the characters ''P–''. The TPSC further requests that the characters ''P–'' or ''BC-'' be followed by the name of the submitter. If a submission represents the views of multiple persons, only one needs to be listed in the file name. If the same person or persons has submitted multiple documents, each should be sequentially numbered, with the number following the name of the submitter in the file name. (E.g., the sixth public submission by Smith and Jones would be labeled ''P-Smith-6''.)

• Interested persons who make submissions by electronic mail should not provide separate cover letters. Any information that might appear in a cover letter should be included in the submission itself, or in the electronic mail message used to transmit the submission. To the extent possible, any attachments to the submission should be aggregated into a single file with the submission itself, and not transmitted separately.

These modifications are applicable to all documents related to action under section 203 of the Trade Act with regard to imports of certain steel that are submitted to the TPSC after publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

Carmen Suro-Bredie,

Chair, Trade Policy Staff Committee.

[FR Doc. 01–29776 Filed 11–27–01; 3:07 pm]

BILLING CODE 3190–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee Meeting on Air Carrier and General Aviation Maintenance Issues

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice; correction.

SUMMARY: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is issuing this notice to advise the public that the December 5, 2001, meeting of the FAA Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee to discuss Air Carrier and General Aviation Maintenance Issues related to repair station ratings and quality assurance programs has been rescheduled and the meeting location has been changed.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Vanessa R. Wilkins, Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Rulemaking (ARM–207), 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, telephone (202) 267–8029; fax (202) 267–5075.

Correction

In the **Federal Register** of November 20, 2001, in FR Doc. 01–28930, on page 58187 the third column, correct the **DATES** caption to read:

DATES: The meeting will be held on December 11, 2001, from 9:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

On page 58187, in the third column correct the **ADDRESSES** caption to read:

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the National Air Carrier Association, 910 Seventeenth Street, NW., Suite 1100, Washington, DC, 20006.

Dated: November 21, 2001.

Anthony F. Fazio,

Executive Director, Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee.

[FR Doc. 01–29636 Filed 11–28–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Office of the Comptroller of the Currency

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC), Treasury.

ACTION: Notice and request for comment.

SUMMARY: The OCC, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on a continuing information collection, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a respondent is not required to respond to, an information collection unless the information collection displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OCC is soliciting comment concerning its proposed information collection titled, ''OCC Communications Questionnaire.'' The OCC also gives notice that it has sent the information collection to OMB for review and approval.

DATES: You should submit your comments to the OCC and the OMB Desk Officer by December 31, 2001.

ADDRESSES: You should direct your comments to:

Communications Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Public Information Room, Mailstop 1–5, Attention: 1557–OCCPRODUCTS, 250 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20219. In addition, comments may be sent by fax to (202) 874–4448, or by electronic mail to *regs.comments@occ.treas.gov.* You can inspect and photocopy the comments at the OCC's Public Information Room, 250 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20219. You can make an appointment to inspect the comments by calling (202) 874–5043.

Alexander T. Hunt, OMB Desk Officer, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Room 3208, Washington, DC 20503.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: You can request additional information or a copy of the collection from Jessie Dunaway, OCC Clearance Officer, or Camille Dixon, (202) 874–5090, Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division. Questions regarding content of the questionnaire should be directed to Thomas Baucom, Communications Division, (202) 874–5513.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The OCC is requesting OMB approval of the following information collection:

Title: OCC Communications Questionnaire.

OMB Number: 1557—to be determined.

Description: The OCC is proposing to collect information from national banks regarding the quality, timeliness, and effectiveness of OCC communications products, such as booklets, issuances, CDs, and Web site. Completed questionnaires will provide the OCC with information needed to properly evaluate the effectiveness of its paper and electronic communications products. The OCC will use the information to identify problems and to improve its service to national banks.

Type of Review: New collection.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profit (national banks).

Estimated Number of Respondents: 2,300.

Estimated Total Annual Responses: 2,300.

Frequency of Response: One time.

Estimated Time per Respondent: 30 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 1,150 burden hours.

Dated: November 21, 2001.

Mark J. Tenhundfeld,

Assistant Director, Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division.

[FR Doc. 01–29635 Filed 11–28–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–33–P

AVIATION RULEMAKING ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ARAC)

Air Carrier and General Aviation Maintenance Issues

Meeting Minutes

DATE: December 11, 2001

TIME: 9:30 a.m.

PLACE: National Air Carrier Association

The Assistant Chair, Ms. Sarah MacLeod, called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

Agendas were distributed (attachment 1) and an attendance sheet was circulated (attachment 2). Mr. David Cann, Assistant Executive Director, read instructions governing the conduct of the meeting.

Ms. MacLeod welcomed everyone and then proceeded to hand out a copy of the tasks assigned to ARAC (attachment 3). Ms. MacLeod gave a brief overview of the tasks. There were no objections and the tasks were accepted as assigned. Ms. MacLeod also handed out a document summarizing the history of repair station ratings (attachment 4).

Discussion of Ratings Systems

Ms. MacLeod handed out a matrix of questions and discussion items for ARAC to address. The committee discussed the various parts of the matrix and determined that the matrix should be revised and distributed as a survey to both industry and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) inspectors. The committee revised the matrix (attachment 5) and determined that each organization would send out the survey to its members. Surveys should be returned to their respective ARAC member organization by January 18, 2002. The committee decided that each organization should be responsible for compiling comments received from its members. The committee will discuss the survey responses at the January 31, 2002, meeting.

Discussion of Quality Assurance

Ms. MacLeod handed out a sheet of questions pertaining to quality assurance. The committee determined the questions should not be sent out as a survey. Instead, the committee revised the list of questions (attachment 6). ARAC-member organizations volunteered to take action items to answer some of the questions. The committee concluded that it would not be appropriate to answer some questions until the group had received additional information.

