

ORDER

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

8100.11

9/30/2002

**SUBJ: DEVELOPING UNDUE BURDEN AND NO UNDUE BURDEN DECISION PAPERS
UNDER 14 CFR PART 21**

- 1. PURPOSE.** This order contains policy for developing Undue Burden and No Undue Burden Decision Papers to ensure fair and uniform administration of Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) part 21, Certification Procedures for Products and Parts, § 21.43, § 21.137, § 21.303(g), and § 21.601(c). This order provides details on what project types require a decision paper, explains decision paper processing and distribution procedures, and defines the required content for decision papers. The procedures contained in this order are to be used by Aircraft Certification Service aviation safety inspectors (ASI) and aviation safety engineers (ASE).
- 2. DISTRIBUTION.** This order is distributed to all Aircraft Certification Service directorates, all Aircraft Certification Offices (ACO), all Aircraft Certification field offices, all Manufacturing Inspection Offices (MIO), all Manufacturing Inspection District Offices, all Manufacturing Inspection Satellite Offices, all Certificate Management Offices (CMO), all Certificate Management Units, the Aircraft Certification Branch at the FAA Academy, and the Brussels Aircraft Certification Division.
- 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.** Within 30 days of the issuance of this order, FAA managing offices must adopt the practices contained herein related to developing Undue Burden and No Undue Burden Decision Papers. Any decision papers currently being developed may be processed using the existing guidance.
- 4. BACKGROUND.**
 - a.** This order incorporates the following information and documents:
 - (1)** Change in terminology used. Previously issued Undue Burden/No Undue Burden Policy Memorandums historically made reference to the term "priority parts." Use of this term is discontinued with publication of FAA Order 8120.2C, Production Approval and Certificate Management Procedures.
 - (2)** AIR-200 Policy Memorandum (PM) 99-09, Guidance for Developing Undue Burden and No Undue Burden Decision Papers Under 14 CFR Part 21, dated November 19, 1999.
 - (3)** AIR-100/200 Memorandum, Additional Guidance for Determination of Undue Burden, dated May 27, 1999, which provided additional guidance concerning projects involving supplemental type certificates (STC) and foreign-registered aircraft.

(4) AIR-200 Memorandum, Submission of Undue Burden/No Undue Burden Decision Papers to AIR-200 for Concurrence, dated December 1, 2000, which eliminated the requirement to coordinate decision papers with the Production and Airworthiness Division, AIR-200 for projects in those countries with bilateral agreements.

b. The language of 14 CFR part 21, § 21.43, § 21.137, § 21.303(g), and § 21.601(c), states that the Administrator does not issue type certificates (§ 21.43), production approvals (§ 21.137, § 21.303(g)) or Technical Standard Order (TSO) Authorizations (§ 21.601(c)) if the manufacturing facilities are located outside the United States, unless the Administrator finds that the location of the manufacturer's facilities places no undue burden on the FAA. Various ACOs and MIOs have independently interpreted these regulations since their inception. These interpretations have identified a need for a standardized approach to determine what constitutes an undue burden.

c. The FAA has traditionally supported international programs using existing personnel. However, with the increased globalization of manufacturing, the FAA is compelled to evaluate existing as well as new programs that may cause an undue burden for regulatory oversight.

(1) When an initial production approval involving non-U.S. manufacturing facilities is issued by the FAA, the "undue burden or no undue burden" decision is made based upon manufacturing programs at that time. The requirement to prepare a decision paper for an undue burden or no undue burden determination was previously applicable only to non-U.S. suppliers of what were identified as priority parts. However, FAA Order 8120.2C has changed the way supplier oversight is performed. Minimum requirements for supplier control audits and product audits have been established which are now based on the production approval holder's (PAH's) resource targeting group and facility category. Suppliers are now selected for audit based on a random sampling method and criteria that considers whether a supplier may have a significant impact if not properly controlled by the PAH or associate facility. If the production approval holder proposes to use a non-U.S. manufacturing facility, the criteria for supplier selection in Order 8120.2 must be applied to determine whether the supplier would likely be selected for a supplier control audit. If the supplier would not be selected, there is no burden. If the supplier could be selected, the FAA is required to prepare a decision paper in accordance with this order.

