

Clearance Record
DOCUMENT COMMENT LOG

Originating Office: AIR-110	Document Description: Order 8100.15B – Organization Designation Authorization Procedures	Lead Reviewer:	Reviewing Office:	Suspense Date: 5/25//2012
---------------------------------------	---	-----------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

FAA Action Regarding Proposed "Applicant Showings" Procedures

The FAA has removed the proposed language in Paragraph 3-23 regarding compliance determinations without Unit Member involvement, which will be addressed in future revision to the Order. This is not meant to imply that all compliance activity requires UM involvement , just that the FAA is not ready to issue standardized policy on how to manage that activity at this time..

Until we do, ODA holders should work with their respective OMTs to identify compliance showing areas where compliance findings can be made with lesser ODA unit member involvement. For example, engineering unit members could approve data that was generated from tests that didn't have UM conformity inspection or UM test witness. Another example would be generating compliance data by qualified organizations, such as foreign Design or Production Organization Approval holders negating the need for UM conformity or test witnessing.

The implementation of any such procedures is at the discretion of the managing OMT based on the ODA holder's experience, past performance, and established procedures.

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
<i>Airbus</i>	n/a	n/a	As required by EASA Part 21, Airbus, as DOA holder, shall show the satisfactory integration of its Partners/subcontractors within its Design Assurance System. In the event that a Partner/Sub-contractor holds a DOA (GM to 21A.239(c)2), Airbus may take this into account in demonstrating the effectiveness of this integrated system. It would be of added value for European TC/STC holders to make ODA acknowledged by EASA through an update of the TIP. This will allow European TC/STC holders to rely on ODA for showing compliance with EU Part 21.239(c) for the monitoring of their US suppliers.	No changes proposed to the 8110.15. This is at the discretion of the FAA to promote the ODA awareness and recognition by EASA.	The decision to provide any allowances based on FAA ODA authorization is made by each foreign authority, and can not be mandated by the FAA. The FAA continues to work with all foreign authorities to educate them on the role of ODA within the FAA's certification system. No change has been introduced based on this comment.

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
Cessna	Multiple	Multiple	"We" has been deleted and replaced with "FAA" on the cover page and in the sections that have been revised for Rev B.	Cessna recommends changing the remaining instances of "we" to "FAA" for consistency.	The FAA agrees with this suggestion. We have removed the term "we" throughout the document and replaced with appropriate language.
Cessna	All	All	This revision is a good step forward in the maturing of the ODA. It is easier to identify and understand the changes in this revision. Thank you.	Not applicable.	No change has been introduced based on this comment.
Mr. Larry VanDyke	1-1	1-4a	The proposed revision provides for allowing increased flexibility of the OMT to accept procedures that deviate from the procedures defined in the various Orders referenced in 8100.15. However, I would like to request FAA to consider further expansion of the guidance to allow an ODA to propose following a significantly different process than defined in the Orders if that process is shown to produce the same end result and it meets the regulatory requirements of Parts 21 and 183 Subpart D. This would allow the applicant the freedom to produce the results required by 14 CFR 21 and 183, Subpart D, using procedures or processes they may develop. With the current computer capability, significant improvements in the process can be achieved and provide the same, or better, end results with less effort and time. These processes can also be more robust and transparent than most of the procedures defined in the current Orders and certainly more efficient for both the applicant and the FAA. Most of the procedures described in the Orders are based on a paper based system that requires a		<p>The FAA recognizes that alternative approaches from those described in referenced FAA procedures might be more efficient for both the ODA holder and their managing office.</p> <p>However, a foundational part of the ODA procedure requirements are that those procedures be based on the underlying FAA procedures.</p> <p>If an ODA holder wishes to deviate significantly from established FAA procedures, it may propose to do so through request to its managing office. The FAA prefers, however, that approval of any such procedural differences be documented and coordinated with the appropriate headquarters office through the deviation process.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
			<p>significant amount of redundant data that is not required in a modern data base approach. The paper based system relies on hard or PDF copies of documents that must be manually created, transmitted, and filed that adds non-value added time and cost to achieve the regulation required results. Please consider re-writing this requirement to remove the requirement that specific procedures identified in FAA Orders, or with minimal adaptations, must be followed unless those procedural requirements are identified in Part 21 or 183 Subpart D. Replace it with a requirement that the ODA holder must provide the data and documentation as required by Part 21 or 183 Subpart D using procedures acceptable to the FAA. This would encourage creation of improved processes and procedures that could help both the applicant and the FAA reduce the costs and time to conduct compliance activities and at the same time improve robustness of the processes. The improved processes could provide the FAA with real time access to the data and make FAA oversight of the applicant much easier.</p>		
Mr. Larry VanDyke	1-1	1-4b	<p>The last sentence in paragraph 3-13a appears to provide significant discretion to the OMT to review ODA unit member appointment decisions with no guidance on when they should or should not do this or under what conditions. This appears to provide an OMT with the opportunity to essentially require all unit member appointments to be reviewed by the OMT for as long as they desire, thus essentially bypassing the 2 year limitation on OMT review of the ODA unit member selection process.</p>		<p>As referenced, paragraph 3-13d describes those conditions which warrant OMT review of selection decisions after 2 years. As provided in section 3-13d, the OMT should not review selection decisions unless there are documented problems with the ODA holder's selection process or the ODA holder has not selected enough UMs to substantiate the performance of its process.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
					on this comment.
