



THE SUPPLIER

A SUPPLIER OF NEWS AND
INFORMATION

AIR CARRIER SECTION

COORDINATING AGENCY FOR SUPPLIER EVALUATION

VOL. 17 NO. 1 May 31, 2006

SPRING 2006 CONFERENCE

April 30th – May 3rd

AFTER ACTION REPORT:

We had a great conf in MSP at the Holiday Inn Select, Minn. Airport Hotel with 93 in attendance.

The committees were very busy and two (2) committee chairs were elected;

1. **Data-Base Chair—Jim Amick**
2. **Standards & Procedures Chair—Rex Graft**

FALL CONF. ELECTIONS

Four (4) ACS positions are scheduled for election at the Fall 2006 conference as follows;

- ❖ **ACS Chair**
- ❖ **ACS Vice Chair**
- ❖ **Fuel Committee Chair**
- ❖ **ACS Membership & Promotions**

If you are interested in a position, please submit your name for election at any time. If possible prior to the meeting, let a member of the Audit & Compliance Committee know of your intention to run.

FUTURE CONFERENCES

- ✚ Fall 2006 (Oct 22-25) Conference at the Lakeway Resort and Spa, Austin, Texas
- ✚ Spring 07(April 22-26) Conference at the Holiday Inn Select, Memphis Airport, Tenn.

✚ Fall 2007 (Nov 5-8) Conference at the St. Louis Sheraton St. Louis, Missouri

✚ Spring 2008 (April 22-26) Conference at the Miami Sheraton Miami, Florida

TRAINING--SUMMER 2006

by : "Vinny" Martinez, American Eagle Airlines

July 9th - 13th, to be held at the Dolce conference & Resort, Dallas, Texas

REGISTRATION DEAD-LINE-15 June 2006.

Located minutes south of the Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport and nestled among 30 wooded acres, the American Airlines Training & Conference Center is

designed to encourage learning and professional growth without distraction

<http://dolce.mpoint.com/global/search/FacDetail.asp?ID=18541&searchid=100872>

As a reminder from the training committee, please keep in mind that the training sessions are designed for experienced auditors. Also, any auditor(s) showing up late for class(s) [The P&P, pg. 2-3-1, requires ATTENDANCE] or not bringing a current P&P, will not be allowed to test, only "audit" the class(s), and once you sign in for a class, you must complete that same class in order to receive credit. Anyone changing classes and / or instructors without instructor approval, will not receive training credit!

IN THIS ISSUE

	Page
Spring Conference	1
Fall Conf. Elections	1
Future Conferences	1
Training-Summer 2006	1
A&C Committee News	1
CASE Statistics	2
Auditor / Air Carrier Activity	2
Audit & Compliance Alert	2
Side-Bar Discussions :	
✓ Out of Tolerance Action	2
✓ ATOS 101	3
✓ Haz-Mat Training Req.	4
✓ Human Factors Breakdown	4
Data-Base Memo	6
FAA Registry Question	6

A & C COMMITTEE NEWS

by: Andy Monteith, UPS Airlines

During 2005 Spring conference it was announced that the A&C Committee was beginning to work on dividing up the administrative duties between the committees members. The purpose of this action was to distribute the work load and to better serve the ACS. This is especially important when dealing with time sensitive matters. With this having been said, the membership had no

means to know who to contact, except the A & C Chair.

I am happy to report that this project has been completed. At the C.A.S.E. web-site / Air carrier/ Committee/ Audit & compliance:

http://www.caseinc.org/sections/acs/news_carriers_auditcompliance.htm

you'll find an icon saying "Committee Contact by Subject". Primary and Secondary committee member contact information is available to the membership, by subject, for almost every task this committee works. The term "Projected", is found and meant for future contact, after any training or detailed counseling has been completed.

Just so it is fully understood, delegating the administrative duties does not relieve me of the ultimate responsibility for the committee activity. I will continue to be actively involved in the decision making process. This will allow me the time to provide more of an oversight roll and help in other projects to better serve the ACS.

If anyone would have any questions or concerns, please feel free to comment. Thank you.