(2) Any subsequent changes to an approval holder's manufacturing programs involving non-U.S. facilities will cause the initial undue burden or no undue burden decision to be re-evaluated by the FAA. Any PAH who changes foreign suppliers to include new or different non-U.S. suppliers is subject to the decision paper process prescribed in this order. When a decision paper is currently on file for a PAH, that paper must be reviewed to determine if it is appropriate for the new situation.

d. This order provides general instructions on what to consider during decision paper development. It also contains the general content requirements of decision papers that include a specific list of required decision paper elements in attached appendices.

5. FORMS. This order includes form templates to be used for processing Undue Burden and No Undue Burden Decision Papers. These forms can be provided by AIR-200 in electronic format.

6. DEVIATIONS. Adherence to the procedures in this order is necessary for uniform administration of this directive material. Any deviations from this guidance material must be coordinated and approved by AIR-200. If a deviation becomes necessary, the FAA employee involved should ensure the deviations are substantiated, documented, and concurred with, by the appropriate supervisor. The deviation must be submitted to AIR-200 for review and approval. The limits of federal protection for FAA employees are defined by Title 28 United States Code § 2679.

7. AUTHORITY TO CHANGE THIS ORDER. The issuance, revision, or cancellation of the material in this order is the responsibility of the Aircraft Certification Service, Production and Airworthiness Division, AIR-200. This division will accomplish all required changes to carry out the FAA's responsibility to provide policy relative to Undue Burden and No Undue Burden Decision Papers.

8. PROCEDURES.

a. An undue burden may be found to exist under the following circumstances:

(1) There is a need to transfer resources from international to domestic surveillance due to an increase in domestic program levels, causing a potential undue burden for the international program.

(2) The applicant has not adequately addressed regulatory responsibility for the project (design, manufacturing, quality, or continued airworthiness).

(3) A permanent reduction in authorized ASI staffing levels occurs or other resource reductions preclude international surveillance.

(4) A Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) cannot perform oversight functions on behalf of the FAA.

(5) Civil unrest, or the potential for civil unrest, exists in the applicable country.

(6) Significant safety concerns develop such as failed quality control processes or systems, failed parts, or any other significant areas that could affect safety.

(7) Project is dependent upon the use of co-producers of parts suppliers in non-bilateral countries.

(8) The PAH requests the FAA to permanently appoint designees at a non-U.S. manufacturing facility.

b. If any of the above circumstances are found to create an undue burden, accurate and conclusive justification must be provided to evaluate whether the FAA should support the project.

c. A decision paper is the means to formally document all undue burden or no undue burden determinations. The applicant's ACO in conjunction with the appropriate MIO should prepare the decision paper for type certification and supplemental type certification activities. The PAH's CMO or the applicant's CMO, in conjunction with the appropriate ACO, should prepare the decision paper for production certification and surveillance activities. When both type and production certification

activities are involved, the Directorate manager will assign either the ACO or MIO to lead the development of a single decision paper for the entire scope of the project. The responsible MIO or ACO will ensure that all design and production issues relative to the final decision have been considered. A decision paper should be developed for the following:

(1) Initial grant of design approvals including STCs involving manufacturing facilities outside the United States. Guidance relating to international STCs is available in Order 8110.4, Type Certification.

NOTE: A letter of TSO design approval for an import appliance from bilateral country does not require a decision paper.

(2) Extensions of FAA production approvals; reference Advisory Circular (AC) 21-24, Extending a Production Certificate to a Facility Located in a Bilateral Airworthiness Agreement Country.

(3) New part suppliers in other countries of a type that are selected for a supplier control audit or product audit as identified in FAA Order 8120.2.