Future Meetings, Dates, and Locations

The committee accepted the following schedule of meetings for 2002: January 9, January 31, February 20, March 12, and April 17. The General Aviation Manufacturers Association will host both January meetings.

Action Items

1. Mr. Richard Peri, Aircraft Electronics Association, will review the comments on repair station ratings submitted to FAA in response to public meetings held in 1989 and place them in the agreed upon matrix for consideration on the January 31st meeting.
2. Mr. Peri also will identify the basic elements of a quality assurance system for the January 9, 2002 meeting.
3. Mr. Jim Gess, Independent Pilots Association, will identify the benefits of a quality assurance system for the January 9th and/or 31st, 2002, meeting.
4. Ms. MacLeod will provide additional historical information on ratings and classes for the January 9 and/or 31st, 2002, meeting.
5. Ms. MacLeod also volunteered to complete the agreed upon changes to the matrix and ensure that all ARAC member organizations received it electronically before it was finalized.

Ms. MacLeod adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

Attendance

The December 11, 2001, meeting of the ARAC to address Air Carrier/General Aviation Maintenance issues was attended by 27 people, including committee members, alternates, government employees, and members of the general public.

Public Notification

An announcement of the meeting was published in the Federal Register on November 20, 2001 (66 FR 59600), amended, November 29, 2001 (66 FR 59600).

Approval

I certify that the above minutes are accurate.

/s/ Ms. Sarah MacLeod,

Assistant Chair for ARAC Air Carrier/General Aviation Maintenance Issues

Issued: January 8, 2002.

6 Attachments

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC) Meeting on

AIRCRAFT Certification PROCEDURES Issues

March 21, 2002, 8:30-11:30 A.m.

General Aviation Manufacturers Association

1400 K Street, NW, Suite 801

Washington, DC 20005-2485

AGENDA

OPENING REMARKS William (Bill) H. Schultz

ARAC Assistant Chair

READING OF ETHICS STATEMENT Brian Yanez

Assistant Executive Director

DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON PARTS AND PRODUCTION CERTIFICATION WORKING GROUP DRAFT DOCUMENTS:

"Means of Compliance with Proposed Quality System Requirements"

"Recommendation for Consistent Application of ODAR Processes for PAH Shipments"

"PAH Transition to New Quality System Requirements"

"ARAC Working Group Advisory Circular Proposal"

William (Bill) H. Schultz

STATUS REPORT ON THE PARTS AND PRODUCTION CERTIFICATION WORKING GROUP TASKING Working Group Chair

STATUS REPORT ON THE FAA SUBMITTED RULEMAKING PROJECTS FOR:
"Establishment of Organization Designation Authorization (ODA) Procedures"
"Production Certification and Parts Manufacturing" Brian Yanez

DISCUSSION OF FUTURE MEETING DATES, ACTIVITIES, AND PLANS William (Bill) H. Schultz

ADJOURN

AVIATION RULEMAKING ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AIR CARRIER AND GENERAL AVIATION MAINTENANCE

SIGN-IN SHEET

DECEMBER 11, 2001

MEMBER (M) NON-MEMBER (N)	NAME	AFFILIATION	TELEPHONE/ FAX NUMBER	E-MAIL ADDRESS
M	MIKE WHISSELL	TRANSPORT CANADA	613 953 9104 613 954 3278	whissem@tc.gc.ca
N	JASON DICKSTEIN	Airline Suppliers Association	202 730 0272 202 730 0274	jason@washingtonaviation.com
M	SKIP JONES	AEROSPACE INDUSTRIES ASSN.	202-371-8433 202-371-8471	JONES@AIA-AEROSPACE.ORG
M	LANCE NUCKOLLS	Aircraft owners & Pilots Assoc.	301-695-2086 301-695-2214	LANCE.NUCKOLLS@AOPA.ORG
M	STUART SCHWARTZBERG	EQUIPMENT LEASING ASSOCIATION	212-536-9373 TEL 212-536-9401 FAX	STUART.SCHWARTZBERG@TYCOCAPITAL.COM
M	JIM GESS	Independent Pilots Association	770 306 1267 Tel 770 306-1311 Fax	~~JEFF~~ JIM.GESS@MINDSPRING.COM
M	RICHARD PERI	AIRCRAFT ELECTRONICS ASSOCIATION	202-544-1144 410-551-9534	RICP@AOL.NET
M	ED GAGNON	Boeing NATA	314 [illegible] 314 [illegible]	ed.gagnon@[illegible]
N	CHAD BERGMAN	Airline Suppliers Assoc.	[illegible]	chad.bergman@[illegible]
N	JEE SIRICO	PRATT & WHITNEY	860-565-6633 860-755-4538	siricojj@pwa.com
N	JOE BUTTNER	DALLAS AIRMOTIVE-MILLVILLE	856 825 6000 825 0078	JBUTTNER@DALLASAIRMOTIVE.COM
N	RALPH MALCOLM	AVIATION CONSULTANT	703 354 1672	NYRMC@STARPOWER.NET
M	ERIC R. BYER	NATA	703-575-2043 PH 703-845-8176 FX	EBYER@NATA-ONLINE.ORG