▼

C.A.S.E. STATISTICS

As reported by the ACS A&C Committee Jan 2006:

⇒	Level III 1A Auditors -	81
⇒	Level IV 1A Evaluators -	8
⇒	Level III 2A Auditors -	21
⇒	Level IV 2A Evaluators -	4
⇒	TOTAL AUDITORS --	114

▼

AUDITOR / AIRCARRIER ACTIVITY

SUSTAINING MEMBERS OPERATING UNDER EXEMPTIONS, ONE (1):

- Independence Air

AUDITOR'S (2) ON THE MOVE :

- Richard McFarlane Miami Air, Moved to USA3000 Airlines
- Howard Dunn Mesaba, Moved to Ross Aviation
- Penney Newell World Airways, No longer auditing
- Byron Cato AStar, left the airline
- Eddie Stockavas Ross Aviation, Left the airline
- Sherwood Smith UPS, No longer auditing
- Johnny Portillo America West, Left carrier
- Glenn DeLaney Spirit Airlines, Left carrier

Since the last issue of The Supplier,

New Level III Auditors – 1A (5)
Benny Smith Gemini Air Cargo
George Pastular Custom Air Cargo
David Medeiros Hawaiian Airlines
Allen Katzenmaier Northwest Airlines
Thomas C. Smith Mesaba

New Level III Auditors – 2A (2)
Terry Hodge Pinnacle
Becky Huff America West

New Level III Auditors – 3A (0)

New Level IV Evaluators – 1A (2)
Robin Forman Ryan
John Bruce Delta

New Level IV Evaluators – 2A (2)
John Bruce Delta
Richard Boucher Sky West

Failed Level III Check-Rides
Initial – Two (2)
Recurrent – Two (2)

▼

AUDIT & COMPLIANCE ALERT -- 21 Feb 2006

by: Audit & Compliance Comm.

Subject: Clarification, P&P, 2-3-1, page 9, paragraph 7.B

ACS P&P Manual 2-3-1, Para. 7.B) requires after July 2005, Level III Auditors and Level IV Evaluators qualified to the 1A Standard must attend and pass with a minimum score of 70%, recurrent training in the C.A.S.E. Policies and Procedures and 1A Standard.

Basis for the clarification:

There appears to be some confusion from some of the members as to when the recurrent training for P&P is due. We believe that some members think that their auditors are current to this policy as long as they get this recurrent training done by July 2008. We believe that the membership, under the direction of the ACS Training Committee, understood that by voting in this policy, they were accepting this change to get all personnel in compliance with this policy as-soon-as-possible.

A review of the training records for several 1A Standard qualified auditors indicates that there are several auditors that have not completed their recurrent training on the Policies and Procedures. To correct this situation, we would expect any 1A Standard authorized auditor, who has not taken and successfully passed recurrent training on the Policies and Procedures within the last 3 years do so not-later-than the first training session of 2007. That gives these auditors 2 chances to get themselves in compliance.

Note:

Keep in mind that the training sessions are designed for experienced auditors. As a reminder, any auditor(s) showing up late for class(s) [The P&P, pg. 2-3-1, requires attendance] or not bringing a current P&P, will not be allowed to test, only to "audit" the class(s).

▼

SIDE BAR DISCUSSIONS

❖ OUT OF TOLERANCE ACTION – Tooling and Test Equipment

by : Krish De, Qantas

The following discussion is intended to raise the awareness and reinforce the procedures as detailed in the Company MOE or RSM/QCM under the heading "Certification Procedures" or equivalent section and

in particular the Result Recording / Defect Recording / Equipment Recording requirements.

Each MRO must have a review process for tooling and facilities to identify all of the processes and issues associated with the current system and to develop and implement a new business model that meets the requirement of the business and of EASA, FAA and other foreign Regulators.

Part of this review has addressed the requirements of various Airworthiness Authorities that an organization properly monitors calibrated tooling and has a process in place to react to an "Out of Tolerance Action" (OTA).