(4) Other unique international situations that may arise that would result in FAA certification or surveillance activities. In these situations, communication with the International Airworthiness Program Staff, AIR-4, the Aircraft Engineering Division, AIR-100, and/or AIR-200 is encouraged to ensure current national policy is appropriately considered, and to assist in determining if a decision paper is necessary.

9. WORK ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH DECISION PAPER APPROVALS FOR TYPE CERTIFICATES AND SUPPLEMENTAL TYPE CERTIFICATES.

a. A certain level of activity by the ACO may be permitted to determine if a project is viable prior to final approval of the decision paper. However, under no circumstances should any authorizations be provided to the applicant relative to beginning work. Work that can be performed includes:

(1) Discussing details of the applicant's plans;

(2) Defining the State of Registry and establishing communications;

(3) Obtaining permission from the State of Registry for the modification;

(4) Identifying necessary resources;

(5) Identifying capability to perform the production, type certificate (TC), or STC project based on the general design;

(6) Ensuring the appropriate CAA is prepared to return the test article to service;

(7) Notifying the CAA of the country in which work will be performed of the intent to use designees to perform work in their country; and

(8) Opening up a certification project (for the purpose of tracking time and providing a numbering system for decision papers only).

NOTE: The FAA must obtain concurrence from the CAAs (both bilateral and non-bilateral countries) of the intent to use FAA designees. Concurrence may be assumed if no negative reply is received. Concurrence in the form of a positive response must be obtained from France.

b. Work that must **not** be initiated includes:

- (1) Establishing the certification basis and compliance checklist;
- (2) Issuing requests for conformities;
- (3) Findings of compliance;
- (4) Any manufacturing activity or parts production relative to the TC/STC; and
- (5) Any surveillance or oversight of production or designee activities.

NOTE: In an effort to permit projects to proceed while awaiting decision paper approval, applicants have been asked to sign papers which acknowledge their acceptance of the risk in proceeding with a project that may be denied by the FAA. The FAA has no authority to request such action.

10. MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT REGISTERED OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES AND NON-REGISTERED AIRCRAFT.

a. The FAA has gained considerable knowledge of the procedures involving the modification of aircraft registered outside of the United States. As a result of examining the policy decisions and procedures in this area, TC, amended TC, and STC applications from a U.S. applicant will not be accepted involving foreign-registered aircraft that do not hold the equivalent of a U.S. standard airworthiness certificate under 14 CFR § 21.183, § 21.184, or § 21.185.

b. Application for TC, amended TC, and STC from a U.S. applicant involving foreign military/government aircraft, will be accepted without any further finding when production is limited to the United States and does not involve suppliers in other countries and when the applicant can show that an agency of the U.S. Government (e.g., the State Department, Department of Defense, U.S. Coast Guard, etc.) has made a determination of U.S. national interest.

c. Where no U.S. national interest has been shown for the proposed project, and/or where production may fall outside the United States, a decision paper must be prepared in accordance with this order.

d. For other TC and STC applications that fall within the guidelines of this order, the following must be in place:

(1) The ACO in working with the U.S. applicant must have documentation that the State of Registry will be responsible for airworthiness determinations regarding flight testing, acceptance of the modification, returning the aircraft to service, and acceptance of parts into their country.

(2) The U.S. applicant will be responsible for any additional flight test requirements of the State of Registry.

(3) Designees should have appropriate authority for the project work. Specifically, Designated Airworthiness Representatives (DARs) and Designated Manufacturing Inspection Representatives (DMIRs) are restricted from the following activities:

(a) DARs are not permitted to make airworthiness determinations on foreign-registered aircraft. As an example, DARs cannot make airworthiness determinations of the aircraft in support of flight testing or returning a foreign-registered aircraft to service; however, they would be authorized to perform part and aircraft installation conformities in support of STC type design data.

(b) DMIRs are not permitted to go beyond the scope of their authorized function.

(4) Designated Alteration Stations and Designated Engineering Representatives are subject to limitations and are not permitted to go beyond the scope of their authorized function(s).