AVIATION RULEMAKING ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AIR CARRIER AND GENERAL AVIATION MAINTENANCE

SIGN-IN SHEET

DECEMBER 11, 2001

MEMBER (M) NON-MEMBER (N)	NAME	AFFILIATION	TELEPHONE/ FAX NUMBER	E-MAIL ADDRESS
N	DAVID A. SMITH	IATA (JET AVIATION)	201 462 4023 FAX 201 462 4009	david_smith@jetaviation.com
M	Rosita M. Sequeira	BOEING	425-237-4716	Rosita.M.Sequeira@Boeing.com
M/N	Scott G. Peterson	Boeing	425-237-7967	Scott.g.peterson@boeing.com
M	Ron Priddy	NACA	202-833-8200 202-659-9479	rpriddy@naca.cc
M	Tim Bryla	Teamsters	502-241-0658 502-357-0747	tandsbryla@prodigy.net
M	CHRIS LEONARD	ISAMP	610-883-4431 610-644-7681	isamp@msn.com
M	BOB HALL	AIR LINE PILOTS ASSOC.	703-689-4205 703-464-2104	hallb@alpa.org
N	DIANA L. FROHN	FAA/AFS 340	202-267-9027 202-267-5115	diana.frohn@faa.gov
N	VANESSA WILKINS	FAA	202-267-8599 202-267-5075	vanessa.wilkins@faa.gov
M	Arthur Luby	TWU	202-898-1707 626-9276	ALuby@ODSLAW.com
M	WALTER DESROSIER	GAMA	202 393 1500 202 842 4063	WDESROSIER@GAMAINFO.ORG
N	DAVID E. CANN	FAA/AFS-300	202-267-3546	dave.cann@faa.gov
M	SARAH MACLEOD	ARSA/ARAC CHAIR	703-739-7543	SarahSays@arsa.org

AVIATION RULEMAKING ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AIR CARRIER AND GENERAL AVIATION MAINTENANCE

SIGN-IN SHEET

DECEMBER 11, 2001

MEMBER (M) NON-MEMBER (N)	NAME	AFFILIATION	TELEPHONE/ FAX NUMBER	E-MAIL ADDRESS
M	GEORGE R PAUL	NACA (ALT)	703-760-8702 / 703-760-8244 / main 703 930 [illegible]	george.paul@[illegible].com
	Amy Zuzek (for Glenn Rizner) M	HAI	703-683-4646 703-683-4745	glenn.rizner@rotor.com amy.zuzek@rotor.com

AVIATION RULEMAKING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Date: March 6, 2002
ACTION: Draft Materials for Production Certification and Parts Manufacturing Working Group

To: ARAC Aircraft Certification Procedures Issues Members
From : Bill Schultz, Assistant ARAC Chair, Aircraft Certification Procedures Issues
Fax: (202)842-4062 or E-mail: wschultz@generalaviation.org

Enclosed for your review and comment are copies of the draft materials from the Production Certification and Parts Manufacturing Working Group, entitled "Means of Compliance with Proposed Quality System Requirements," "Recommendation for Consistent Application of ODAR Processes for PAH Shipments," "PAH Transition to New Quality System Requirements," and "ARAC Working Group Advisory Circular Proposal." The Production Certification and Parts Manufacturing Working Group are submitting these drafts as their work product for issues members to vote on at the Aircraft Certification Procedures Issues meeting on March 21, 2002.

I encourage you to make a special effort to attend the March 21 meeting from 8:30-11:30 a.m. at the General Aviation Manufacturers Association, 1400 K Street, NW., Suite 801, Washington, DC. The agenda will consist of voting on the enclosed materials, as well as hearing status reports on the working group's remaining tasks, and on the FAA submitted rulemaking projects for "Establishment of Organization Designation Authorization (ODA) Procedures", and "Production Certification and Parts Manufacturing".

Should you be unable to attend the March 21 meeting, please submit your vote and/or comments to me by fax to (202) 842-4063, by E-mail to wschultz@generalaviation.org, or by mail to General Aviation Manufacturers Association, Attn.: Bill Schultz, 1400 K Street, Suite 801, Washington, DC 20005-2485

Thank you for your support.

Bill Schultz

4 Attachments

Means of Compliance with Proposed Quality System Requirements

The Parts and Production Certification Working Group proposes that AS9100 become the quality system model of the future. This aviation industry quality system standard meets the NPRM Part 21 Subpart G

requirements. Production approval holders and suppliers should comply with this document.

Existence of a quality system alone, however, does not guarantee conforming parts. Therefore, the production approval holder must impose adequate inspections to determine conformance to the type design and condition for safe operation of released products and parts. [The Americas Aerospace Quality Group (AAQG) of SAE, the publisher of AS9100, is working to develop and publish supporting documents. These supporting documents (e.g., first piece inspection, statistical process control, etc.) should be used to help determine inspections necessary to assure compliance to the quality system requirements.]

Recommendations for Consistent Application of ODAR processes for PAH Shipments

-

Background

With the proposed NPRM requirement to issue airworthiness approvals for all shipments, AIR-200 had proposed that the Parts and Production ARAC Working Group take an action item to make "recommendations on ODAR personnel qualification requirements who issue these approvals". I have been working on this and have some recommendations to propose for your review and comments.

Proposed changes are to FAA Order 8100.8A "Designee Management Handbook", I confirmed with Mary Hoff (FAA) that all the requirements for the creation and operation of the ODAR are contained in this Order. I also coordinated this with Dale Gordon, Rolls-Royce Corp., who was doing a similar project for AIA.

Summary of Proposed Changes

Current production approval holders (PAHs) already have the responsibility per CFR 14 part 21 to assure parts meet approved design and are airworthy/safe (if it is a PC, PMA or TSO holder the part 21 the wording is a little different for each). The only difference in the new NPRM requirement is that the people who issue the airworthiness approvals under the ODAR must know the FAA requirements for issuance of FAA form 8130-3's. FAA Order 8100.8A is very clear in paragraph 401 (Table II) under Regulatory Appointment Criteria, that "it is the ORGANIZATION that must meet all DAR qualifications for authorized functions identified... The ODAR is responsible for ensuring the individual authorized representatives…COLLECTIVELY meet the overall qualification criteria... not each individual...".