Calibrated tooling/equipment is any item that has to undergo regular periodic checking to ensure calibration is correct. This is not limited to aircraft/component manufacturers supplied special test equipment or equipment made to their specification, it can include commercially available items like VOM meters, tyre pressure gauges or torque wrenches, etc.

When calibrated tooling / equipment is used for a task then the item description and identification number should be recorded on the task card to enable an audit trail to be initiated when necessary.

If a piece of calibrated tooling/equipment is found to be out of calibration/tolerance, it must be considered that all measurements since the last calibration are suspect and the maintenance organization must have in place:

- A process / procedure that will assess the risk and the effect of the OTA.
- An audit process/procedure to determine on what equipment, systems, etc the calibrated tooling/equipment was used in determining the return to service criteria.
- Procedures for any recall, of any maintenance performed, that may be determined necessary for continued airworthiness.
- Documentation to support above.

To enable informed risk assessment and determination of any recall action required, each Maintenance Organization should have tracking capability, either electronically or otherwise, to monitor both calibration and real time recording of identity of calibrated Tool/Equipment to Task accomplishment.

❖ ATOS 101

by: David Schubkegel – Mesaba Airlines

System Safety Integration versus ATOS Compliance Issue: The release of the Version 1.X Data Collection Tools and the transition to ATOS of the first Phase II air carrier, mark the most recent developments in the ongoing evolution of ATOS. These events have prompted some industry representatives to - inquire how they can best prepare their manuals, procedures and internal structures to become "ATOS compliant". While this question is understandable and well mentioned, it reveals that we may have become somewhat disconnected from the original intent and definition of the program. For this reason it is an appropriate time for both agency and industry personnel to revisit the concepts and principles that were integral to the program's original mandate.

Background:

In 1997, the 90-Day Safety Review directed that FAA surveillance employ a dynamic system, capable of retargeting agency resources as necessary in response to areas of identified risk. ATOS was developed in response to this recommendation and provides a process for aviation safety inspectors to assess both regulatory compliance and system design data to identify areas of air carrier risk. The underlying philosophy of ATOS is that, in addition to regulatory compliance, the presence of certain attributes in the design, construction, maintenance, and operation of air carrier systems provides a degree of assurance that those systems are more tolerant of failures and external challenges.

ATOS provides system-based and standardized surveillance planning, data collection, and risk management tools to assist aviation safety inspectors in their oversight of air carriers. Safety Attribute

Inspections (SAIs), which are based on specific regulatory requirements, assess the air carriers' systems using safety attributes (responsibility, authority, procedures, controls, process measures and interfaces). Inspectors use SAIs during initial certifications, as a reference tool for evaluating air carrier program changes, and to conduct periodic audits of the air carrier's systems. Element performance inspections (EPIs) assess the output of an air carrier's system against established performance measures that are based on specific regulatory requirements and safety attributes. Inspectors use EPIs to determine if an air carrier follows their written procedures and controls and performs to the standards described in their manuals. The EPI and SAI, in combination, allow the FAA to evaluate the carrier's ability to identify, analyze, assess and control hazards and risks within the constraints of operational effectiveness, time, and cost.

Discussion:

ATOS is an oversight methodology for use by inspectors, not a set of standards or processes that an operator must comply with. To suggest that an operator must comply with this oversight process is to misconstrue the intent of the system. The term "compliance" as commonly used has referred to regulatory issues. While encouraged, there is no regulatory directive for a carrier to incorporate the underlying concepts of System Safety or to reference the ATOS surveillance tools in any aspect of their operations. Air Carrier certification is based on the regulations and structures specifically outlined in 14 CFR Part 121. After initial certification, regulatory compliance is expected as a minimum standard. Even under ATOS oversight, non-compliance cannot result in enforcement action.

To further illustrate this point, consider this simple analogy. An automobile manufacturer sets out to build the best product they possibly can. It is assumed that, once approved for production, the product

conforms to existing regulatory specification and standards. During the design phase, the manufacturer is free to - incorporate safety and functionality improvements based on past experience and research. In so doing, the manufacturer will probably produce a product that exceeds the minimum regulatory standards.