NOTE: Without these appropriate guidelines in place a project should not continue.

e. For projects where the appropriate guidelines referenced above are in place, decision papers in accordance with this order are not required if all of the following criteria have been met by the responsible ACO:

(1) When production is involved, all production is within the United States; this does not preclude the fabrication of installation hardware in accordance with STC type design data;

(2) The aircraft to be modified has a valid U.S. type certificate;

(3) The CAA of the State of Registry has been notified and agrees to the modification; and

(4) The CAA where the aircraft is located has been notified and agrees to the use of designees, if required.

f. Additionally, decision papers are not required for Canadian applications within the United States where a Transport Canada Civil Aviation production approval has been issued.

g. All projects not requiring decision papers should include a record to the file ensuring that the above guidelines were met.

h. For projects where the application is beyond the scope of these guidelines, a decision paper will be prepared in accordance with this order.

11. BILATERAL COUNTRY CONSIDERATIONS:

a. In many cases, applicants may anticipate the FAA burden to be mitigated through technical assistance by the counterpart CAA under a Bilateral Airworthiness Agreement (BAA) or Bilateral Aviation Safety Agreement (BASA). However, this support may not be available or advantageous under certain circumstances, and it is critical to consider each case and country individually during the decision paper development process. Preliminary discussions between the CAA and the FAA should be conducted so that the decision paper can indicate if, and to what extent, they will support FAA activities. The following factors should be considered when assessing potential support from another CAA:

(1) Not all authorities have the same level of understanding of FAA requirements nor the same capabilities to support TC/STC or production/airworthiness requirements;

(2) Not all authorities have the same level of resources to support new or expanded U.S. company ventures;

(3) Not all existing bilateral partners have a "components" conformity provision in their agreements with the United States or are active in the same companies that U.S. PAHs use; and

(4) Is a bilateral agreement in effect (confirmation should be obtained from AIR-4).

b. For each BAA/BASA country involved, the decision paper should identify the nature of the activities that the FAA would request of the CAA. It should be noted that unless a country has a current BAA/BASA with the United States, the full burden for support and surveillance remains with the FAA.

12. DECISION PAPER DEVELOPMENT AND PROCESSING.

a. Persons preparing decision papers for TC and STC projects, including projects in Delegated Option Authorization organizations and Designated Alteration Stations, should refer to appendix 1, Decision Paper for TC Products, and appendix 2, Decision Paper for STC Products, for the appropriate template.

b. Persons preparing decision papers for production approval extensions (PAE) or non-U.S. parts suppliers should refer to appendix 3 of this order for the appropriate template.

c. Electronic versions of the appendices were created using *check boxes* and *text fields* to enable on-screen completion. To complete the *Questions* section of the template electronically, use the left mouse button to select the appropriate answer. To complete the *Cost Impact* and *Conclusion* narrative sections electronically, use your mouse to select the text box and enter information applicable to your project. In appendix 3 delete the examples first, then enter the information applicable to your project.

Electronic versions of this order and appendices will be transmitted to all MIO, ACO, and Directorate Managers. Copies may also be obtained from a member of AIR-200 at the phone number listed at the end of this order.

NOTE: Decision Papers are not required to be submitted to AIR-100/200 for review and concurrence for projects located in countries with bilateral agreements. However, these decision papers must still be completed and submitted to the Directorate Manager for approval. Decision papers for work involving projects in non-bilateral countries must be submitted to AIR-100/200 for review and concurrence.

d. For those decision papers that must be submitted to AIR-100/200, early notification and communication with the Manager, Production and Airworthiness Division, AIR-200; the Manager, Aircraft Engineering Division, AIR-100; and the Manager, International Airworthiness Programs Staff, AIR-4, during the decision paper development process will facilitate timely processing. In an effort to expedite decision paper approval, a draft may be forwarded via e-mail to AIR-200 for initial review and comment by AIR-4/100/200 as appropriate.

