The required Administrator's biannual report with the roll-up of data has the potential to provide more useful analytical information in the long term.

**Synopsis of Findings and Planned Actions from April 2012 ATOS Data Review**

<b>Region</b>	<b>ATOS Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance</b>	<b>Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region</b>
Alaska (AAL)	None found	N/A
Central (ACE)	None found	N/A
Eastern (AEA)	Regulatory compliance issues were identified with at least one operator in the region for 16 PA elements and 6 DA elements	Actions taken by the CMTs were reviewed by the region and appear to be appropriate. No further CAs required by Region.
Great Lakes (AGL)	One adverse trend identified	Region will continue to monitor this element and four others identified in ATOS data from prior months
Northwest Mountain (ANM)	One adverse trend in regulatory compliance identified	Region will continue to monitor
Southern (ASO)	One adverse trends in regulatory compliance identified	Region will continue to monitor
Southwest (ASW)	None found	N/A
Western-Pacific (AWP)	Possible trends in 22 elements	No CAs taken due to inconclusive regulatory and non-regulatory trends.

**Section 343 Monthly Synopsis of  
Flight Standards Regional Offices  
Air Transportation Oversight System (ATOS) Data  
Month: May 2012**

In accordance with section 343 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, each region is required to submit a monthly report to the Administrator, the Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety, and the Director of Flight Standards Service. The regions shall use the ATOS data base to identify adverse trends for their regions. The specific findings from each region, along with the corrective actions planned or being taken to address each adverse trend is attached. This cover page is a synopsis of these findings.

It is important to note the following when reviewing the data being presented:

- ATOS is designed for the Certificate Management Team (CMT) to identify hazards and risks at the local level and work with the certificate holder to develop and track corrective actions. The process does not lend itself to a comparative national trend analysis program without significant manipulation of the data.
- The ATOS process is based upon periodic assessments of different elements of the operators program. These assessments occur at various intervals based on criticality of the element. Performance Assessments can occur at 6 month, 1 year, or 3 year intervals while a Design Assessment occurs at a 5 year interval.
- Trends are slow to develop due to the periodic nature of the ATOS assessment program.
- The required Administrator's biannual report with the roll-up of data has the potential to provide more useful analytical information in the long term.

**Synopsis of Findings and Planned Actions from May 2012 ATOS Data Review**

Region	ATOS Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance	Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region
Alaska (AAL)	None found	N/A
Central (ACE)	None found	N/A
Eastern (AEA)	None found	N/A
Great Lakes (AGL)	Possible trends in four elements were analyzed in detail; <u>none</u> were determined to be adverse trends	Region is continuing to monitor adverse trends in four elements identified in ATOS data from prior months
Northwest Mountain (ANM)	One adverse trend identified	Regional team believes CAs being taken by the CMT is appropriate; region will continue to monitor
Southern (ASO)	Nine adverse trends identified	Local CMTs are managing the risk in four of the areas and Region will continue to monitor; the other five areas do not require CAs
Southwest (ASW)	None found	N/A
Western-Pacific (AWP)	Possible trends in 21 elements	No CAs taken due to inconclusive regulatory and non-regulatory trends.

**Section 343 Monthly Synopsis of  
Flight Standards Regional Offices  
Air Transportation Oversight System (ATOS) Data  
Month: June 2012**

In accordance with section 343 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, each region is required to submit a monthly report to the Administrator, the Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety, and the Director of Flight Standards Service. The regions shall use the ATOS data base to identify adverse trends for their regions. The specific findings from each region, along with the corrective actions planned or being taken to address each adverse trend is attached. This cover page is a synopsis of these findings.

It is important to note the following when reviewing the data being presented:

- ATOS is designed for the Certificate Management Team (CMT) to identify hazards and risks at the local level and work with the certificate holder to develop and track corrective actions. The process does not lend itself to a comparative national trend analysis program without significant manipulation of the data.
- The ATOS process is based upon periodic assessments of different elements of the operator's program. These assessments occur at various intervals based on criticality of the element. Performance Assessments can occur at 6 month, 1 year, or 3 year intervals while a Design Assessment occurs at a 5 year interval.
- Trends are slow to develop due to the periodic nature of the ATOS assessment program.
- The required Administrator's biannual report with the roll-up of data has the potential to provide more useful analytical information in the long term.

**Synopsis of Findings and Planned Actions from June 2012 ATOS Data Review**

<b>Region</b>	<b>ATOS Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance</b>	<b>Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region</b>
Alaska (AAL)	One adverse trend identified	Manual revisions underway and follow-up is planned
Central (ACE)	None found	N/A
Eastern (AEA)	None found	N/A
Great Lakes (AGL)	One adverse trend identified	Region will continue to monitor this element and four others identified in ATOS data from prior months
Northwest Mountain (ANM)	Three adverse trends identified	Region will continue to monitor these three elements
Southern (ASO)	Two adverse trends in regulatory non-compliance identified	Actions by local CMTs appear appropriate and Region will continue to monitor
Southwest (ASW)	None found	N/A
Western-Pacific (AWP)	Possible trends in 16 elements	No CAs taken due to inconclusive regulatory and non-regulatory trends.