Mr. Larry VanDyke	1-1	1-4d	I fully support the use of the procedures in FAA Order 8110.115 for project notification. However, paragraph 8-6c(2)(a) leaves a lot of questions about what kind of projects may, or may not, require a CPN. As written, it is possible for one ODA to have to provide a CPN on a project that another ODA would not have to. Plus the criteria for a CPN could be different between directorates. Will the criteria change when the person in charge at the directorate changes? For ODAs with both part 23 and part 25 aircraft this requires that they coordinate with both directorates and the requirements might be different for the different directorates. This would seem to create a lot of confusion for the ODAs and even for the directorates. How are the directorates going to keep track of what kinds of projects the different ODAs have to submit a CPN on? How will they review or analyze the data for trends, work load, or any other thing without a consistent means of identifying what requires a CPN or what doesn't.		The requirements for CPNs are established by Order 8110.4 and Order 8110.115. It is not the intent of Order 8100.15 to define the types of projects which require CPNs, which is already established as a requirement for any major change in type design. This order does provide for an allowance at the directorate's discretion that CPNs might not be required for some ODA projects, but it is not meant to restrict or define for the directorates when CPNs might or might not be required. No change has been introduced based on this comment.
Mr. Larry VanDyke	1-1	1-4e	I agree that these types of changes need to be expedited. But as written this can still be allowed to drag out to several months. When it is obvious that a manual change needs to be made to comply with the regulations, the holder should not be held in limbo for months waiting for approval of these changes. Otherwise it puts the holder in the position of		The FAA recognizes the commenter's concern and is taking steps to expedite the approval of procedures manual revisions. However, we do not agree with establishing artificial time-frames for the review of procedures manual revisions. The FAA managing offices have to prioritize this work along with

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
			<p>either complying with the regulation and violating the manual or complying with the manual and violating the regulation. It would seem appropriate to set a maximum of 30 days to approve these types of changes. If it goes beyond 30 days then the OMT Lead should have to provide a justification to the ODA holder at the end of thirty days and the ODA holder should not be liable for any FAA findings of non-compliance between the time the requested change is submitted and the change is approved and provided to the ODA holder.</p>		<p>other FAA workload, and are committed to responding to ODA manual revisions in a timely manner.</p> <p>ODA holders will not be evaluated negatively if their OMT are not able to approve the manual revisions within a timely manner.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>
Mr. Larry VanDyke	1-1	1-4h	<p>Does this mean that unit members who are not also DERS will be assigned designee numbers and tracked in the DIN system? Or will they be tracked under the ODA number? What else will be added to their files in the DIN system? Can the ODA Lead administrator view what has been entered in the DIN system or will he be given the information for someone who has been entered in the system who has applied for a UM position under that ODA Lead administrator? Where is this procedure defined for this change?</p>		<p>The corresponding paragraphs of the Order require that the FAA tracks unit members that are removed for misconduct within the DIN system. The records included in the DIN will document the ODA unit member, the ODA holder, the reason for and evidence of removal based on misconduct, and the functions the individual was authorized to perform.</p> <p>ODA administrators and personnel do not have access to the DIN information, but will be informed if the FAA is aware of any individual is unsuitable for ODA unit appointment as required in paragraph 3-13a.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
Mr. Larry VanDyke	1-2	1-4k	<p>Agree with 3-23. One question though. Does the certifying statement on Form 8100-11 represent a certification statement provided by the applicant as required by 21.20 or is an FAA project closure document? If it is an FAA project closure document is the applicant required to submit a separate certifying statement to the ODA administrator in accordance with 21.20 that they have complied with all the requirements and then the ODA administrator or ODA unit member can use that certifying statement to complete the 8100-11? The 8100-11 form instructions show either an ODA administrator or ODA unit member as acceptable approvers. Thus I assume they are doing this on behalf of the FAA since the ODA administrator and unit members are representatives of the FAA. Can the ODA administrator or a unit member sign on behalf of the applicant when as administrators or unit members they are acting on behalf of the FAA, or are they signing strictly as representatives of the applicant when signing the form? If they are signing as representatives of the applicant then why is the person signing limited to an ODA administrator or ODA unit member? Does the 8100-11 then become a legal document because of the certifying statement thus making the person who signed the document legally responsible for ensuring compliance? Some companies have internal rules for who can sign a legal document and it is frequently an officer of the company. Whoever signs this will stand a good chance of being deposed in legal proceedings if there is any question about the certification. I would recommend this</p>		<p>The certifying statement documented on FAA Form 8100-11 is separate and distinct from the applicant's certifying statement required by 14 CFR 21.20.</p> <p>FAA Form 8100-11 certifies that all of required FAA approvals/findings and substantiation data/requirements are complete and accounted for. As such, it is similar to the applicant's 21.20 statement, but is completed on behalf of the FAA, not the applicant. As an "FAA" responsibility, one of the procedural steps required for completion of the Form 8100-11 is to verify that any required applicant certifying statement has been completed.</p> <p>The appropriate person to sign an applicant certifying statement is the individual identified by the applicant as responsible for compliance. In most cases, this would not be the ODA administrator, but the individual who signs the TC/STC/PMA application.</p> <p>In most ODA organizations, there is a separation of roles clearly identified or inherent in the ODA organizational structure. It would only be appropriate for the ODA administrator to sign an applicant statement for small ODA holders which do not have separate personnel fulfilling the applicant/ODA unit roles.</p> <p>FAA Form 8100-11 is a legal document to the extent that it is a</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