Once in service, this product is now subject to a recommended 30,000-mile inspection. This inspection is designed to assess and address problems that have developed during the operation of the product. If repairs or adjustments are necessary it does not necessarily imply that the product was faulty at its inception. Nor does it follow that, in all cases, such problems could have been designed out of the product. Conversely, the automobile manufacturer does not design and build a car simply to meet the regimen of the 30,000-mile inspection. Although it can be assumed that a well-designed product will fair better during its lifetime and need less repairs at inspection cycles.

While simplistic, this analogy attempts to make the point that ATOS is a process separate from the design phase of an air carrier operation. While operators are encouraged to incorporate System Safety concepts into their operational structures, the ATOS oversight program and the related assessment tools are not intended to be used as a mandatory checklist for the development of the final product. The audit tools developed for this task are simply that, tools used to assess the risks associated with air carrier operations. These tools were developed using a model of "System Safety" that treats safety as a system wide process, and advises that risk be managed through a continual process of assessment, evaluation, measurement and improvement. These identified risk assessments serve as information used to direct further surveillance. In this way we create a feedback loop of information and improvement.

Conclusion:

FAA does not require that an operator comply with the ATOS process,

although data collection tools that were designed for this process may certainly be utilized to assist the operator in improving operational safety. ATOS supplies valuable information that allows the FAA to target agency resources toward areas of air carrier risk. Air carriers can benefit from this same information to make the internal adjustments necessary to mitigate risks as part of their internal audit or quality assurance functions.

❖ **HAZ- MAT TRAINING REQUIREMENT**

FAA ACTION: Final rule
by: *Glenn Bolton-Lynden Air Cargo*

APPLICABILITY:

This Special Federal Aviation Regulation (SFAR) applies to all U.S. air carriers and commercial operators that are issued a certificate under part 119 of this chapter on or before November 7, 2005 to operate under part 121 or part 135 of this chapter. For purposes of hazardous materials training, these air carriers and commercial operators may comply with the provisions of this SFAR until its expiration. Alternatively, they may comply with the provisions of part 121, subpart Z, or part 135, subpart K, as applicable.

SUMMARY:

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has amended its hazardous materials (hazmat) training requirements in §§ 121.401(a)(1), 121.433a for certain air carriers and commercial operators. In addition, the FAA is requiring that certain repair stations provide documentation showing that persons handling hazmat for transportation have been trained, as required by the Department of Transportation's Hazardous Materials Regulations (HMRs). The FAA is updating its regulations because hazmat transportation and the aviation industry have changed significantly since the FAA promulgated its hazmat regulations over 25 years ago. Also, due to the frequency of undeclared shipments, the FAA believes that a broader training program, which includes hazmat recognition training, must be mandated for all part 121 operators. The rule will set clear hazmat training standards and

ensure uniform compliance with hazmat training requirements.

DATES:

- *Effective Date:* 7 November 05.
- *SFAR Expiry Date:* 7 February 07.
- *Compliance Date:* 7 February 07.

All existing hazmat training provisions have been transferred and moved into Special Federal Aviation Regulation (SFAR) No. 99 to make it easier for certificate holders to identify existing requirements and distinguish them from new requirements. The final rule for 121 hazmat requirements will be listed in subpart Z as §§ 121.1001 through 121.1007.

In this final rule, the FAA also clarifies the portion of the NPRM preamble that discussed when an individual's job function would necessitate training. The certificate holder has the responsibility to determine which employees meet the "function specific" or "assigned" requirements to mandate training.