NOTE: Coordination with the Director, Aircraft Certification Service, AIR-1, and the Deputy Director, Aircraft Certification Service, AIR-2, must take place during unique, complex, or precedent-setting programs, prior to the Directorate Manager's approval. Such programs include fabrication and manufacturing of major sub-assemblies outside the United States. Since these are directorate programs, it is the responsibility of directorate management to brief AIR-1 and or AIR-2 prior to final submittal of the decision paper.

e. The final version of the decision paper shall be electronically forwarded to the Directorate Manager, or in the Directorate Manager's absence, the Assistant Directorate Manager for approval. Approval authority may only be delegated to the Assistant Directorate Manager. Once approved, the directorate shall transmit, via e-mail, the final version of the decision paper to AIR-200 for concurrence (AIR-200 will ensure coordination of the final submittal with AIR-1 and AIR-2 as necessary.) The message shall make the following or similar statement:

"The enclosed decision paper for *(XYZ Aviation)* has been reviewed and approved by *(name)*, Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, ACE-100."

f. AIR-200 will review the document to ensure standardization throughout AIR. Appropriate Headquarters offices (AIR-1/2/4/100) are included in the coordination process when necessary. Copies of all completed decision papers will be retained by AIR-200. Upon completion of the concurrence process, AIR-200 will transmit an e-mail message back to the Directorate MIO or ACO of origin. The message shall contain the following or similar language:

"The decision paper for *(XYZ Aviation)* has been reviewed and concurred with by *(name)*, Manager, Production and Airworthiness Division, AIR-200 (and Manager, Aircraft Engineering Division, AIR-100, as appropriate)."

g. All completed decision papers are considered current until the program terminates or there is a need to amend them. Decision papers need not be completely rewritten in order to incorporate an amendment. However, all amendments should be coordinated with AIR-100 and AIR-200 as appropriate. AIR-200 will ensure the review process is completed within 30 calendar days.

NOTE: Decision papers are internal resource allocation determination documents and are not to be released to the PAH, applicant, or public. Because decision papers are deliberative documents, they may be exempt from release under the Freedom of Information Act.

h. Upon completion, the ACO or MIDO is responsible for notifying the applicant, TC/STC holder or PAH, of the determination of undue burden or no undue burden.

13. INFORMATION CURRENCY. Any deficiencies found, clarifications needed, or improvements to be suggested regarding the content of this order should be forwarded to the Aircraft Certification Service, Automated Systems Branch, AIR-520, Attention: Directives Management Officer, for consideration. FAA Form 1320-19, Directive Feedback Information, is located on the last page of this order for the commentor's convenience. If a response is urgently needed, you may contact AIR-200 using Form 1320-19 as a follow-up to the conversation.

14. RECORDS MANAGEMENT. Refer to Orders 0000.1, 1350.15, and 1350.15, or your Records Management Officer (RMO)/Directives Management Officer (DMO) for guidance regarding retention or disposition.

15. CONCLUSION. The policy contained in this order was developed in coordination with AIR-4 and AIR-100. If there are any questions regarding this order please contact a member of the Evaluations and International Programs Branch, AIR-230, at (202) 267-8361.

/s/

Frank P. Paskiewicz
Manager, Production and Airworthiness
Division, AIR-200

DECISION PAPER FOR TC PROJECTS

PROJECT NUMBER			
APPLICANT NAME			
ADDRESS			
PHONE		FAX	
PROJECT TYPE	AMENDED/TC	OTHER	
APPROVALS HELD			
PRODUCT		MODEL NO.	
PRODUCT LOCATION			
NON-U.S. PARTS SUPPLIER MFG LOCATION			
BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT			

NOTE: The International Airworthiness Programs Staff, AIR-4, should be contacted if assistance is required with questions relative to bilateral agreements and their applicability.