**Section 343 Monthly Synopsis of  
Flight Standards Regional Offices  
Air Transportation Oversight System (ATOS) Data  
Month: July 2012**

In accordance with section 343 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, each Flight Standards region is required to submit a monthly report to the Administrator, the Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety, and the Director of Flight Standards Service. The regions shall use the ATOS data base to identify adverse trends for their regions. The specific findings from each region, along with the corrective actions planned or being taken to address each adverse trend is attached. This cover page is a synopsis of these findings.

It is important to note the following when reviewing the data being presented:

- ATOS is designed for the Certificate Management Team (CMT) to identify hazards and risks at the local level and work with the certificate holder to develop and track corrective actions. The process does not lend itself to a comparative national trend analysis program without significant manipulation of the data.
- The ATOS process is based upon periodic assessments of different elements of the operator's program. These assessments occur at various intervals based on criticality of the element. Performance Assessments can occur at 6 month, 1 year, or 3 year intervals while a Design Assessment occurs at a 5 year interval.
- Trends are slow to develop due to the periodic nature of the ATOS assessment program.
- The required Administrator's biannual report with the roll-up of data has the potential to provide more useful analytical information in the long term.

**Synopsis of Findings and Planned Actions from ATOS Data Review**

Region	ATOS Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance	Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region
Alaska (AAL)	None found	N/A
Central (ACE)	None found	N/A
Eastern (AEA)	None found	N/A
Great Lakes (AGL)	Possible trends in five elements were analyzed in detail; <u>none</u> were determined to be adverse trends	Region is continuing to monitor adverse trends in four elements identified in ATOS data from prior months
Northwest Mountain (ANM)	Three adverse trends identified	CAs appear appropriate and Region will continue to monitor these three elements
Southern (ASO)	Two adverse trends in regulatory non-compliance identified	Actions by local CMTs appear appropriate and Region will continue to monitor
Southwest (ASW)	None found	N/A
Western-Pacific (AWP)	Possible trends in 17 elements	No CAs taken due to inconclusive regulatory and non-regulatory trends.

**Section 343 Monthly Synopsis of  
Flight Standards Regional Offices  
Air Transportation Oversight System (ATOS) Data  
Month: August 2012**

In accordance with section 343 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, each Flight Standards region is required to submit a monthly report to the Administrator, the Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety, and the Director of Flight Standards Service. The regions shall use the ATOS data base to identify adverse trends for their regions. The specific findings from each region, along with the corrective actions planned or being taken to address each adverse trend is attached. This cover page is a synopsis of these findings.

It is important to note the following when reviewing the data being presented:

- ATOS is designed for the local Certificate Management Team (CMT) to identify hazards and risks at the local level and work with the certificate holder to develop and track corrective actions. The process does not lend itself to a comparative national trend analysis program without significant manipulation of the data.
- The ATOS process is based upon periodic assessments of different elements of the operator's program. These assessments occur at various intervals based on criticality of the element. Performance Assessments (PAs) can occur at 6 month, 1 year, or 3 year intervals while a Design Assessment (DA) occurs at a 5 year interval.
- Trends are slow to develop due to the periodic nature of the ATOS assessment program.
- The required Administrator's biannual report with the roll-up of data has the potential to provide more useful analytical information in the long term.

**Synopsis of Findings and Planned Actions from ATOS Data Review**

Region	ATOS Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance	Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region
Alaska (AAL)	No new trends identified	N/A
Central (ACE)	One adverse DA trend and seven PA trends identified	None needed. Region will continue to monitor.
Eastern (AEA)	None found	N/A
Great Lakes (AGL)	Possible trends in five elements were analyzed in detail; <u>one</u> was determined to be an adverse trend	Region will continue to monitor this element and four others identified in ATOS data from prior months. One previously identified element was found to no longer warrant regional concern.
Northwest Mountain (ANM)	One adverse trend identified with several past enforcement actions	Region and CMTs are monitoring corrective actions being taken by the air carriers.
Southern (ASO)	Three adverse trends in regulatory non-compliance identified	Actions by CMTs appear appropriate and Region will continue to monitor
Southwest (ASW)	None found	N/A
Western-Pacific (AWP)	No adverse trends in specific elements, however, starting to discover common trends related to "not following manuals" and "manuals needing revisions."	No CAs taken due to inconclusive regulatory and non-regulatory trends.

**Section 343 Monthly Synopsis of  
Flight Standards Regional Offices - Air Transportation Oversight System (ATOS) Data  
Month: September 2012**

In accordance with section 343 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, each Flight Standards region is required to submit a monthly report to the Administrator, the Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety, and the Director of Flight Standards Service. The regions have used the ATOS data base to identify adverse trends for their regions and documented their findings and corrective actions planned or being taken to address each adverse trend identified. This document is a synopsis of these findings.

It is important to note the following when reviewing the data being presented:

- ATOS is designed for the local Certificate Management Team (CMT) to identify hazards and risks at the local level and work with the certificate holder to develop and track corrective actions. The process does not lend itself to a comparative national trend analysis program without significant manipulation of the data.
- The ATOS process is based upon periodic assessments of different elements of the operator's program. These assessments occur at various intervals based on criticality of the element. Performance Assessments (PAs) can occur at 6 month, 1 year, or 3 year intervals while a Design Assessment (DA) occurs at a 5 year interval.
- Trends are slow to develop due to the periodic nature of the ATOS assessment program.
- The required Administrator's biannual report with the roll-up of data has the potential to provide more useful analytical information in the long term.