			proposal be given additional consideration prior to finalizing the instructions.		<p>required certification document for ODA approvals, and the ODA holder could be subject to enforcement actions under 14 CFR 21.2 for fraudulent or intentionally false statements.</p> <p>However, as resolved by previous FAA Tort cases, including the U.S. Supreme Court "Varig" case (United States v. Varig Airlines, 467 U.S. 797 (1984)) any legal liability for "compliance" rests with the applicant, and not with the FAA.</p> <p>When the applicant is an organization, the individual authorized to sign the applicant's certifying statement does so on behalf of the applicant. As such the organization, not the individual signing the statement, is liable for both compliance and any fraudulent or false statements.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>
Mr. Larry VanDyke	1-2	1-4m	Does this mean that capturing the information and permanently storing it electronically is not acceptable? This seems to not be in agreement with the guidance in FAA Order 8000.79. With current electronic data capabilities it is possible to capture the data electronically and print out reports or forms at any time later. Requiring the data to be printed out onto paper forms for distribution or submittal to the FAA adds to the time and cost of maintaining this data and is not necessary in today's electronic		<p>The commenter's comments and questions appear to address the electronic storage of ODA records required to be retained by 14 CFR 183.61 and Order 8100.15. The commenter is correct that these records may be retained under the guidance of 8000.79 as approved in each ODA procedures manual.</p> <p>The language introduced in this change regarding electronic storage of</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
			<p>environment. This should be reconsidered in view of the costs that this adds to the process with no visible benefit. Recommend that companies be given the option to use permanent electronic data storage methods to store the data and to only print out forms or reports as needed. This would require an electronic data process agreement be created and signed by both the FAA and the applicant in accordance with FAA Order 8000.79 but we should not be forced to stay with paper only data retention processes that are not efficient and add time and cost to the process.</p>		<p>records only applies to inspection discrepancy records retained by the FAA. There is no impact on existing ODA holder record retention requirements.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>
Mr. Larry VanDyke	1-2	1-4n	<p>Agree. The only thing I see missing is a requirement for when the FAA has to respond to the applicants input. The applicant should be provided a response in a timely manner. Without some kind of deadline for a response from the FAA this can end up dragging out and leaving the applicant out on a limb on their plans and schedules. Perhaps any requests that are not answered by the time the project notification is answered are put on an issues tracking list that must be coordinated with between the OMT Lead and the ODA Lead administrator, with the issue being elevated in accordance with the issue resolution process in the ODA manual.</p>		<p>The FAA agrees with the commenter's concern and is taking steps to expedite the review of program notification submittals. However, we do not agree with establishing any specific time-frames for the review of program notifications for TC ODA holders. The FAA managing offices have to prioritize this work along with other FAA workload, and are committed to responding in a timely manner.</p> <p>ODA holders should ensure that their PNL submittals contain sufficient information to allow efficient FAA review. ODA holders should also work in conjunction with their OMTs to ensure that the OMT is aware of the ODA holder's project priorities.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
Mr. Larry VanDyke	1-3	1-4y	Does Type of Project in Figure 11 agree with Project Type in Table 1 of 8110.115? Some consideration needs to be made to get 8110.4, 8110.115, and 8100.15 aligned the same definitions and requirements to eliminate confusion.		<p>The use of project types in Order 8110.115 is to identify project codes for use within the certification project notification system, which are not required for FAA Form 8100-11.</p> <p>The description of project type on FAA Form 8100-11 is to document the type of approval, and it is evident what is appropriate for each project type. If there is any question on the use of FAA Form 8100-11, it should be clarified in the ODA procedures manual.</p> <p>The FAA sees no benefit in trying to align the project types in 8110-115 with the FAA Form 8100-11.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>
Bell Helicopter	1-3	1-4(y)	There is no appendix 1 in this order	Change to Appendix A	Concur. Revised as suggested.
American Airlines	1-3	1-5	Procedure requires compliance within 150 days after publication. The requirement "must be addressed in ODA procedures manuals" is not clear. Does that mean published revision, or revision submitted to the OMT for approval?	"ODA manual revision must be submitted to the OMT within 150 days after publication"	Revised to require that manuals are submitted by 140 days after publication (or as required by the OMT). Manuals must be approved by 230 days after publication.