Questions:

	FAA	CAA	Designee
1. Who will approve the design?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Who will perform manufacturing conformity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Who will perform installation conformity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Who will witness required testing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Who will have continued airworthiness oversight responsibility?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Who will make determinations of airworthiness?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	No	N/A
7. Are any non-bilateral countries proposed as parts supplier locations? (If answer is yes, undue burden finding should be made.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Will test witnessing be required outside the United States?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Must other technical cooperation with the CAA(s) be arranged? (If answer is yes, briefly explain in Conclusion Section.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. If proposed, have FAA Designees, been briefed on their potential roles? (If answer is no, briefly explain in Conclusion Section.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DECISION PAPER FOR TC PROJECTS (CONTINUED)

Questions: (If below listed answers are no, briefly explain in Conclusion Section.) Yes No N/A

- 11. If work is to occur in a bilateral country, has the CAA(s) been notified of the use of FAA designees in their country?
- 12. For France and non-bilateral countries, has the CAA(s) indicated that FAA designees will be permitted access in their countries?
- 13. In the event of suspected non-compliance with regulations, has the applicant identified an accountable person?
- 14. Does the directorate have the adequate funds necessary to support this activity?
- 15. If production follows type certificate issuance, does the directorate have funds necessary for production oversight?

Questions: (If below listed answers are yes, briefly explain in Conclusion Section.) Yes No N/A

- 16. Are there any U.S. Department of State prohibitions on official business travel to the out-of-country locations? (Current prohibitions can be obtained by contacting the International Airworthiness Programs Staff, AIR-4, or the FAA Office of International Aviation (AIA) in Washington, D.C.)
- 17. Will this program advance our bilateral relationships?
- 18. Will the PAH participate in training/supporting resource needs of our counterpart CAA(s)?
- 19. Does the CAA(s) require any FAA training?

Cost Impact:

Estimated Travel Costs for Two Persons

Location	Airfare Cost	Lodging Cost	M&IE Cost	Local Travel Cost	Total Cost Estimate for One Engineer and One Inspector
Bury St. Edmunds, U.K. (1st year only)	(\$1,000)	\$1,400	\$840	\$320) x 2 =	\$7,120

DECISION PAPER FOR TC PROJECTS (CONTINUED)

Questions:

Yes No

20. Does this project present complex issues that should be emphasized? (If answer is yes, briefly explain in Conclusion Section.)

21. If project involves a bilateral country, have any functions been delegated to the CAA(s)? (If answer is no, briefly explain in Conclusion Section.)

Conclusion:

DECISION PAPER FOR STC PROJECTS

PROJECT NUMBER			
APPLICANT NAME			
ADDRESS			
PHONE		FAX	
PROJECT TYPE	PAE <input type="checkbox"/>	NON-U.S. PARTS SUPPLIER <input type="checkbox"/>	OTHER
APPROVALS HELD			
PRODUCT MFR		MODEL NO.	
PRODUCT LOCATION		STATE OF REGISTRY AND REGISTRATION NUMBER	
MFG LOCATION			
INSTALLATION LOCATION			
BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT (INCLUDE PRODUCTION QUANTITY)			

NOTE: The International Airworthiness Programs Staff, AIR-4, should be contacted if assistance is required with questions relative to bilateral agreements and their applicability.

Questions:

	FAA	CAA	Designee
1. Who will approve the design?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Who will perform manufacturing conformity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Who will perform installation conformity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Who will witness required testing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Who will have continued airworthiness oversight responsibility?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Who will make determinations of airworthiness on the test article?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Who will be responsible for return to service of the test article?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DECISION PAPER FOR STC PROJECTS (CONTINUED)

<u>Questions:</u>	Yes	No	N/A
8. Are any non-bilateral countries proposed as parts supplier locations? (If answer is yes, undue burden finding should be made.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. If the test article is not U.S.-registered, and flight-testing is necessary in the United States, does the applicant intend to apply for a Special Flight Authorizations? (If answer is no, briefly explain in Conclusion Section.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Must other technical cooperation with the CAA(s) be arranged? (If answer is yes, briefly explain in Conclusion Section.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. If proposed, have Designees been briefed on their potential roles? (If answer is no, briefly explain in Conclusion Section.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Is the project multiple STC?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Is the project one-only STC?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<u>Questions:</u> (If answers are no, briefly explain in Conclusion Section.)	Yes	No	N/A
14. If the U.S. is not the State of Registry has the appropriate CAA been asked to participate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. If the country of registry is the same as country of installation, has the CAA been requested to perform conformity inspections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. If installation is occurring outside the United States, will installation be accomplished in an FAA-approved repair station?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. Has the applicant been informed that the CAA(s) may assess fees for oversight and surveillance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. If work is to occur in a bilateral country, has the CAA(s) been notified of the use of FAA designees in their country?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. For France and non-bilateral countries, has the CAA(s) indicated that FAA designees will be permitted access in their countries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. In the event of suspected non-compliance with regulations, has the applicant identified an accountable person?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. Does the directorate have the adequate funds necessary to support this activity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DECISION PAPER FOR STC PROJECTS (CONTINUED)