**Synopsis of Findings and Planned Actions from ATOS Data Review**

<b>Region</b>	<b>Identified Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance</b>	<b>Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region</b>	<b>Potential Adverse Trends Being Monitored</b>
Alaska (AAL) 5 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aircraft Parts/Material Control</li> <li>• Line Stations</li> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> </ul>
Central (ACE) 5 operators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> <li>• Maintenance/Inspection Schedule</li> </ul>	For both elements, actions by CMTs are appropriate and Region will continue to monitor.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airmen Duties/Flightdeck Procedures</li> <li>• Carry-On Baggage</li> <li>• Extended Operations (ETOPS)</li> <li>• Lower Landing Minimums</li> <li>• Maintenance Certificate Requirements</li> <li>• Major Repairs and Alterations</li> <li>• Operational Control</li> <li>• Part 119 Required Personnel</li> <li>• Required Inspection Items (RII)</li> <li>• RVSM Authorization</li> <li>• Training of Flight Crewmembers</li> </ul>

<b>Region</b>	<b>Identified Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance</b>	<b>Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region</b>	<b>Potential Adverse Trends Being Monitored</b>
Eastern (AEA) <i>15 operators</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training of Flight Attendants</li> <li>• Extended Operations (ETOPS)</li> </ul>	For both elements, issues reviewed by region and no CAs are necessary at this time. Region will continue to monitor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordinating Agencies for Suppliers Evaluation (CASE)</li> <li>• Flight Crewmember Flight/Duty/Rest Time</li> <li>• Flight Attendant Duty/Rest Time</li> <li>• Training &amp; Qualification of Dispatchers/Flight Followers</li> <li>• Training of Check Airman &amp; Instructors</li> </ul>
Great Lakes (AGL) <i>17 operators</i>	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airmen Duties/Flight Deck Procedures</li> <li>• Continuous Analysis &amp; Surveillance System (CASS)</li> <li>• De-Icing Program</li> <li>• Dispatch/Flight Release</li> <li>• Extended Operations (ETOPS)</li> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> </ul>
Northwest Mountain (ANM) <i>6 operators</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training of Flight Attendants</li> <li>• Required Inspection Items (RII)</li> <li>• Manual Management</li> </ul>	For each adverse trend, actions by CMTs are appropriate and Region will continue to monitor.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fueling</li> </ul>
Southern (ASO) <i>18 operators</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> <li>• Maintenance/Inspection Schedule</li> <li>• Line Stations</li> <li>• Carry-On Baggage Program</li> <li>• Training of Flight Attendants</li> <li>• Line Station Operations/ Ground Personnel Duties</li> </ul>	For each adverse trend, actions by CMTs are appropriate and Region will continue to monitor.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance Facility/Main Maint. Base</li> <li>• Airworthiness Directives and Maintenance Record Requirements</li> <li>• Aircraft Parts / Material Control</li> <li>• Cargo Handling Equipment, Systems and Appliances</li> <li>• Hazardous Materials</li> <li>• Operational Control</li> <li>• Exit Seating Program</li> <li>• MEL/CDL/NEF Procedures</li> <li>• RVSM Authorization (AW)</li> <li>• Flight Crewmember Flight/Duty/Rest Time</li> </ul>
Southwest (ASW) <i>6 operators</i>	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flight/Load Manifest/Weight &amp; Balance Control</li> <li>• Maintenance/Required Inspection Item (RII) Training Program</li> </ul>
Western-Pacific (AWP) <i>13 operators</i>	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance/Required Inspection Item (RII) Training Program</li> </ul>

**Section 343 Monthly Synopsis of  
Flight Standards Regional Offices - Air Transportation Oversight System (ATOS) Data  
Month: October 2012**

In accordance with section 343 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, each Flight Standards region is required to submit a monthly report to the Administrator, the Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety, and the Director of Flight Standards Service. The regions have used the ATOS data base to identify adverse trends for their regions and documented their findings and corrective actions planned or being taken to address each adverse trend identified. This document is a synopsis of these findings.

It is important to note the following when reviewing the data being presented:

- ATOS is designed for the local Certificate Management Team (CMT) to identify hazards and risks at the local level and work with the certificate holder to develop and track corrective actions. The process does not lend itself to a comparative national trend analysis program without significant manipulation of the data.
- The ATOS process is based upon periodic assessments of different elements of the operator's program. These assessments occur at various intervals based on criticality of the element. Performance Assessments (PAs) can occur at 6 month, 1 year, or 3 year intervals while a Design Assessment (DA) occurs at a 5 year interval.
- Trends are slow to develop due to the periodic nature of the ATOS assessment program.
- The required Administrator's biannual report with the roll-up of data has the potential to provide more useful analytical information in the long term.