To alleviate the impact on PAH and FAA resources for airworthiness approval functions in the new NRPM requirements, the FAA should shift some responsibilities to the ODAR focal points in the PAHs. Below is a summary of the proposed changes:

- PAH's ODAR focal point could be approved to provide equivalent training to the authorized representatives. The training could be included in the PAH's ODAR Procedure Manual that is approved by the FAA. It would be kept up to date by requiring the ODAR focal point to attend the FAA Standardization Training at least every two years.
- The ODAR focal point could be given the authority to appoint new ODAR authorized representatives for airworthiness approval functions. As they are added to the ODAR Procedure Manual the FAA would do a post review approval.
- The ODAR focal point would have the authority to assign/reassign authorized functions to the ODAR authorized representatives as long as they are authorized functions already approved for the ODAR. After the functions are assigned the FAA would do a post review approval.

Supporting Paragraphs already contained in FAA Order 8100.8A

Throughout the Order reference is made to the applicant or designee. In the case of an ODAR, the organization is the applicant and the designee.

Paragraph 203. APPOINTING OFFICE MANAGER.

f. **Sign or coordinate on all designee appointments or candidacies after the EP decision has been reached.**

In the above paragraph the designee in question is the ODAR and any subsequent appointments within the ODAR can be "coordinated". The "EP (Evaluation Panel) decision" again is for the ODAR and subsequent reviews of candidate qualifications are part of the ODAR procedures manual (Reference paragraph 405.a.(4)).

and

Paragraph 902.b. Oversight Considerations Unique to ODAR's. **It is the ODAR's responsibility to comply with all provisions of their organizational designation. The ODAR will perform and document self assessments activities to ensure only qualified authorized functions in accordance with the pertinent regulations, related policies, and procedures. The Advisor will provide direct supervision by interfacing with the organization's focal point and monitoring these self assessment activities. The managing office will review and provide written approval of all changes to the ODAR's FAA-approved procedures manual. This shall include any additions or removals of individual authorized representatives who perform authorized function(s). At the appointing/managing office's discretion, changes may be approved before or after implementation by the ODAR.**

Specific Changes Proposed for Order 8100.8A

Para. 405. ODAR APPLICATIONS. Add new para. 405.a.(6) to say:

(6) Defines the training requirements for individual authorized representatives.

Para. 405.b. ODAR Focal Point. Revise paragraph to say:

The application for an ODAR must be signed by the proposed focal point. The proposed focal point is a management official within the applicant's quality organization who will have sufficient authority to effect change within the ODAR. The ODAR focal point will be responsible for management and oversight of the ODAR, including; authorization of representatives, assignment / reassignment of representatives and equivalent standardization training as permitted by the ODAR manual. The management representative will serve as the FAA focal point for ODAR activities. Any changes in an ODAR focal point shall be reported to the FAA Managing Office.

Para. 802. SEMINAR ATTENDANCE. Add the following to the end of 802.b. NOTE to say:

Authorized ODAR representatives, that only perform airworthiness approvals at a PAH (Class II/III product airworthiness approvals) can obtain equivalent training through the ODAR. The PAH's ODAR can provide equivalent training to authorized representatives. The training program would be included in the PAH's ODAR Procedures Manual that is approved by the FAA. The training program would be kept up to date by requiring the ODAR focal point to attend the FAA Standardization Training at least every two years and update the program accordingly.

Para. 902. MANUFACTURING DMIR/DAR/ODAR OVERSIGHT (SUPERVISION, MONITORING, AND TRACKING).

Modify paragraph 902.a.(1)(c) to say:

(c) Verify that the designee's attendance at the appropriate standardization seminar is in accordance with this order. Verify attendance at the appropriate standardization seminar or equivalent training by each representative performing an authorized function(s) under an organizational designation in accordance with this order.

Add a NOTE to paragraph. 902.b. to say:

NOTE: For airworthiness approval functions (Class II/III product airworthiness approvals) at a PAH, the ODAR focal point can provide equivalent standardization training, appoint new authorized representatives, and assign/reassign these functions to authorized representatives as provided in the ODAR Procedures Manual. The FAA managing office would review and approve the ODAR Procedure Manual changes at its next opportunity.

PAH Transition to New Quality System Requirements

- All current PC, PMA, TSO and APIS holders must be compliant with the new Subpart G requirements (including the internal audit, record retention, and part marking requirements) within two years of publication of the Final Rule.
    - To assist the FAA in resource availability planning, within one year of the final rule publication the PAH should notify the FAA of its compliance plan.
    - If the PAH submits a written compliance plan with milestones, the PAH may elect to perform its transition in stages, as described in the written plan, such that at any one time the PAH may be in compliance with a combination of old and new requirements in accordance with the FAA approval of that plan.
    - All required information, including the revised Quality Manual must be submitted to the FAA within the two-year timeframe.
    - Considering that all Final Rule changes are in addition to the approved existing quality system requirements, the PAH may operate to the new Quality Manual prior to FAA approval. Any other changes to the quality system incorporated concurrently with the new Quality Manual requirements must be approved in a form and manner acceptable to the FAA.
- After publication of the Final Rule, a production approval holder may add new products and parts under its existing production approval, but the applicant must be compliant with the new Subpart G requirements within two years of the Final Rule.
- An application for a new production approval in process prior to publication of the Final Rule may be approved under the old rule, but the applicant must be compliant with the new Subpart G requirements within two years of the Final Rule.
- A manufacturer may produce product "under TC only" up to six months after publication of the Final Rule. After six months, the manufacturer must produce the products under a production certificate issued under either the new or old rule. If the production certificate was issued under the old rule, the applicant must be compliant with the new Subpart G requirements within two years of the Final Rule.
- PAHs must obtain FAA Forms 8130-3 for all shipments of finished parts within two years of the Final Rule. Unfinished parts and materials that are not eligible for an airworthiness approval may be accompanied by the manufacturer's certificate of conformance.
- Subpart L changes, including elimination of FAR 21.325(b)(3) and use of an FAA Form 8130-3 for export of engines and propellers are effective immediately upon publication of the Final Rule.
- A PMA holder may not eliminate the "FAA-PMA" and installation eligibility markings per the Final Rule until the new marking and IFCA (installation eligibility publication) requirements are met. These changes may be implemented prior to compliance with other parts of the final rule.
    - After 2 years from publication of the final rule, the PMA Holder may continue to apply the "FAA-PMA" and installation eligibility markings on currently approved parts.
    - The PMA Holder may make a block change to its engineering data for marking requirements either through an FAA-approved engineering change or an FAA-approved section of its Quality Manual.