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
Cessna	1-3	1-5.	Cessna respectfully disagrees with this wording. The ODA cannot control when the OMT will provide approval or comments, nor can the OMT approve comments in 150 days if the ODA does not provide them within a reasonable period.	Suggest similar language as in 8100.15A, which provides a deadline for submittal of the revisions to the OMT and then provide a method for use of temporary changes to meet rules, guidance or policy in 5-3 (Reference comment to 5-3.a.(2)(a)).	<p>We have introduced requirements for both the submittal of procedures manual revisions (140 days after publication) and FAA review/approval (230 days after publication).</p> <p>ODA holders will not be evaluated negatively if their OMT are not able to approve the manual revisions within a timely manner.</p> <p>The FAA does not agree that manual revision may be incorporated based on lack of response by the OMT. Each manual revision that justifies FAA response must be specifically approved by the FAA.</p>
US Airways		2.4 Figure 2.1	To eliminate confusion concerning the function codes (all numeric), please place the letter identifier following the function code in parenthesis to distinguish it as not being part of the function code:	Function code 11010 (E) (preferred) vs. 11010 E (not preferred)	Concur, revised as suggested.
Bell Helicopter	3-7	3-9(a)(4)	We welcome the clarification on communication among UMs, administrators and OMT	None	No change has been introduced based on this comment.
Boeing Commercial Airplanes	3-8	3-9.a.(2)(4)(f)	ODA Procedures Manuals should be a high level of requirements. ODA internal policies and procedures should have all the details necessary to meet the high level requirements as listed in the Procedures Manuals. The Boeing ODA Procedures Manual directs ODA Unit Members to go to an internal Boeing procedure that describes in detail the certification plan content.	Boeing recommends changing this title to: “(f) Minimum Requirements for Certification Plan Content.”	The FAA does not agree with this suggestion. The intent of the procedures manual in this regard is to define what content will be in certification plans that are developed for ODA certification projects. While this must include the minimum amount of information required in Order 8100.15, additional content might be

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
			<p>The title of the Appendix shown as paragraph (f) is: “(f) Content of certification plans.”</p>		<p>required based on the ODA holder's internal practices, or based on OMT-mandated requirements for that ODA holder. In either case, the manual must define the content required by directly stating the requirements and referencing additional processes as appropriate.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>
Boeing Commercial Airplanes	3-9 C-4	3-10a Condition 1-7	<p>Paragraph 3-10.a. states: “a. ODA Holder-Provided Training <i>(1) The ODA holder's processes, and its procedures manual.</i> <i>...</i>” Appendix C states: “(Statement of Condition) 1-7 - Does the ODA holder provide in-house training to its ODA unit members? . . . <i>- Review of documentation and forms used by the organization.</i></p> <p>The rationale for our suggested changes is to make the Statement of Condition 1-7 consistent with Paragraph 3-10 on training.</p>	<p>Boeing suggests making one of the following revisions to the text: “a. ODA Holder-Provided Training <i>(1) The ODA holder's processes, and its procedures manual, including documentation and forms.” or “(Statement of Condition) 1-7 - Does the ODA holder provide in-house training to its ODA unit members? . . . <i>- Review of documentation and forms used by the organization.</i> ===”</i></p>	<p>The FAA agrees with this suggestion and has incorporated the suggested change in paragraph 3-10a(1): <i>(1) The ODA holder's processes, and its procedures manual, including documentation and forms.</i></p>
Bell Helicopter	3-12	Figure 3-1	<p>Removing the requirement that OMT review ODA appointment of existing designees after appointment is appreciated</p>	None	<p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
L-3 Avionics Systems	3-15	3-16e	Manufacturing Unit Member Training Status Report. The ODA holder must submit a quarterly report of the status of its inspection unit members FAA seminar attendance to the OMT. The report will list the inspection unit members, along with their authorized function codes, the date of last FAA training and, if applicable, their next scheduled FAA training date.	<p>Quarterly reporting is too frequent as our UMs are required to attend FAA training only once every three years.</p> <p>This reporting is also redundant since we report our UM's training status each year to the OMT Lead as a required part of the ODA self audit. This information is also recorded annually on the ODA Supervision Record for each UM.</p>	<p>This is presently the only way for FAA Manufacturing to maintain a timely and accurate account of the numbers and trained status of Manufacturing unit members.</p> <p>Since there is no mandatory format for this reporting, a simple "no change in status since last report" may be acceptable to an OMT.</p>
American Airlines	3-15	e.	AAL ODA PM requires Mfg UMs to attend applicable FAA seminars every 3 years. We also have a process whereby monthly a staff ass't checks personnel UM files for UMs that are due training within the next 6 months (and sends reminders). Lastly, each year during UM evaluations, the Lead ODA Administrator verifies compliance with FAA training. For ODAs that have good processes/controls in place (and history of compliance), why require a quarterly report?	<p>Don't mandate this for all ODAs. Rather leave this to the discretion of the OMT Lead if they want a report</p>	<p>This is presently the only way for FAA Manufacturing to maintain a timely and accurate account of the numbers and trained status of Manufacturing unit members.</p> <p>Since there is no mandatory format for this reporting, a simple "no change in status since last report" may be acceptable to an OMT.</p>
RAM Aircraft	3-15	3-16.e	UM Training Status Report	<p>UM training status is already required to be tracked and is an auditable item when FAA-OMT conducts facility visits. (reference sec. 5-4.e of this Order). Adding this requirement is redundant and overly burdensome. No value added.</p>	<p>This is presently the only way for FAA Manufacturing to maintain a timely and accurate account of the numbers and trained status of Manufacturing unit members.</p> <p>Since there is no mandatory format for this reporting, a simple "no change in status since last report" may be acceptable to an OMT.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