**Synopsis of Findings and Planned Actions from ATOS Data Review**

<b>Region</b>	<b>Identified Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance</b>	<b>Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region</b>	<b>Potential Adverse Trends Being Monitored</b>
Alaska (AAL) 5 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aircraft Parts/Material Control</li> <li>• Line Stations</li> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> </ul>
Central (ACE) 5 operators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advanced Qualification Program (AQP)</li> <li>• Maintenance/Inspection Schedule</li> </ul>	For both elements, actions by CMTs are appropriate and Region will continue to monitor.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airworthiness Directives and Maintenance Record Requirements</li> <li>• Appropriate Airman/Crewmember Checks and Qualifications</li> <li>• Continuous Analysis and Surveillance System (CASS)</li> <li>• Maintenance Certificate Requirements</li> <li>• Maintenance Facility/Main Maint. Base</li> <li>• Required Inspection Items (RII)</li> <li>• RII Personnel</li> <li>• Simulators/Training Devices</li> <li>• Training of Flight Crewmembers</li> </ul>

<b>Region</b>	<b>Identified Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance</b>	<b>Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region</b>	<b>Potential Adverse Trends Being Monitored</b>
Eastern (AEA) 15 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advanced Qualification Program (AQP)</li> <li>• Flight Crewmember Flight/Duty/Rest Time</li> <li>• Flight Attendant Duty/Rest Time</li> <li>• Training of Flight Attendants</li> <li>• Training of Check Airman &amp; Instructors</li> </ul>
Great Lakes (AGL) 17 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airmen Duties/Flight Deck Procedures</li> <li>• Continuous Analysis and Surveillance System (CASS)</li> <li>• De-Icing Program</li> <li>• Extended Operations (ETOPS) AW</li> <li>• Maintenance Control</li> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> </ul>
Northwest Mountain (ANM) 6 operators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training of Flight Crewmembers</li> </ul>	Actions by CMTs are appropriate and Region will continue to monitor.	<i>None</i>
Southern (ASO) 18 operators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cargo Handling Equipment, Systems and Appliances</li> <li>• Continuous Analysis and Surveillance System (CASS)</li> <li>• Passenger Handling</li> <li>• Weight &amp; Balance Program</li> </ul>	For each adverse trend, actions by CMTs are appropriate and Region will continue to monitor.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airworthiness Release/Maintenance Log Recording Requirements</li> <li>• Aircraft Parts / Material Control</li> <li>• Coordinating Agencies for Suppliers Evaluation (CASE)</li> <li>• De-Icing Program</li> <li>• Exit Seating Program</li> <li>• Extended Operations (ETOPS)</li> <li>• Hazardous Material Training Program</li> <li>• Hazardous Materials</li> <li>• Maintenance Facility/Main Maint. Base</li> <li>• MEL/CDL/NEF Procedures</li> </ul>
Southwest (ASW) 6 operators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance/Required Inspection Item (RII) Training Program</li> <li>• Maintenance/Inspection Schedule</li> </ul>	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flight/Load Manifest/Weight &amp; Balance Control</li> </ul>
Western-Pacific (AWP) 13 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carry-On Baggage Program</li> <li>• Training of Station Personnel</li> </ul>

**Section 343 Monthly Synopsis of  
Flight Standards Regional Offices - Air Transportation Oversight System (ATOS) Data  
Month: November 2012**

In accordance with section 343 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, each Flight Standards region is required to submit a monthly report to the Administrator, the Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety, and the Director of Flight Standards Service. The regions have used the ATOS data base to identify adverse trends for their regions and documented their findings and corrective actions planned or being taken to address each adverse trend identified. This document is a synopsis of these findings.

It is important to note the following when reviewing the data being presented:

- ATOS is designed for the local Certificate Management Team (CMT) to identify hazards and risks at the local level and work with the certificate holder to develop and track corrective actions. The process does not lend itself to a comparative national trend analysis program without significant manipulation of the data.
- The ATOS process is based upon periodic assessments of different elements of the operator's program. These assessments occur at various intervals based on criticality of the element. Performance Assessments (PAs) can occur at 6 month, 1 year, or 3 year intervals while a Design Assessment (DA) occurs at a 5 year interval.
- Trends are slow to develop due to the periodic nature of the ATOS assessment program.
- The required Administrator's biannual report with the roll-up of data has the potential to provide more useful analytical information in the long term.

**Synopsis of Findings and Planned Actions from ATOS Data Review**

<b>Region</b>	<b>Identified Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance</b>	<b>Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region</b>	<b>Potential Adverse Trends Being Monitored</b>
Alaska (AAL) 5 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aircraft Parts/Material Control</li> <li>• Line Stations</li> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> <li>• Training of Flight Attendants</li> </ul>
Central (ACE) 5 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airworthiness Directives and Maintenance Record Requirements</li> <li>• Appropriate Airman/Crewmember Checks and Qualifications</li> <li>• Continuous Analysis &amp; Surveillance Syst.</li> <li>• Maintenance Certificate Requirements</li> <li>• Maintenance Facility/Main Maint. Base</li> <li>• Required Inspection Items (RII)</li> <li>• RII Personnel</li> <li>• Simulators/Training Devices</li> <li>• Training of Flight Crewmembers</li> </ul>