ARAC Working Group ADVISORY CIRCULAR Proposal

Subject: Handling Standard Parts and Commercial Parts

1. Purpose: This advisory circular provides guidance for a design approval holder to declare parts, included in the type design, which it wishes to define as either Standard Parts or Commercial Parts in accordance with the recently published definitions in Part 1 of the Federal Aviation Regulations. The new definitions are intended to help identify parts that do not require manufacture by an FAA production approval holder. The implementation of these definitions shall not take

away the ability for an installer to make a determination of installation eligibility under FAR 43.13 of appropriate parts.

2. Related Federal Aviation Regulations, Advisory Circulars and Reference Material:
   a.) Part 1 Extended Definition of Standard Part

   b.) Part 1 Definition of Commercial Part

3. Discussion: Many parts which are incorporated into the type design of aeronautical products which are of relatively simple design and which in most instances are no more critical to the product airworthiness than AN, MS, etc., nuts and bolts, have for many years required Parts Manufacturer Approval (PMA) for regulatory approval. This has placed a burden on the FAA out of proportion to the parts criticality. Similarly, many parts included in the type design of aeronautical products are commercial off-the-shelf parts such as light bulbs, fire axes, batteries, etc., which have for many years had no formal regulatory basis of approval and for which there has been little or no prospect of the manufacturers of such parts ever making application to the FAA for Parts Manufacturer Approval (PMA).

   In the future the design approval holder will be permitted to declare these parts as either Standard Parts or Commercial Parts in accordance with the definitions for each category released in Part 1 of the Federal Aviation Regulations, and approved by the FAA through the type design approval process. Whether or not the design approval holder has declared parts as standard / commercial, the installer continues to have the ability to install parts that meet the performance standards of Part 43, even if the parts are not produced by a production approval holder.

4. Definitions:
   1. Industry Standard Part: a part which meets one of the following criteria

      a. A part manufactured to a specification prepared by a standards setting organization, which includes the engineering data, the manufacturing process data and uniform identification requirements. The specification must include all information necessary to produce and conform the part. The specification must be published so that any party may manufacture the part. Examples include but are not limited to National Aerospace Standards (NAS), Air Force – Navy Aeronautical Standard (AS), Military Standard (MS).
      b. A part manufactured to a specification established by a FAA design approval holder that is included in the type design and meets the following criteria:

         1. The specification contains design, manufacturing, test and acceptance criteria and uniform marking requirements.

2. The specification is available to any person so that anyone may manufacture the part.
3. The part is not subject to special quality assurance oversight by the PAH.

a. A part manufactured to a specification that the Administrator finds will result in a part that may be conformed (airworthiness established) solely on the basis of meeting performance criteria and uniform marking requirements.
b. A part manufactured to a specification for a non-programmable electrical or electronic part produced in conformance with a specification published and maintained by a consensus standards organization, a government agency or a holder of a design approval; or in conformance with the manufacturers internal specifications or standards. The internal specifications or standards must include manufacturing controls, quality and reliability test methods and identification requirements. They may include acceptance test criteria. With the exception of parts manufactured to U.S. Military specifications, design of which are controlled by the Defense Supply Center, Columbus (DSCC), the specifications or standards do not include electrical parameters and data, these are obtained from the suppliers data sheet. The part is used within the manufacturer's published operating and environmental ranges.

1. Commercial Part

A detail part or a subcomponent included in the type design that is designated by the design approval holder based on the following criteria:

1. The part is not necessarily designed for application in commercial aviation and…..
2. The part is manufactured to a specification or catalog description and marked under the identification scheme of the manufacturer.

1. Procedure: The procedure for a design approval holder to designate and receive regulatory approval for either an industry standard part, 4.1.(b) above or a commercial part 4.2 above, is the same in both cases.
    1. Step One: The design approval holder prepares two lists, one for standard parts and one for commercial parts. The lists shall include manufacturers name and address of parts included in the type design that it wishes to declare as a commercial part.
    2. Step Two: The design approval holder submits the two individual and separate lists to the local Aircraft Certification Office (ACO) for approval.
    3. Step Three: The FAA ACO by comparison with the type design reviews the lists submitted and approves these as appropriate.
    4. Step Four: The approved lists are published by the design approval holder (e.g., in Instructions for Continued Airworthiness, Illustrated Parts Catalog, listing of manufacturer's standard parts, etc.).

2. Revisions: The design approval holder may make revisions to the standard and commercial parts lists (e.g., adding a new manufacturer) under a system approved by the FAA.

REPAIR STATION RATINGS

The History

FAR Part 1 currently states that ***rating*** *means a statement that, as part of a certificate, sets forth special conditions, privileges, or limitations.* When the regulation of air commerce began in the United States, with the passage of the Air Commerce Act of 1926,[1] ratings were the safety[2], or specialty identifiers for aircraft, the skill level identifiers for airmen[3] and the safety and suitability identifiers for air navigation facilities.[4] Repair stations were not mentioned in the 1926 Act; as such facilities had not yet been developed. With the rapid development of civil aviation in the United States during the 1920s and 1930s, economic need led to creation of repair stations (along with other entities such as schools for training pilots and mechanics). Upon passage of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, creating the Civil Aeronautics Authority (later changed to Administration) (CAA), regulation of the operations of repair stations and their personnel,[5] which had started by regulation under the general authority of the 1926 Act, became a legislatively directed regulated activity. Ratings, as defined today, were used then to differentiate between repair stations of greater, lesser or different skills. However, CAA requirements for various minimum levels of equipment, facilities and personnel skills often blurred the need for the strict ratings covering the skills and competency of the certificated organizations; redundancy of the rating system with the basic repair station requirements became evident.