- Questions:** (If answers are yes, briefly explain in Conclusion Section.)
- | | Yes | No | N/A |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 22. Are there any U.S. Department of State prohibitions on official business travel to the out-of-country locations? (Current prohibitions can be obtained by contacting the International Airworthiness Programs Staff, AIR-4, or the FAA Office of International Aviation (AIA) in Washington, D.C.) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 23. Will this program advance our bilateral relationships? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 24. Will the PAH participate in training/supporting resource needs of our counterpart CAA(s)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 25. Does the CAA(s) require any FAA training? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Cost Impact:

Estimated Travel Cost for Two Persons

Location	Airfare Cost	Lodging Cost	M&IE Cost	Local Travel Cost	Total Cost Estimate for One Engineer and One Inspector
Bury St. Edmunds, U.K. (1st year only)	(\$1,000	\$1,400	\$840	\$320) x 2 =	\$7,120

- Questions:**
- | | Yes | No |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 26. Does this project present complex issues that should be emphasized? (If answer is yes, explain in conclusion section.) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 27. Does the FAA have continuing regulatory responsibilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 28. Does the CAA(s) have continuing regulatory responsibilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 29. If project involves a bilateral country, have any functions been delegated to the CAA(s)? (If answer is no, briefly explain in Conclusion section at end of decision paper.) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Conclusion:

**DECISION PAPER FOR PAE OR NON-U.S.
PARTS SUPPLIER PROJECT**

PROJECT NUMBER					
APPLICANT NAME					
ADDRESS					
PHONE			FAX		
PROJECT TYPE	TC <input type="checkbox"/>	STC <input type="checkbox"/>	PAE <input type="checkbox"/>	NON-U.S. PARTS SUPPLIER <input type="checkbox"/>	OTHER <input type="checkbox"/>
APPROVALS HELD					
PRODUCT MFR			MODEL NO.		
PARTS INVOLVED					
MFG LOCATION					
BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT (INCLUDE PRODUCTION QUANTITY)					

NOTE: The International Airworthiness Programs Staff, AIR-4, should be contacted if assistance is required with questions relative to bilateral agreements and their applicability.

Questions: (If below listed answers are no, briefly explain in Conclusion Section.)

- | | Yes | No | N/A |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Are parts/assemblies fully inspectable upon receipt? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Has the applicant identified the location at which parts/assemblies will be inspected and conformity or airworthiness determinations will be made? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Does the applicant hold or has the applicant applied for any production approvals? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Has the PAE or non-U.S. Parts Supplier been fully integrated into the PAH's quality control system to ensure regulatory responsibility and compliance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Has the applicant identified a single point of contact for the extension/supplier production program? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. In the event of suspected non-compliance with regulations, has the applicant identified an accountable person? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Has the applicant provided in writing how, and who will conduct evaluation and surveillance of the PAE or non-U.S. Parts Supplier? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**DECISION PAPER FOR PAE OR NON-U.S.
PARTS SUPPLIER PROJECT (CONTINUED)**