<b>Region</b>	<b>Identified Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance</b>	<b>Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region</b>	<b>Potential Adverse Trends Being Monitored</b>
Eastern (AEA) 15 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advanced Qualification Program (AQP)</li> <li>• Flight Attendant Duty/Rest Time</li> <li>• Training of Check Airman &amp; Instructors</li> </ul>
Great Lakes (AGL) 17 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airmen Duties/Flight Deck Procedures</li> <li>• Continuous Analysis and Surveillance System (CASS)</li> <li>• De-Icing Program</li> <li>• Extended Operations (ETOPS) AW</li> <li>• Maintenance Control</li> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> </ul>
Northwest Mountain (ANM) 6 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outsource Maintenance</li> </ul>
Southern (ASO) 18 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airworthiness Release / Maintenance Log Recording Requirements</li> <li>• De-Icing Program</li> <li>• Exit Seating Program</li> <li>• Flight Crewmember Flight/Duty/Rest Time</li> <li>• Hazardous Materials</li> <li>• Lower Landing Minimums</li> <li>• MEL / CDL / NEF Procedures</li> <li>• Operational Control</li> <li>• Simulators / Training Devices</li> <li>• Training of Flight Crewmembers</li> </ul>
Southwest (ASW) 6 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dispatch / Flight Release</li> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> <li>• Station Facilities</li> </ul>
Western-Pacific (AWP) 13 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Carry-On Baggage</li> <li>• RVSM Authorization</li> <li>• Maintenance/Required Inspection Item (RII) Training Program</li> <li>• Training of Station Personnel</li> </ul>

**Section 343 Monthly Synopsis of  
Flight Standards Regional Offices - Air Transportation Oversight System (ATOS) Data  
Month: December 2012**

In accordance with section 343 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, each Flight Standards region is required to submit a monthly report to the Administrator, the Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety, and the Director of Flight Standards Service. The regions have used the ATOS data base to identify adverse trends for their regions and documented their findings and corrective actions planned or being taken to address each adverse trend identified. This document is a synopsis of these findings.

It is important to note the following when reviewing the data being presented:

- ATOS is designed for the local Certificate Management Team (CMT) to identify hazards and risks at the local level and work with the certificate holder to develop and track corrective actions. The process does not lend itself to a comparative national trend analysis program without significant manipulation of the data.
- The ATOS process is based upon periodic assessments of different elements of the operator's program. These assessments occur at various intervals based on criticality of the element. Performance Assessments (PAs) can occur at 6 month, 1 year, or 3 year intervals while a Design Assessment (DA) occurs at a 5 year interval.
- Trends are slow to develop due to the periodic nature of the ATOS assessment program.
- The required Administrator's biannual report with the roll-up of data has the potential to provide more useful analytical information in the long term.

**Synopsis of Findings and Planned Actions from ATOS Data Review**

<b>Region</b>	<b>Identified Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance</b>	<b>Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region</b>	<b>Potential Adverse Trends Being Monitored</b>
Alaska (AAL) <i>5 operators</i>	Training of Flight Attendants	Actions by CMTs are appropriate and Region will continue to monitor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> </ul>
Central (ACE) <i>5 operators</i>	Required Inspection Items (RII)	Issue reviewed by Region and no corrective action necessary at this time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower Landing Minimums</li> <li>• Maintenance Certificate Requirements</li> <li>• Maintenance Facility/Main Maint. Base</li> <li>• Mechanical Interruption Summary (MIS) / Service Difficulty Reports (SDR)</li> </ul>
Eastern (AEA) <i>14 operators</i>	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major Repairs and Alterations</li> </ul>

<b>Region</b>	<b>Identified Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance</b>	<b>Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region</b>	<b>Potential Adverse Trends Being Monitored</b>
Great Lakes (AGL) 17 operators	Maintenance Providers	Issue reviewed and no corrective action necessary at this time. Will continue to monitor.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airmen Duties/Flight Deck Procedures</li> <li>• Continuous Analysis and Surveillance System (CASS)</li> <li>• De-Icing Program</li> <li>• Extended Operations (ETOPS) AW</li> <li>• Flight/Load Manifest/Weight &amp; Balance Control</li> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Operational Control</li> </ul>
Northwest Mountain (ANM) 7 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Line Stations</li> <li>• Outsource Organization</li> <li>• Training of Station Personnel</li> </ul>
Southern (ASO) 17 operators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airworthiness Directives and Maintenance Record Requirements</li> <li>• Maintenance Control</li> </ul>	For both adverse trends, actions by CMTs are appropriate and Region will continue to monitor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fueling</li> <li>• Maintenance/Inspection Schedule</li> <li>• Mechanical Interruption Summary (MIS) / Service Difficulty Reports (SDR)</li> <li>• Special Flight Permits</li> </ul>
Southwest (ASW) 6 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airworthiness Directives and Maintenance Record Requirements</li> <li>• Airworthiness Release/Maintenance Log Recording Requirements</li> <li>• Dispatch / Flight Release</li> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Station Facilities</li> </ul>
Western-Pacific (AWP) 13 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Carry-On Baggage</li> <li>• Maintenance/Required Inspection Item (RII) Training Program</li> <li>• RVSM Authorization</li> <li>• Station Facilities</li> <li>• Training of Flight Crewmembers</li> <li>• Training of Station Personnel</li> </ul>

**Section 343 Monthly Synopsis of  
Flight Standards Regional Offices - Air Transportation Oversight System (ATOS) Data  
Month Analyzed: January 2013**

In accordance with section 343 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, each Flight Standards region is required to submit a monthly report to the Administrator, the Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety, and the Director of Flight Standards Service. The regions have used the ATOS data base to identify adverse trends for their regions and documented their findings and corrective actions planned or being taken to address each adverse trend identified. This document is a synopsis of these findings.