> After passage of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, when the CAA repair station certificate itself served as the standard for the required skill level, the use of a rating system for repair stations played a secondary position. Part 52 - Repair Station Ratings, used the term in its title with the same meaning as the term is defined today[6] and ratings, covering all repair station activities, were defined as follows:
>
> 52.1 **Repair Station ratings**. Repair station ratings are as follows:
> (a) Aircraft of composite construction;

---

[1] May 20, 1926

[2] *The Secretary of Commerce shall by regulation — (b) Provide for the rating of aircraft of the United States as to their airworthiness.* Section 3 (b) Regulatory powers: Air Commerce Act of 1926.

[3] *The Secretary of Commerce shall by regulation — (c) Provide for the periodic examination and rating of airmen serving in connection with aircraft of the United States as to their qualifications for such service.* Section 3 (c) Regulatory powers: Air Commerce Act of 1926.

[4] *The Secretary of Commerce shall by regulation — (d) Provide for the examination and rating of air navigation facilities available for the use of aircraft of the United States as to their suitability for such use.* Section 3 (d) Regulatory powers: Air Commerce Act of 1926.

[5] as to the adequacy and suitability of the equipment, facilities, and materials for, and methods of, repair, alteration, maintenance, and overhaul of aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers, and appliances, and the competency of those engaged in the work or giving any instruction therein. Section 607 Air Agency Ratings, Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

[6] See Civil Air Regulation Part 52 Repair Station Rating — as amended to October 1, 1942

(b) Aircraft of all metal construction;
(c) Aircraft engines;
(d) Aircraft metal propellers and metal hubs;
(e) Aircraft wood propellers and their metal propeller hubs;
(f) Aircraft instruments.

To be able to operate as a repair station with one or more of the above ratings, the repair station had to be eligible for, and obtain, a certificate from the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

> 52.2 **Repair station certificate requirements**. To be eligible for a rating as a repair station and certification as such, an applicant shall comply with the following requirements:

Following Section 52.2 is a listing of requirements applicable to all repair station certificates — 52.2 . . adequate personnel certificated as required by the Civil Air Regulations and qualified to perform or supervise the type of work involved; 52.21 . . suitable housing facilities which are adequately heated, lighted, and ventilated; 52.22 . . an adequate system of inspection; 52.23 . . a stockroom for . . materials; 52.24 . . facilities and equipment for making drawings; and 52.25 . . other requirements as necessary (with the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration [CAA] determining what is *necessary*). A footnote in Part 51 refers the reader to Manual No. 52, which contains ". . in detail various types of work . . within the scope of [rated] repair stations . ." as well as "lists of equipment, facilities, and material . . approved as adequate. ." The repair station's ratings, during this time frame, established its areas of work specialty as well as its work limits.

Following the very rapid growth of civil aviation following WWII, particularly, in the number of aircraft models, the complexity of the aircraft types used in scheduled and on-demand commercial service and the marked increase in navigation and communication equipment, it was determined by the Civil Aeronautics Administration (the entity that administered the regulations) and the Civil Aeronautics Board (the entity that promulgated virtually all of the CARs) that a comprehensive overhaul of the rules affecting the maintenance, repair and alteration of the civil aviation fleet in the United States was necessary.

Beginning in 1948, a concerted government/industry program to revise CAR 18 Maintenance, Repair, and Alteration of Airframes, Powerplants, Propellers, and Appliances, CAR 24 Mechanic Certificates, CAR 52 Repair Station Certificates and CAR 53 Mechanic School Certificates was started. It led, more than a year later, to the simultaneous publication in the Federal Register of four Notices of Proposed Rulemaking, proposing significant changes to each of these related CARs.[7]

The proposed changes to CARs 18, 24, 52 and 53 were not well received and the comments and criticisms were profuse. As a result, after considerable government/industry consultations, a new Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (rather than a final rule) appeared in the April 28, 1951 issue of the Federal Register. The preamble of proposed CAR 18 carried the following comments about its revised proposals:

---

[7] See 14 F.R. 7533 dated December 16, 1949

> The revise part, with certain exceptions, provides that only certificated mechanics, persons operating under the supervision of certificated mechanics, or repair stations shall be authorized to work on aircraft or aircraft components.

The exceptions were for pilots performing preventive maintenance on their personally owned aircraft and for manufacturers to rebuild or alter their own products without the need to obtain a repair station certificate. The preamble also states that:

> In addition, except . [for] permissive work by manufacturers, the part restricts the performance of work on instruments and the making of major repairs and alterations on propellers to appropriately rated repair stations.

The preamble of proposed CAR 24 carried the following comments about its revised proposals:

> In view of the almost unanimous adverse reaction from all industry segments to our original proposal to issue propeller, radio, instrument, and accessory ratings to individual mechanics, we have decided to provide standards for mechanics certificates with only airframe and powerplant ratings. . However, in proposed Part 52 we have made provision for the issuance to repair stations of propeller, radio, instrument, and accessory ratings of several different classes, and in proposed Part 18, we have required that instrument repair and alteration and major propeller repairs be performed by a certificated repair station. Part 52 makes the repair station responsible for the competence of its personnel. .

The preamble of proposed CAR 52 carried the following comments about its revised proposals:

> The most important innovations in the previously proposed revisions of part 52 are provisions for the issuance of repair station ratings for radio, instruments, and accessories, and for the issuance of ratings limited to the performance of specialized services. . .
>
> . . This proposal sets forth the main functions to be performed by a repair station holding a particular rating. It is believed that these functions are stated in such terms as to permit an applicant and a CAA examining agent to determine jointly the facilities and equipment required to be furnished for a particular rating without resort, as under regulations, to a detailed mandatory list of facilities and equipment. . .