<u>Questions:</u>	Yes	No	N/A
8. For non-bilateral country facilities, has the CAA(s) concurred that access will be permitted?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Will the applicant use on-site source inspectors?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Will all necessary documentation be available in English?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Does the project require any special considerations based on the scope and provisions of the Bilateral Agreement? (If answer is yes, briefly explain in Conclusion Section.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Has the applicant been informed that the CAA(s) may assess fees for oversight and surveillance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Are any non-bilateral countries proposed as non-U.S. parts supplier locations? (If answer is yes, undue burden finding should be made.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. If work is to occur in a bilateral country, has the CAA(s) been notified regarding use of FAA Designees in their country? (If answer is no, briefly explain in Conclusion Section.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. For France and non-bilateral countries, has the CAA(s) indicated that FAA designees will be permitted access in their countries? (If answer is no, briefly explain in Conclusion Section.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. If the project involves a bilateral country, will any functions be delegated to the CAA(s)? (Explain what functions will or will not be delegated in Conclusion Section.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. Is the CAA(s) competent to perform the specific duties expected on behalf of the FAA?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. Does the CAA(s) have resources to continually provide surveillance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. Must other technical cooperation with the CAA(s) be arranged? (If answer is yes, briefly explain in Conclusion Section.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. If proposed, have FAA Designees been briefed on their potential roles? (If answer is no, briefly explain in Conclusion Section.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. Does the directorate have the adequate funds necessary to support this activity? (If answer is no, briefly explain in Conclusion Section.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22. Will there be two production lines for this product? (If yes, explain in Conclusion Section what part markings will be used at the non-U.S. location to identify the manufacturing origin of all products and parts.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**DECISION PAPER FOR PAE OR NON-U.S.
PARTS SUPPLIER PROJECT (CONTINUED)**

- | <u>Questions:</u> | Yes | No | N/A |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 23. Are there any U.S. Department of State prohibitions on official business travel to the out-of-country locations? Current prohibitions can be obtained by contacting the International Airworthiness Programs Staff, AIR-4, or the FAA Office of International Aviation (AIA) in Washington, D.C. (If answer is yes, briefly explain in Conclusion Section.) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 24. Will this program advance our bilateral relationships? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 25. Will the PAH participate in training/supporting resource needs of our counterpart CAA(s)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 26. Does the CAA(s) require any training in order to ensure that FAA oversight would be conducted appropriately? (If answer is yes, briefly explain in Conclusion Section.) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Cost Impact:

Estimated Travel Costs for Two Persons

Location	Airfare Cost	Lodging Cost	M&IE Cost	Local Travel Cost	Total Cost Estimate for two Inspectors
Bury St. Edmunds, U.K. 1st year	(\$1,000	\$1,400	\$840	\$320) x 2 =	\$7,120
Bury St. Edmunds, U.K. 3rd year	(\$1,000	\$1,400	\$840	\$320) x 2 =	\$7,120
Bury St. Edmunds, U.K. 5th year	(\$1,000	\$1,500	\$840	\$320) x 2 =	\$7,320
				SUBTOTAL	\$21,560

**DECISION PAPER FOR PAE OR NON-U.S.
PARTS SUPPLIER PROJECT (CONTINUED)**

Question:

Yes No

27. Does this project present complex issues that should be emphasized? (If answer is yes, briefly explain in Conclusion Section.)

28. Does the FAA have continuing regulatory responsibilities?

29. Does the CAA(s) have continuing regulatory responsibilities?

Conclusion:



U.S. Department
of Transportation
**Federal Aviation
Administration**

Directive Feedback Information

Please submit any written comments or recommendations for improving this directive, or suggest new items or subjects to be added to it. Also, if you find an error, please tell us about it.

Subject: Order _____

To: Directive Management Officer, AIR-520

(Please check all appropriate line items)

___ An error (procedural or typographical) has been noted in paragraph _____ on page _____.

___ Recommend paragraph _____ on page _____ be changed as follows:
(attach separate sheet if necessary)

___ In a future change to this directive, please include coverage on the following subject:
(briefly describe what you want added)

___ Other comments:

___ I would like to discuss the above. Please contact me.

Submitted by: _____ Date: _____

FTS Telephone Number: _____ Routing Symbol: _____

FAA Form 1320-19 (8-89)