It is important to note the following when reviewing the data being presented:

- ATOS is designed for the local Certificate Management Team (CMT) to identify hazards and risks at the local level and work with the certificate holder to develop and track corrective actions. The process does not lend itself to a comparative national trend analysis program without significant manipulation of the data.
- The ATOS process is based upon periodic assessments of different elements of the operator's program. These assessments occur at various intervals based on criticality of the element. Performance Assessments (PAs) can occur at 6 month, 1 year, or 3 year intervals while a Design Assessment (DA) occurs at a 5 year interval.
- Trends are slow to develop due to the periodic nature of the ATOS assessment program.
- The required Administrator's biannual report with the roll-up of data has the potential to provide more useful analytical information in the long term.

**Synopsis of Findings and Planned Actions from ATOS Data Review**

<b>Region</b>	<b>Identified Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance</b>	<b>Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region</b>	<b>Potential Adverse Trends Being Monitored</b>
Alaska (AAL) 5 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> </ul>
Central (ACE) 5 operators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MEL/CDL/Deferred Maintenance</li> <li>• Fueling</li> <li>• Lower Landing Minimums</li> </ul>	For all adverse trends, actions by CMTs are appropriate and Region will continue to monitor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aircraft Parts/Material Control</li> <li>• Weight &amp; Balance Program</li> <li>• Mechanical Interruption Summary (MIS) / Service Difficulty Reports (SDR)</li> </ul>

<b>Region</b>	<b>Identified Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance</b>	<b>Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region</b>	<b>Potential Adverse Trends Being Monitored</b>
Eastern (AEA) 14 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> <li>• Maintenance/Inspection Schedule</li> <li>• MEL/CDL/Deferred Maintenance</li> <li>• Control of Calibrated Tools and Test Equipment</li> <li>• Major Repairs and Alterations</li> <li>• Continuous Analysis and Surveillance System (CASS)</li> <li>• Passenger Handling</li> <li>• Carry-On Baggage Program</li> <li>• Exit Seating Program</li> <li>• Pilot Operating Limitations / Recent Experience</li> </ul>
Great Lakes (AGL) 17 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Control of Calibrated Tools and Test Equipment</li> <li>• Continuous Analysis and Surveillance System (CASS)</li> <li>• Deicing Program</li> <li>• Operational Control</li> <li>• Flight/Load Manifest/Weight &amp; Balance Control</li> </ul>
Northwest Mountain (ANM) 7 operators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training of Station Personnel</li> <li>• Hazardous Materials</li> </ul>	For both adverse trends, actions by CMTs are appropriate and Region will continue to monitor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Line Station Operations/Ground Personnel Duties</li> </ul>
Southern (ASO) 17 operators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extended Operations (ETOPS) Ops</li> <li>• Airworthiness Release/Maintenance Log Recording Requirements</li> </ul>	For both adverse trends, actions by CMTs are appropriate and Region will continue to monitor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance Facility/Main Maint. Base</li> <li>• Safety Program (Ground and Flight)</li> </ul>
Southwest (ASW) 6 operators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airworthiness Release/Maintenance Log Recording Requirements</li> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> </ul>	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dispatch / Flight Release</li> <li>• Line Station Operations/Ground Personnel Duties</li> <li>• Airworthiness Directives and Maintenance Record Requirements</li> </ul>

Region	Identified Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance	Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region	<i>Potential</i> Adverse Trends Being Monitored
Western-Pacific (AWP) 13 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Carry-On Baggage</li> <li>• Maintenance/Required Inspection Item (RII) Training Program</li> <li>• RVSM Authorization</li> <li>• Training of Flight Crewmembers</li> <li>• Training of Station Personnel</li> </ul>

**Section 343 Monthly Synopsis of  
Flight Standards Regional Offices - Air Transportation Oversight System (ATOS) Data  
Month Analyzed: February 2013**

In accordance with section 343 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, each Flight Standards region is required to submit a monthly report to the Administrator, the Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety, and the Director of Flight Standards Service. The regions have used the ATOS data base to identify adverse trends for their regions and documented their findings and corrective actions planned or being taken to address each adverse trend identified. This document is a synopsis of these findings.

It is important to note the following when reviewing the data being presented:

- ATOS is designed for the local Certificate Management Team (CMT) to identify hazards and risks at the local level and work with the certificate holder to develop and track corrective actions. The process does not lend itself to a comparative national trend analysis program without significant manipulation of the data.
- The ATOS process is based upon periodic assessments of different elements of the operator's program. These assessments occur at various intervals based on criticality of the element. Performance Assessments (PAs) can occur at 6 month, 1 year, or 3 year intervals while a Design Assessment (DA) occurs at a 5 year interval.
- Trends are slow to develop due to the periodic nature of the ATOS assessment program.
- The required Administrator's biannual report with the roll-up of data has the potential to provide more useful analytical information in the long term.