FAA's experience with repair stations, has concluded that there should be better communication between repair stations and the part 121/135 operators regarding the will-carry or will-not-carry status of the certificate holder. The FAA is therefore clarifying that the repair stations intended to be covered under this rule are the repair stations that perform work for, or on behalf of a part 121 or part 135 operators and are regulated by 49 CFR parts 171 through 180. Specific rules effecting Foreign Locations are found within §§ 121.1005(f) and 135.505(f)

❖ **HUMAN FACTORS BREAKDOWN**

by Rex Graft, Comair

*Summary by Dajuan B. Sevillian
Compliance, Standards, Procedures
Evaluator
Aviation Safety and Security
Department, Frontier Airlines*

Upon accepting an aircraft (Canadair Regional Jet) during a crew change, the pilots noticed that both engines

were low on oil. They proceeded to service the engines from an oil replenishment system within the aft equipment bay of that type of aircraft. After putting two quarts (U.S. quarts) into each engine, the Captain called maintenance control to report that the engine oil tanks still did indicate that they were full. The Maintenance Controller (MC) advised them to dry motor the engine to see if the oil levels then indicated full. The pilots said they would do the dry run but that the oil replenishing tank in the aircraft was empty.

MC called the On-call servicing provider in that city asking them to re-service the replenishing tank. MC then faxed the instructions to the On-call provider. MC only asked the mechanic to re-service the reservoir... not the engines themselves.

The Captain called MC a little later and was concerned about the type of oil that was being added to the reservoir. He also noted, "They're back there with a whole bunch of cans." The controller re-assured the Captain that the correct oil was being used but took no note of the "bunch of cans" comment.

Following is a transcription of the next phone call. This occurred between MC and an On-call Mechanic (OCM) regarding the replenishment. Vital information has been changed or withheld for privacy reasons :

MC : "Maintenance Control, Mike."

OCM : "Hey, this is Ed in Miami."

MC : "Yeah, what's up, Ed."

OCM : "Hey, I'm on aircraft 7777 servicing the oil."

MC : "Uh huh..."

OCM : "I think these motors are bone dry... I did the... I'm servicing the #2 right now"

MC : "Uh huh..."

OCM : "I did the self test on the servicing panel..."

MC : "Right..."

OCM : "...three times to make sure it's working. I've got thirty-one quarts in number two already."

MC : "How many?!"

OCM : "Thirty-one."

MC : "You pumped thirty-one quarts into an engine?"

OCM : "Yup."

MC : "That's not possible. It won't hold that much. Our oil replenishment system can't be working correctly."

OCM : "Where's the oil going?"

MC : "It's not actually pumping is it? I mean, you're actually, you're saying you're pumping and it's actually going out of the reservoir?"

OCM : "Oh, yeah, it's going somewhere."

MC : "So, which engine did you say you pumped thirty-one quarts into?"

OCM : "Two."

MC : "Alright, let's go ahead and open up that number two engine cowling and actually look in the tank itself. It's looking like we over serviced it, man... they only hold six quarts."

OCM : "The engine, how big is the engine tank?"

MC : "Six quarts".

OCM : "You're kidding me."

MC : "No. That's why it's not possible to pump thirty-one quarts into it."

OCM : "Well, something's screwed up here... where, where would this oil be going then?"

MC : "You're putting the oil into the, ah, oil replenishment tank in the back, right? The little..."

OCM : "Yep."

MC : "The little yellow tank."

OCM : "Yep."

MC : "And there's a mechanism on the side there... a little dial and you can turn and it pumps the oil into the engine."

OCM : "Yep."

MC : "And you're saying it's... you've... it holds... what's that hold? Eight quarts? Seven, eight quarts?"

OCM : "No, that...that holds six."

MC : "That holds six and you've filled it up five times and pumped it dry each, five times now?"

OCM : "Yep." (pause) "How many gallons is the tank on the engine?"

MC : "We're going to have to take a look at that engine... the engine that you pumped that oil in, and see what's going on."

OCM : "How many gallons does that, the tank on the engine itself?"

MC : "It doesn't hold gallons, I think it holds six quarts."

OCM : "You're kidding me!"

MC : "No. You'll see when you get up there. It's real small.

OCM : "What the %*!&! Alright."

MC : "Okay?"

OCM : "Alright."

MC : "Alright, we'll talk to you in a little bit."

OCM : "Bye."

The Physical Evidence (Hardware)

There is a probe in the engine's oil tank which senses when the tank is full and a signal conditioner which relays this information to the replenishment and warning systems. In this case, the probe was not working properly which gave a false low quantity reading as well as rendering the automatic replenishing shut-off system inoperative.

