



TERMS OF REFERENCE

- Task Nr:** RMT.0252 (MDM.056)
- Issue:** 3
- Date:** 15 December 2011
- Regulatory reference:**
- CS-22, CS-23, CS-25, CS-27, CS-29, CS-31, CS-APU, CS-E, CS-ETSO, CS-P, CS-VLA, CS-VLR, CS-XXX.1529 + appendices, CS-APU 30, CS-E 25 + AMC, CS-P 40
 - Commission Regulation (EC) No 1702/2003; Part-21: 21A.61, -107, -120, -263, -449, and -609
 - Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003; Part-M.A.302, -303, -304, and -401 and Part-145.A.40 and -45
- Reference documents:** FAA Order 8110.54 Instructions for Continued Airworthiness
- Appendices** 1: List of questions associated with ToR MDM.056

<p>1. Subject: Instructions for continued airworthiness</p>
<p>2. Problem/Statement of the issue and justification; reason for regulatory evolution (regulatory tasks):</p> <p>The Instructions for Continued Airworthiness (ICA) have to be produced by design approval holders as part of the product/part certification which, if properly implemented, should ensure that the product/part remains airworthy during its intended life.</p> <p>Regarding ICA, there are many important questions that need to be addressed (see Appendix 1).</p> <p>The answers to these enclosed questions are included in the relevant airworthiness codes (CSs, AMCs) in Part-21, in Part-M and in Part-145. However, experience has shown that there is too much room for interpretation in the current rules and standards, leading to differences and possible safety risks. It appears that different Type Certificate (TC) holders have different interpretations of what a complete set of ICA is and to what level they are required to control the data that constitutes the ICA. The consequence is that parts of this data may not be sufficiently controlled by design approval holders and that maintenance organisations may not have all the necessary data to perform the maintenance in the correct way, which can lead to using unapproved methods, unapproved or wrong parts, or standard practices where not appropriate.</p> <p>In addition, there was a specific request to emphasise and/or clarify the obligation for Supplemental Type Certificate (STC) holders/applicants and repair/change design approval holders/applicants to produce and make available the ICA for the changed/repaired product.</p> <p>A similar request was made to improve/clarify the ICA obligation for ETSO Authorisation holders/applicants.</p>

3. Objective:

Improving the relevant provisions in the Certification Specifications (CSs), Implementing Rules, Commission Regulation (EC) No 1702/2003 and Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003, and AMC and GM in a consistent way in order to establish clear requirements and responsibilities for all parties involved in the production of ICA and other type of maintenance data, their approval and their implementation.

Producing harmonised regulatory material with other regulatory authorities (i.e. FAA, TCCA) in those subjects of common interest.

4. Specific tasks and interface issues (Deliverables):

The specific tasks and interface issues identified in the previous Issue 2 of the ToR were the following:

- Identify all the issues related to ICA not yet addressed in the questions (see Appendix 1 attached).
- Review all the relevant rules/CS/AMC/GM and ongoing main developments such as OSD (task 21.039) and propose improvements where necessary to provide clear answers to the questions enclosed in Appendix 1 and any additional issues identified, based on industry's best practice.
- Clarify the responsibility of repair/change design, STC and ETSO-A holders/applicants to produce and maintain ICA.
- Clarify the responsibility of the DAH (repair/change design, STC and ETSO-A holders/applicants) for ensuring compatibility of "supplemental ICA" with TC holder's ICA.
- Clarify the responsibility for operator/owner/installer for integrating ICA from multiple sources.
- Ensure that a proper feedback loop exists for in-service experience with ICA.
- Ensure that ICA take into account Human Factors such as the identification of "sensitive/critical" maintenance tasks and possible standardisation of job cards.
- Harmonise as far as possible with the relevant FAA and TCCA rules, orders and guidance.
- Assess the impact of any possible rule changes on existing fleets. The case of the orphan aircraft is to be considered.
- Ensure that rules are proportionate depending on type of aircraft and type of operations.
- Assess the impact on the Fees and Charges Regulation.

However, the CMT meeting held in Cologne in December 2010 between EASA, FAA and TCCA showed parallel activities on ICAs within the three authorities.

Consequently, an additional meeting was held in April 2011 between EASA, FAA and TCCA to harmonise the approach and any resulting regulatory material. During this meeting it was concluded that the scope of the task MDM.056 was too large to allow the agreement on a final deliverable and it was agreed to split the task in sub-tasks and to ensure the development of harmonised material for those subjects of common interest.

In addition, it was agreed that the task should not be that focused on ICAs but should cover all kinds of maintenance data.

Based on this new approach, the main issues covered by this ToR can be summarised as follows:

- What information/documents/manuals are considered ICAs and how they are approved by the aviation authorities.
- What happens with the information/documents/manuals which are not considered ICAs. What is the level of approval/acceptance and who is responsible for their content.
- To whom (e.g. operators, maintenance organisation) and when this information (ICAs and non-ICAs) should be made available.
- How this information (ICAs and non-ICAs) is used by operators/maintenance organisations and who can introduce changes.

Furthermore, the following roadmap was agreed:

Phase 1

EASA, FAA and TCCA will work together in order to define the need for sub-tasks, the areas of common interest, priorities and the sequence of each sub-task.

Phase 2

The detailed sub-tasks identified in Phase 1 will be carried out according to specific ToRs to be created for each one of them. Each ToR will identify whether it is a group task or an Agency task. For this purpose, material already developed by the MDM.056 initial group.

5. Working methods (in addition to the applicable Agency's procedures):

For **Phase 1**: Agency.

For **Phase 2**: To be defined in the separate ToRs for each sub-task.

6. Timescale, milestones:

Phase 1 finishing in Q1/2012

Phase 2 starting in Q2/2012. Finish date to be defined in the separate ToRs for each sub-task.