Garmin	3-15	3-16.e.	<p>This new paragraph requires the ODA to submit a quarterly report of the status of all manufacturing UMs.</p> <p>The ODA is responsible for maintaining all UMs in compliance with the training requirements of the Order. It is unclear what is gained by singling out inspection UMs for increased OMT visibility. The ODAs should continue to be held accountable for ensuring that their UMs are trained within the required timeframes. There does not seem to be any additional benefit from having yet another submittal to the OMT. This is a step backwards from managing an organization that is responsible for its members. It creates additional workload for little benefit.</p>	Delete this requirement and allow the ODAs to be responsible for the status of training.	<p>This is presently the only way for FAA Manufacturing to maintain a timely and accurate account of the numbers and trained status of Manufacturing unit members.</p> <p>Since there is no mandatory format for this reporting, a simple “no change in status since last report” may be acceptable to an OMT.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>
Cessna	3-15	3-16.e.	Cessna does not understand the rationale for this requirement. The ODA already tracks this information based on existing FAA Order and ODA Procedures Manual training requirements.	Delete requirement.	<p>The FAA does not agree. This is presently the only way for FAA Manufacturing to maintain a timely and accurate account of the numbers and trained status of Manufacturing unit members.</p> <p>Since there is no mandatory format for this reporting, a simple “no change in status since last report” may be acceptable to an OMT.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>
Bell Helicopter	3-15	3-16(e)	Manufacturing Unit Member Training Status Report--Why are Manufacturing UMs being singled out for this new requirement? Annual reviews, annual ODA Self-Audit, annual OMT supervision, and biennial FAA DOIP already require review of training records. There is no value added with this extra administrative requirement	Remove this requirement	<p>The FAA does not agree with this suggestion. This is presently the only way for FAA Manufacturing to maintain a timely and accurate account of the numbers and trained status of Manufacturing unit members.</p> <p>Since there is no mandatory format for this reporting, a simple “no change in status since last report” may be</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
					<p>acceptable to an OMT.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>
Pratt & Whitney	3-15 and 3-16	3-16 e.	<p>The proposed Order states: <u>Manufacturing Unit Member Training Status Report</u>. The ODA Holder must submit a quarterly report of the status of its inspection unit members FAA seminar attendance to the OMT. The report will list the inspection unit members, along with their authorized function codes, the date of last FAA training and, if applicable, their next scheduled FAA training date.</p>	<p>Remove this requirement or extend it to all unit members, not just inspection unit members.</p> <p>NOTE: The reason for this revision is unknown other than changes to training requirements made by the FAA necessitated additional classes being added to the schedule in order to appoint ODA unit members who needed to complete Part 2 before being appointed. Also, there seemed to be miscommunication and differences of opinion between the FAA Administrative Office and ODA Holders regarding training requirements, e.g., 3 years vs. 36 months, etc. FAA also said they lost their flexibility to continue to carry a designee if they could not attend training for extenuating circumstances which forced many suspensions where there was long term illness, etc.</p>	<p>The FAA does not agree with this suggestion. This is presently the only way for FAA Manufacturing to maintain a timely and accurate account of the numbers and trained status of Manufacturing unit members.</p> <p>Since there is no mandatory format for this reporting, a simple “no change in status since last report” may be acceptable to an OMT.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>
Gulfstream Aircraft		3-16e	<p>The quarterly report of the status of the ODA holder’s inspection unit members FAA seminar attendance should already be readily available to the FAA. Gulfstream requests an explanation why the ODA holder is being given the responsibility to submit the report. If the report is required would it be possible to be included on the IAR</p>		<p>This is presently the only way for FAA Manufacturing to maintain a timely and accurate account of the numbers and trained status of Manufacturing unit members.</p> <p>Since there is no mandatory format for this reporting, a simple “no change in status since last report” may be</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
			Information spreadsheet?		<p>acceptable to an OMT.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment</p>
Boeing Commercial Airplanes	3-17	3-18c.(5) Note	<p>The proposed text states: Note: <i>Potentially unsafe conditions require 24 hour notification. All others require 72 hour notification. A notification due on Saturday, Sunday, or holiday may be delivered on the next working day.</i></p> <p>The subject note for FAA notification originally applied to notifications due in 24 hours and provides accommodation for 24-hour-notifications due on a Saturday, Sunday, or Holiday. This accommodation consistently provides 1 full working day to report a 24-hour-notification. To be reasonable, notifications due in 72 hours should be provided the same exact accommodation for weekends and holidays, but the proposal fails to provide 3 full working days to report. For example, both 24-hour- and 72-hour-notifications determined reportable on a Friday would both be due on the next working day. Our recommended change would provide 72-hour-notifications 3 full working days to report.</p>	<p>Boeing recommends revising the Note in this paragraph to read as follows: Note: <i>Potentially unsafe conditions require 24 hour notification. A 24 hour notification due on Saturday, Sunday, or holiday may be delivered on the next working day. All other notification types listed require 72 working hour notification. A 72 hour notification must be delivered within 3 full working days, not counting weekends or holidays.</i></p>	<p>The FAA does not agree with the suggestion. The allowance intended by the note is to allow notifications that are due on a non-working day to be provided on the next working day.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
US Airways	3-19	3-23	<p>Although the description and discussion that allows applicants to use "Applicant Showings" findings is explained, there needs to be a specific discussion on the process to document applicant showings in the PSCP, and for STC ODA's on the STC form 8110.2.</p> <p>US Airways recommends compliance findings that will use "applicant showings" are documented in the PSCP as "applicant showings" in place of specific UM names.</p> <p>The specific CFR's, regardless of whether compliance was found per "applicant showings" or by a UM, need to be documented in the Certification Basis on STC form 8110.2.</p>		Information on substantiation without UM participation has been removed from the Order. See introductory paragraph.