**Synopsis of Findings and Planned Actions from ATOS Data Review**

<b>Region</b>	<b>Identified Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance</b>	<b>Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region</b>	<b>Potential Adverse Trends Being Monitored</b>
Alaska (AAL) 5 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airmen Duties/Flightcrew Procedures</li> <li>• Dispatch/Flight Release</li> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> </ul>
Central (ACE) 5 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aircraft Parts/Material Control</li> <li>• Weight &amp; Balance Program</li> <li>• Mechanical Interruption Summary (MIS) / Service Difficulty Reports (SDR)</li> </ul>

<b>Region</b>	<b>Identified Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance</b>	<b>Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region</b>	<b>Potential Adverse Trends Being Monitored</b>
Eastern (AEA) 14 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> <li>• Maintenance/Inspection Schedule</li> <li>• MEL/CDL/Deferred Maintenance</li> <li>• Major Repairs and Alterations</li> <li>• Continuous Analysis and Surveillance System (CASS)</li> <li>• Passenger Handling</li> <li>• Carry-On Baggage Program</li> <li>• Exit Seating Program</li> <li>• Pilot Operating Limitations / Recent Experience</li> </ul>
Great Lakes (AGL) 17 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Control of Calibrated Tools and Test Equipment</li> <li>• Deicing Program</li> <li>• Operational Control</li> <li>• Flight/Load Manifest/Weight &amp; Balance Control</li> </ul>
Northwest Mountain (ANM) 7 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Line Station Operations/Ground Personnel Duties</li> </ul>
Southern (ASO) 17 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Special Flight Permits</li> </ul>
Southwest (ASW) 6 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dispatch / Flight Release</li> <li>• Training and Qualifications of Dispatchers/Flight Followers</li> <li>• Training of Station Personnel</li> </ul>
Western-Pacific (AWP) 13 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Carry-On Baggage</li> <li>• Maintenance/Required Inspection Item (RII) Training Program</li> <li>• RVSM Authorization</li> <li>• Training of Flight Crewmembers</li> <li>• Training of Station Personnel</li> </ul>

**Section 343 Monthly Synopsis of  
Flight Standards Regional Offices - Air Transportation Oversight System (ATOS) Data  
Month Analyzed: March 2013**

In accordance with section 343 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, each Flight Standards region is required to submit a monthly report to the Administrator, the Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety, and the Director of Flight Standards Service. The regions have used the ATOS data base to identify adverse trends for their regions and documented their findings and corrective actions planned or being taken to address each adverse trend identified. This document is a synopsis of these findings.

It is important to note the following when reviewing the data being presented:

- ATOS is designed for the local Certificate Management Team (CMT) to identify hazards and risks at the local level and work with the certificate holder to develop and track corrective actions. The process does not lend itself to a comparative national trend analysis program without significant manipulation of the data.
- The ATOS process is based upon periodic assessments of different elements of the operator's program. These assessments occur at various intervals based on criticality of the element. Performance Assessments (PAs) can occur at 6 month, 1 year, or 3 year intervals while a Design Assessment (DA) occurs at a 5 year interval.
- Trends are slow to develop due to the periodic nature of the ATOS assessment program.
- The required Administrator's biannual report with the roll-up of data has the potential to provide more useful analytical information in the long term.

**Synopsis of Findings and Planned Actions from ATOS Data Review**

<b>Region</b>	<b>Identified Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance</b>	<b>Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region</b>	<b>Potential Adverse Trends Being Monitored</b>
Alaska (AAL) 5 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airmen Duties/Flightcrew Procedures</li> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> </ul>
Central (ACE) 5 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aircraft Parts/Material Control</li> <li>• Weight &amp; Balance Program</li> <li>• Mechanical Interruption Summary (MIS) / Service Difficulty Reports (SDR)</li> </ul>

<b>Region</b>	<b>Identified Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance</b>	<b>Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region</b>	<b>Potential Adverse Trends Being Monitored</b>
Eastern (AEA) 14 operators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance/Inspection Schedule</li> </ul>	Actions by CMTs are appropriate and Region will continue to monitor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Maintenance Facility/Main Maint. Base</li> <li>• Continuous Analysis and Surveillance System (CASS)</li> <li>• Passenger Handling</li> <li>• Operational Control</li> <li>• Exit Seating Program</li> <li>• Training of Flight Attendants</li> <li>• Training of Check Airmen &amp; Instructors</li> <li>• Line Station Operations/Ground Personnel Duties</li> </ul>
Great Lakes (AGL) 17 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Control of Calibrated Tools and Test Equipment</li> <li>• Deicing Program</li> <li>• Operational Control</li> <li>• Flight/Load Manifest/Weight &amp; Balance Control</li> </ul>
Northwest Mountain (ANM) 7 operators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airworthiness Release / Maintenance Log Recording Requirements</li> </ul>	Actions by CMTs are appropriate and Region will continue to monitor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuous Analysis and Surveillance System (CASS)</li> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Line Station Operations/Ground Personnel Duties</li> </ul>
Southern (ASO) 17 operators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airmen Duties/Flightcrew Procedures</li> </ul>	Actions by CMTs are appropriate and Region will continue to monitor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crewmember Duties / Cabin Procedures</li> <li>• Manual Management</li> </ul>
Southwest (ASW) 6 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airmen Duties/Flightcrew Procedures</li> <li>• Airworthiness Release / Maintenance Log Recording Requirements</li> <li>• Line Stations</li> <li>• Maintenance Facility/Main Maint. Base</li> <li>• Required Inspection Items (RII)</li> </ul>