A count of the cans showed that the mechanic used twenty-seven quarts in addition to the two added by the pilots (just over seven gallons).

Following this conversation, an inspection of the engine showed that the oil was actually flowing out of the engine tank and pooling in the gear box, around the turbine blades, in the compressor chamber, and in the tailpipe. As this would cause too great an imbalance to allow the engine to start, and there is no way to drain the oil, a replacement engine had to be delivered to the outstation for an engine change.

The Breakdowns (Software)

The OCM didn't follow the Controller's instructions to service only the reservoir nor did he follow the written servicing instructions sent via fax. Being used to working larger aircraft, the OCM neglected to regard the Regional Jet with the same amount of respect. Once the OCM had begun servicing the engine, had he followed the Maintenance Manual instructions he could have 1) noted that the Oil capacity is 12.8 quarts (6.8 on the engine, 6.0 quarts in the replenishment tank); 2) seen in a NOTE that servicing is not to exceed two quarts at a time; 3) seen in a CAUTION that over servicing can cause damage to the engine; 4) seen in a NOTE that no more than 6.8 quarts are to be added; 5) read in the servicing procedure that if the tank is

not full after two quarts are added, a dry motoring procedure is called for; 6) read in the dry motoring procedure that, after 6 quarts are added, the Fault Isolation Manual is to be consulted.

MC did not make it clear to the OCM that only the reservoir was to be filled. MC also failed to take note of the pilot's comments regarding the "bunch" of oil cans.

The pilots also failed to notice that the quantity of cans was abnormally high.

Conclusion

Know the aircraft you're working on. Follow the written instructions as well as the verbal instructions of the persons in charge (as long as those verbal instructions don't contradict the written instructions). Listen to everything being reported by those in the field... not just their main points. When in doubt... ask for clarification.

Summary

"Considering the various circumstances of this incident, and all of the active and latent failures that were revealed, it seems very practical to understand the basis of human factors and how it relates to this particular incident. Moreover, understanding the essence of communication, familiarization, and

situational awareness could have prevented the incident. However, the mere understanding of these concepts is generally not enough. Real-time training and measuring the performance of individuals is paramount and could have also prevented these occurrences. Lastly, Maintenance Human Factors Training can encompass awareness training such as Maintenance Resource Management (MRM) which includes communication skills, team building, decision-making and situational awareness to help prevent the occurrences of human performance-based errors in maintenance and flight operations considerably."

DATA-BASE MEMO

When completing any transmittal, be aware that the "A449" radio buttons on the transmittals are defaulted to the "YES" position. We are still seeing transmittals submitted for foreign repair stations and fuel vendors with the buttons checked "Yes". To prevent this obvious error, please verify the selection before submitting your transmittal.

FAA Registry Question ?

by: *David Schubkegel - Mesaba Airlines*

Q. Will the FAA Online Interactive Airmen Inquiry information state or

show if a certificated A&P mechanic or pilot has a suspended or revoked airmen certificate?

A. No, the interactive airman inquiry does not show that information. You must request this information directly from this office via a signed and dated fax request on Company letter-head stationary. The request must indicate the person's complete name and FAA certificate number. A letter will usually be mailed back to the Company within 4-6 weeks.

Regards,

Airmen Certification Branch
fax no. 405-954-4655

Airmen@Registry.jccbi.gov

NEWSLETTER

CONTRIBUTORS

Editor-in-Chief: George Worley,
American Airlines

Editor: Glenn Bolton, Lynden Air
Cargo

Contributing Editors :

Krish De, Qantas

David Schubkegel - Mesaba
Airlines

Andy Monteith, UPS Airlines

Rex Graft, Comair

THE SUPPLIER

Volume 17, No. 2

A SUPPLIER OF NEWS AND INFORMATION

AIR CARRIER SECTION

If you would like to contribute articles, pictures, web-sites, or have topics you would like to see included in future issues of The Supplier, please contact Glenn Bolton, ACS Newsletter Committee Chairman, via e-mail, at, gbolt@lac.lynden.com