Bell Helicopter	3-19 & 3-20	3-23 Use and Recognition of Applicant Showings	We strongly support the ability for Applicant use and ODA/FAA recognition of "applicant showings" in regards to data, inspections, tests, test witnessing, and conformity inspections	None	Information on substantiation without UM participation has been removed from the Order. See introductory paragraph.
Bell Helicopter	3-19 & 3-20	3-23(e)	The "ODA Holder" and "Applicant" wording is confusing	Please review and clarify the user of "ODA Holder" and "Applicant" in this context	Information on substantiation without UM participation has been removed from the Order. See introductory paragraph.

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
Cessna	5-2	5-3.a.(2)(a)	There is not a method for an ODA holder to meet rules, guidance or policy until the OMT accepts the procedure into the ODA Procedures Manual.	Cessna suggests a method for use of temporary changes to the ODA Procedures Manual with a clear and timely notification to the OMT. For example, a letter transmitting a change that states the ODA will adopt a change effective in X days and will become permanent with concurrence of the OMT after X+60 days if no correspondence received from the OMT objecting to it.	<p>Paragraph 3-9, procedures manual requirements, requires the ODA procedures manual to define the methods for incorporating changes into the ODA procedures manuals. The use of "temporary" changes may be allowed so long as the revision process has adequate revision control and clear accounting of the manual's requirements at any point in time.</p> <p>The FAA does not agree that manual revision may be incorporated based on lack of response by the OMT. Each manual revision that justifies FAA response must be specifically approved by the FAA.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>
Bell Helicopter	5-2	5-2(f)(3)	Minor typo	Remove "/" from beginning of sentence	Concur, revised as suggested.
Bell Helicopter	5-2	5-3(a)(2)(a)	We strongly support the requirement that the OMT expedite the review of manual changes that address policy changes, corrective actions, or findings from self-audits or FAA oversight.	None	No change has been introduced based on this comment.

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
Bell Helicopter	5-2	5-3(a)(2)(a)	We strongly support the clarification that not all OMT members must review all Procedures Manual changes. Adherence to this process should expedite OMT review of PM changes and revisions	None	No change has been introduced based on this comment.
Gulfstream Aircraft	5-3a(2)		Section needs clarification on who in the OMT should ensure all OMT members are aware of the current revision status of the manual and have access to the current version. Gulfstream recommends the sentence read, 2(a). The OMT Lead should ensure all OMT members are aware of the current revision status of the manual and have access to the current version.		Concur. Revised to "The OMT lead must ensure that all OMTs have access to the current version of the manual."