Region	Identified Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance	Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region	<i>Potential</i> Adverse Trends Being Monitored
Western-Pacific (AWP) 13 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Carry-On Baggage</li> <li>• De-Icing Program</li> <li>• Maintenance/Required Inspection Item (RII) Training Program</li> <li>• RVSM Authorization</li> <li>• Training of Flight Crewmembers</li> <li>• Training of Station Personnel</li> </ul>

Region	Identified Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance	Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region	<i>Potential</i> Adverse Trends Being Monitored
Western-Pacific (AWP) 13 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Carry-On Baggage</li> <li>• De-Icing Program</li> <li>• Maintenance/Required Inspection Item (RII) Training Program</li> <li>• RVSM Authorization</li> <li>• Training of Flight Crewmembers</li> <li>• Training of Station Personnel</li> </ul>

**Section 343 Monthly Synopsis of  
Flight Standards Regional Offices - Air Transportation Oversight System (ATOS) Data  
Month Analyzed: April 2013**

In accordance with section 343 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, each Flight Standards region is required to submit a monthly report to the Administrator, the Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety, and the Director of Flight Standards Service. The regions have used the ATOS data base to identify adverse trends for their regions and documented their findings and corrective actions planned or being taken to address each adverse trend identified. This document is a synopsis of these findings.

It is important to note the following when reviewing the data being presented:

- ATOS is designed for the local Certificate Management Team (CMT) to identify hazards and risks at the local level and work with the certificate holder to develop and track corrective actions. The process does not lend itself to a comparative national trend analysis program without significant manipulation of the data.
- The ATOS process is based upon periodic assessments of different elements of the operator's program. These assessments occur at various intervals based on criticality of the element. Performance Assessments (PAs) can occur at 6 month, 1 year, or 3 year intervals while a Design Assessment (DA) occurs at a 5 year interval.
- Trends are slow to develop due to the periodic nature of the ATOS assessment program.
- The required Administrator's biannual report with the roll-up of data has the potential to provide more useful analytical information in the long term.

**Synopsis of Findings and Planned Actions from ATOS Data Review**

<b>Region</b>	<b>Identified Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance</b>	<b>Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region</b>	<b>Potential Adverse Trends Being Monitored</b>
Alaska (AAL) <i>5 operators</i>	• Exit Seating Program	Actions by CMTs are appropriate and Region will continue to monitor	• Line Station Operations/Ground Personnel Duties
Central (ACE) <i>5 operators</i>	• RVSM Authorization (Airworthiness)	Actions by CMTs are appropriate and Region will continue to monitor	• De-Icing Program
Eastern (AEA) <i>14 operators</i>	• Lower Landing Minimums	Actions by CMTs are appropriate and Region will continue to monitor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Maintenance/Inspection Schedule</li> <li>• Maintenance Facility/Main Maint. Base</li> <li>• MEL/CDL/Deferred Maintenance</li> <li>• Cargo Handling Equipment, Systems and Appliances</li> <li>• De-Icing Program (Ops)</li> <li>• Line Station Operations/Ground Personnel Duties</li> </ul>

<b>Region</b>	<b>Identified Regional Adverse Trends in Regulatory Compliance</b>	<b>Corrective Actions (CAs) Taken by Region</b>	<b>Potential Adverse Trends Being Monitored</b>
Great Lakes (AGL) 17 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Control of Calibrated Tools and Test Equipment</li> <li>• De-Icing Program (AW)</li> <li>• Operational Control</li> </ul>
Northwest Mountain (ANM) 7 operators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RVSM Authorization (Airworthiness)</li> <li>• Fueling</li> <li>• Special Flight Permits</li> </ul>	For all adverse trends, actions by CMTs are appropriate and Region will continue to monitor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuous Analysis and Surveillance System (CASS)</li> <li>• Maintenance Program</li> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Line Station Operations/Ground Personnel Duties</li> </ul>
Southern (ASO) 17 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fueling</li> </ul>
Southwest (ASW) 6 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance Facility/Main Maint. Base</li> <li>• Short-Term Escalations</li> <li>• Manual Management</li> <li>• Maintenance/Required Inspection Item (RII) Training Program</li> <li>• Line Stations</li> </ul>
Western-Pacific (AWP) 13 operators	No new trends identified	<i>Not applicable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance Providers</li> <li>• Carry-On Baggage Program</li> <li>• De-Icing Program (Ops)</li> <li>• Maintenance/Required Inspection Item (RII) Training Program</li> <li>• RVSM Authorization</li> <li>• Training of Flight Crewmembers</li> <li>• Training of Station Personnel</li> </ul>