The preamble of proposed CAR 53, noting the previous changes to proposed CARs 18, 24 and 52, dropped (among other things), from its earlier NPRM, the proposed required curriculum for instrument, radio and accessory mechanics, as such certificates would not be issued by the CAA, though it further noted that "this action does not prohibit establishment of specialized courses or schools to train certificated airmen for employment by repair stations."

All four of the April 28, 1951 proposed rule changes (Parts 18, 24, 52 and 53) were adopted as final rules, without significant changes, and were published in the Federal on April 5, 1952. The preamble to the changes of CAR 52 is instructive in explaining its intent and a significant portion is quoted below:

> Currently effective Part 52 establishes requirements for the issuance of repair station certificates and ratings and basic operating rules for the holders thereof. It is the intent of this revision to improve the standards of repair stations. To accomplish this objective additional repair station ratings are hereby established to take into account the trend toward specialization, so that the stations will be better able to maintain present-day aircraft. . .
>
> Under the terms of this part the following general ratings may be issued to repair stations: Airframe, powerplant, propeller, radio, instrument, and accessory. Instead of these general ratings a limited rating may be issued authorizing an applicant to work on some particular type of airframe, powerplant, etc., or to perform some specialized maintenance, repair, or overhaul function.
>
> All applicants are required to furnish housing, facilities, equipment, materials and personnel adequate to perform competently the work authorized by the particular rating sought. The exact type and amount of such housing, facilities, equipment, materials and personnel will, in all probability, vary in each instance.

Thoughts and Conclusions

The regulations affecting the maintenance, repair and alteration of the civil aviation fleet, published in 1952, were the last basic, substantive review and change of the scope (additions and reorganizations not withstanding). The Civil Aeronautics Manual (CAM) covering Repair Station Certificates, published in June 1952, shortly after publication in the Federal Register of the revised Civil Air Regulation Part 52, contains, in addition to the CAR, the interpretations and policy pronouncements of the Civil Aeronautics Administration that substantively affected the scope of the CAR. The subject coverage and arrangement of this CAM differs little from the 1961 CAM 52 that was the basis for the re-codification of the content of the repair station rules into FAR Part 145. Amendments to the regulation since publication of Part 145[8] have not changed its subject coverage and arrangement; they have only added a few new words appropriate to the age of avionics (electronics)[9]

The concept expressed in the 1948 — 1952 period, when the "maintenance" industry and its regulatory authority used (or believed it did) the rating concept as the solid base for the assurance that a repair station would have all the necessary technical expertise (people skills, equipment, tools and instructions) to properly inspect, service, repair, overhaul or modify a certificated product was probably a good one. It was easier then to identify all of the *things* one needed to do the job. The basic tools, manuals and facilities rules generally complemented the specific rating requirements and the close working relationships between the responsible CAA inspectors and the applicant for (or holder of) a repair station certificate would provide the means to eliminate conflicts or uncertainties between the rating and the housing and facilities

---

[8] 27 F.R. 6662, July 13, 1962

[9] And left in a few obsolete or changed circumstances words — see, for instance, 145.(a)(1) & (2), covering composite construction of aircraft, which is defined in Part 52 as "structure of the airframe is made of at least two types of substances, such as metal and wood." The common use of the term, composite construction, as used in aircraft, is, of course, entirely different today.

and equipment and materials requirements. That is what the CAA said would happen. But it is an area of concern today.

Perhaps the conflicts today occur because the repair station and FAA personal (or either one of them in any particular case) do not understand the background or objectives of the rules or the words themselves (see my note on composite structures). Education can help in this case, though it is not a perfect cure. Perhaps a bit of the history of how we got where we are today could help. However, I do not believe it is possible to include in FAR 145 all of the *things* one needs to have or do in this dynamic, evolving field in a regulation unless that regulation is reconsidered at least once a year. Though I see fault in the rating system, I believe it can be fixed to cover broad cases of repair station expertise and specialization. The general rules covering the housing and facilities and equipment and materials requirements are probably more amenable to cleanup so as to complement the ratings. This is said in part because no substantive changes were made to the ratings in the new Part 145 and ratings are used in the airman field. But the matter needs a good hard look in view of the fact that problems have occurred in understanding what the rules mean and what is required. It is, in my opinion, a problem of understanding the existing rules in the context in which they were written and intended to apply and then applying them properly.

Stanley J. Green

§ 44701. General requirements

(a) PROMOTING SAFETY.—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall promote safe flight of civil aircraft in air commerce by prescribing—

(1) minimum standards required in the interest of safety for appliances and for the design, material, construction, quality of work, and performance of aircraft, aircraft engines, and propellers;

(2) regulations and minimum standards in the interest of safety for—

(A) inspecting, servicing, and overhauling aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers, and appliances;

(B) equipment and facilities for, and the timing and manner of, the inspecting, servicing, and overhauling; and

(C) a qualified private person, instead of an officer or employee of the Administration, to examine and report on the inspecting, servicing, and overhauling;

(3) regulations required in the interest of safety for the reserve supply of aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers, appliances, and aircraft fuel and oil, including the reserve supply of fuel and oil carried in flight;

(4) regulations in the interest of safety for the maximum hours or periods of service of airmen and other employees of air carriers; and

(5) regulations and minimum standards for other practices, methods, and procedure the Administrator finds necessary for safety in air commerce and national security.

(b) PRESCRIBING MINIMUM SAFETY STANDARDS.—The Administrator may prescribe minimum safety standards for—

(1) an air carrier to whom a certificate is issued under section 44705 of this title; and

(2) operating an airport serving any passenger operation of air carrier aircraft designed for at least 31 passenger seats.