Gulfstream Aircraft		5-4	Supervision', Paragraph (i) 'Communications and Interactions – OMT/ODA Holder' – The Order should further clarify who is responsible for informing the ODA Administrators of communications and guidance provided by the OMT. Additionally, requiring all communication to be processed through the OMT leads and ODA administrators as opposed to communication via ODA team members and the OMT focals will add significant time for information to flow through several organizational levels within the ODA and the OMT.		<p>The OMT lead is ultimately responsible for any FAA communications with the ODA holder. This should be clear based on the description of OMT lead responsibilities throughout the Order. We've revised section 5-4i(1) to allow for communications as agreed to by the FAA and ODA holder.</p> <p>Oversight and supervision communications between the OMT and the ODA holder must be coordinated through the OMT lead and the appropriate ODA administrator, or as otherwise agreed to by the ODA holder and OMT.</p> <p>All communications should follow the guidelines established for communication in the ODA procedures manual.</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
Bell Helicopter	5-5	5-4(a)	Here the FAA introduces another time frame. Now Supervision activity is coordinated around the fiscal year rather than “annually.” Throughout the Order different time frames are referenced. Some requirements are annual, some are “every 12 months,” and some are based on a “fiscal year.” Then there are requirements that are biannual, two years, 24 calendar months.	We ask for FAA consensus and consistency on time frames throughout the Order. When recurring requirements are to be met and the criteria for this is given in a specific manner, both starting requirements and ending requirements must be used in order to meet the stated requirement. When different terms are used this creates confusion on the part of the individual having to meet the recurrent requirement as well as confusion for the administration having to monitor the requirement.	<p>The language added does not introduce any new time frame, but mandates that the annual supervision planning be conducted on an annual basis that corresponds to the FAA's fiscal year calendar. This is only important due to the FAA tools used for tracking supervision and has no direct impact on ODA holders, who are not expected to monitor compliance with these requirements.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>
Bell Helicopter	5-8	5-4(h)(i)	We strongly support the clarification on the appropriate paths of communication among UMs, OMT, ODA Unit, and ODA Holder	None	No change has been introduced based on this comment.
RAM Aircraft	5-11	5-6.d.(1)	Unit members whose performance can be expected to improve with additional review or oversight may continue to act as ODA unit members... The ODA holder will be provided the opportunity to improve the unit member's performance.	This section provides procedures for dealing with ODA unit member performance problems. We acknowledge this section should reflect the same intent as Chapter 11 in Order 8100.8D regarding suspension, reinstatement, and termination of AIR designees, with an emphasis on providing the opportunity to improve the unit member's performance. We also acknowledge circumstances in which termination is necessary and as appropriate, section 5-6.d.(3) addresses the circumstance when the OMT has identified the need for removal of a unit member due to poor performance or other deficiencies. We do not disagree	<p>The ODA unit listing is to identify the individuals authorized to perform functions for the ODA holder. While the authorization holder is free to use approaches consistent with 8100.8 processes for suspension, etc. the listing is always meant to only identify active ODA Unit Members. Even if a "suspended" status were appropriate for the UM listing, the listing would have to be revised to accurately reflect such a status. It would not be acceptable to try to communicate such status by some means other than revising the listing.</p> <p>We agree that an accurate ODA unit listing is an important feature of the</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
				<p>with the additions in the draft Order. However we would like to see some additional considerations included. <u>We ask the authors of this Order to put some more thought into this section to better accommodate “opportunities to improve the unit member’s performance” by considering “temporary suspension” as an option that would not require revision of the ODA unit listing.</u></p> <p>Because of its importance within our ODA holder’s ability to operate, our ODA unit listing is a tightly controlled document, which is subject to the same sort of “approval” and “release” processing as are used in the configuration control of type design data. Therefore, the ODA unit listing revision process consumes a significant amount of company resources, including a significant turn-around time delay. And, since our ODA uses the ODA unit listing as the vehicle for appointing unit members, we do not wish to revise this document for temporary suspensions and then turn right around and revise it again to reinstate someone who recently was removed. This is especially true for UM’s whose performance (or qualification status) is expected to improve or be corrected. We see this requirement to revise the ODA unit listing under such circumstances as overly burdensome and time consuming with no added value.</p>	<p>ODA holders procedures. Although additions to the listing must be agreed to by the FAA (in most cases), the listing is separate from the ODA procedures manual in order to make the revision process simpler and less time-consuming. We would urge ODA holders to institute processes for updating the listing which minimize their administrative burden. The FAA will always strive to coordinate on UM listing revisions in a timely manner.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
Garmin	5-11	5-6.d.(3)	<p>If the ODA holder decides to appeal the OMT notification to remove a Unit Member, it is not clear whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The UM should be removed within 48 hrs despite the appeal and reinstate only if the appeal is successful or • The UM can remain active until the appeal process is final 	The guidance should be revised so there is no ambiguity in the required ODA action.	<p>Added language to clarify:</p> <p>". If the ODA holder desires to appeal the removal decision, it may submit any information or proposed corrective action supporting re-instatement for the OMT's consideration. However, the individual may not perform any functions or remain on the UM listing during the appeal process. The OMT will consider any submitted information and may authorize re-instatement of the individual as it determines justified.</p>
Garmin	6-2	6-3.a.	<p>The sentence:</p> <p>This means that if an ODA holder's late evaluation ended on August 7, 2011, it must be evaluated again by August 31, 2013.</p> <p>does not read correctly.</p>	Change "late" to "last"	Concur. Revised as suggested.
Gulfstream Aircraft		6-4	Inspection Planning' – If the skills listed in this section are required for DOIP auditors, Gulfstream requests if similar requirements be acceptable for those responsible for conducting IAR surveillance.		We assume that "IAR" is referring to an ODA unit member. The requirements for FAA personnel conducting ODA inspections is different than the requirements which would be expected for FAA personnel conducting designee supervision and oversight. Knowledge and understanding of the technical functions performed by any ODA unit member would be required of personnel responsible for the assessment of those unit members.