(c) REDUCING AND ELIMINATING ACCIDENTS.—The Administrator shall carry out this chapter in a way that best tends to reduce or eliminate the possibility or recurrence of accidents in air transportation. However, the Administrator is not required to give preference either to air transportation or to other air commerce in carrying out this chapter.

(d) CONSIDERATIONS AND CLASSIFICATION OF REGULATIONS AND STANDARDS.—When prescribing a regulation or standard under subsection (a) or (b) of this section or any of sections 44702–44716 of this title, the Administrator shall—

(1) consider—

(A) the duty of an air carrier to provide service with the highest possible degree of safety in the public interest; and

(B) differences between air transportation and other air commerce; and

(2) classify a regulation or standard appropriate to the differences between air transportation and other air commerce.

(e) BILATERAL EXCHANGES OF SAFETY OVERSIGHT RESPONSIBILITIES.—

(a) when the Administrator decides that the requirements are or would be unreasonably costly, burdensome, or impractical.

(d) COMMUTER AIRPORTS.—In developing the terms required by subsection (b) for airports covered by subsection (a)(2), the Administrator shall identify and consider a reasonable number of regulatory alternatives and select from such alternatives the least costly, most cost-effective or the least burdensome alternative that will provide comparable safety at airports described in subsections (a)(1) and (a)(2).

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Any regulation establishing the terms required by subsection (b) for airports covered by subsection (a)(2) shall not take effect until such regulation, and a report on the economic impact of the regulation on air service to the airports covered by the rule, has been submitted to Congress and 120 days have elapsed following the date of such submission.

(f) LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title may be construed as requiring a person to obtain an airport operating certificate if such person does not desire to operate an airport described in subsection (a).

§ 44707. Examining and rating air agencies

The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration may examine and rate the following air agencies:

(1) civilian schools giving instruction in flying or repairing, altering, and maintaining aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers, and appliances, on the adequacy of instruction, the suitability and airworthiness of equipment, and the competency of instructors.

(2) repair stations and shops that repair, alter, and maintain aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers, and appliances, on the adequacy and suitability of the equipment, facilities, and materials for, and methods of, repair and overhaul, and the competency of the individuals doing the work or giving instruction in the work.

(3) other air agencies the Administrator decides are necessary in the public interest.

§ 44708. Inspecting and rating air navigation facilities

The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration may inspect, classify, and rate an air navigation facility available for the use of civil aircraft on the suitability of the facility for that use.

§ 44709. Amendments, modifications, suspensions, and revocations of certificates

(a) REINSPECTION AND REEXAMINATION.—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration may reinspect at any time a civil aircraft, aircraft engine, propeller, appliance, air navigation facility, or air agency, or reexamine an airman holding a certificate issued under section 44703 of this title.

(b) ACTIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATOR.—The Administrator may issue an order amending, modifying, suspending, or revoking—

(1) any part of a certificate issued under this chapter if—

(A) the Administrator decides after conducting a reinspection, reexamination, or other investigation that safety

PURPOSE: The Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC) was tasked by FAA to recommend a system to rate aeronautical repair stations that mitigates problems associated with the existing system of ratings and accommodates the growth of the aviation industry. The purpose of this survey is to collect information regarding **YOUR** understanding and ideas on the current Part 145 ratings.

INSTRUCTIONS: The current Part 145 rating system is outlined in the table below. Please provide **your** perspective on the scope, usefulness, and issues associated with each rating. Only complete those sections with which you have experience or familiarity**.** Do not submit more than one survey.

Aviation Affiliation (*e.g.*, FAA, Repair Station, Maintenance Technician, Customer)**:**

Name and Contact Information (optional)**:**

Rating	Scope What do you think are the privileges and limitations of this rating?	Usefulness Is this rating necessary? (Yes/No) Please explain.	Issues State any issues that you have experienced with the rating.
AIRFRAME			
Airframe Class 1: Composite Construction Small Aircraft	Space left blank for form	Space left blank for form	
Space left blank for form			
Airframe Class 2: Composite Construction Large Aircraft			
Airframe Class 3: All-metal Construction Small Aircraft			
Airframe Class 4: All-metal Construction			

Limited: Airframes of a particular make and model			
POWERPLANT			
Powerplant Class 1: Reciprocating engines of 400 HP or less			
Powerplant Class 2: Reciprocating engines of more than 400 HP			
Powerplant Class 3: Turbine Engines			
Limited: Engines of a particular make and model			
PROPELLER			
Propeller Class 1: All fixed pitch& ground adjustable propellers of wood, metal, or composite construction			
Propeller Class 2: All other propellers, by make			
Limited: Propellers of a particular make and model			
RADIO			
Radio Class 1: Communication Equipment			
Radio Class 2: Navigational equipment			
Radio Class 3: Radar equipment			
Limited: Radio equipment of a particular make			

and model			
INSTRUMENT			
Instrument Class 1: Mechanical			
Instrument Class 2: Electrical			
Instrument Class 3: Gyroscopic			
Instrument Class 4: Electronic			
Limited: Instruments of a particular make and model			
ACCESSORY			
Accessory Class 1: Mechanical			
Accessory Class 2: Electrical			
Accessory Class 3: Electronic			
Limited: Accessories of a particular make and model			
LIMITED	**(other than those listed above)**		
Limited Landing Gear Components			
Limited Floats, by make			
Limited Nondestructive inspection, testing and processing			

Limited Emergency Equipment			
Limited Rotor blades, by make and model			
Limited Aircraft fabric work			
Limited: Any other purpose as determined by the Administrator			
Limited specialized service			

Quality System Review

What are the objectives of a quality system?

What are the elements of a basic quality system?

What are the current elements of the quality systems in aviation (air carrier continuous analysis and surveillance, voluntarily-internally implemented, contractual requirements with customers, and the JAA requirements)?

What quality system elements are not addressed under the current regulatory requirements?

What is the safety benefit to be realized?

What are the costs associated with these systems?