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
Bell Helicopter	8-1 through 8-26	All references to "Certification Projects"	We welcome the change from "FAA-Managed Projects" to "Certification Projects" in the TC section	None	No change has been introduced based on this comment.
Bell Helicopter	8-3	8-4(b)(4)	Reduction or elimination on life-limited components. This is very confusing: ODA holder can approve an increase as long as the part stays in the manual but if we eliminate due to unlimited life, OMT must approve this. If ODA holder's can approve increase, then we should approve all increases including elimination of life-limited component.	Simplify the requirements. Should be simple: Reductions-OMT approves; Increases-ODA holder approves	The FAA concurs with this recommendation and has revised chapters 8 & 11 language to only require FAA approval of reduction of life-limits. Reductions of life-limits require AD action for fielded products and FAA involvement.
Boeing Commercial Airplanes	8-5	8-6b.	<p>The proposed text states: "b. Program Notification Letter. . . . The ODA administrator must submit the following to the ACO with each PNL: ..."</p> <p>The statement, as written in the proposed Order, requires inclusion in the PNL information that is often not available at the time of a PNL, especially for new type certification (TC) or complex programs. For example, the PNL and application for a TC are done early in a project; requiring the other information is contradictory to FAA Order 8110.4C and the FAA Industry Guide to Product Certification, which stress early involvement and a phased approach to certification. If a PNL and TC application cannot be submitted until the cert plan is complete, that is not in alignment with the other FAA guidance. Further, every ODA is different. Boeing ODA has processes that meet the intent of the</p>	<p>Boeing recommends changing the text to read as follows: "b. Program Notification Letter. . . . The ODA administrator must submit the following, or as approved in the ODA procedures manual, with each PNL: . . ."</p>	<p>The FAA does not agree with this suggestion.</p> <p>The intent of this language is to define the material that must be submitted and reviewed by the FAA in order to authorize the ODA holder to conduct an ODA project. The proposed language does not provide for submittal and FAA review of any specific information and would not provide any assurance that the certification plan contains the basic information required for the FAA to make any delegation decisions regarding the project.</p> <p>We recognize that certification planning may be incomplete at the time the initial PNL is submitted, however, the Order defines the minimum expected documentation</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
			<p>8100.15 Order. Boeing can demonstrate (and has demonstrated) and has evidence that we meet the requirements via a combination of certification processes and tools. Adding our suggested text -- "<i>or as approved in the ODA procedures manual</i>" -- will reduce the number of deviation requests that the FAA will likely receive and be required to evaluate; it will also allow each ODA to meet the intent of this Order in accordance with their own procedures manual.</p>		<p>expected to be submitted throughout the project initiation phase.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>
Boeing Commercial Airplanes	8-5	8-6b(4)	<p>The proposed text states: <i>"(4) Proposed compliance areas not requiring specific unit member functions per paragraph 3-23 of this order."</i></p> <p>Our recommended change will ensure clarity and consistency between listed ODA allowances that the FAA has approved, and requirements for documentation of requests for FAA involvement in areas for which the ODA is not delegated.</p>	<p>Boeing recommends revising the text as follows: <i>"(4) Proposed compliance areas not requiring specific unit member functions per paragraph 3-23 of this order, except those established as acceptable in the ODA procedures manual."</i></p>	<p>Information on substantiation without UM participation has been removed from the Order. See introductory paragraph.</p>
Cessna	8-5	8-6.b.(3)	<p>8-6.b.(3) requires the ODA to recommend areas for Specific Findings per 8-6.d. While Cessna understands the potential benefits of this requirement such as developing the confidence base for expanding the scope of ODA accepted certification plans, most of 8-6.d. has some amount of judgment by the FAA including some areas that are exclusively FAA functions. Is the ODA recommendation expected to be all-inclusive and 100% on target, or simply a means to alert the FAA to areas that the ODA would anticipate Specific Findings?</p>	<p>Cessna requests clarification of the expectation for ODA recommended areas for Specific Findings.</p>	<p>There are no set performance expectations for an ODA holder's recommendation for specific findings. The FAA recognizes that the subjectivity inherent in determining the applicability of specific findings might make it difficult for an ODA holder to make completely accurate suggestions. However, an ODA holder should be able to identify those areas that must be reviewed/approved by the FAA and those areas which have typically been retained based on the</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
					<p>ODA holder's past performance, including those that are being addressed by on-going corrective action.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>
Bell Helicopter	8-5	8-6(a)	The use of ODA Holder, Applicant, and ODA Unit regarding the responsibility of showing compliance is confusing	Clarify "applicant" vs. "holder and make a clearer distinction between the applicant within the ODA Holder and the ODA Unit	<p>For the purposes of TC ODA design approval functions, the term "ODA holder" is equivalent to the term "applicant," since the ODA holder is not authorized to approve type design changes for other applicants.</p> <p>The intent of this paragraph is to clarify that the ODA holder has responsibilities as the "applicant" as well as responsibility on behalf of the FAA (as the ODA holder).</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>
Bell Helicopter	8-5	8-6(a)	Minor typo	Add a space between the comma and "Statement of Completion"	Concur, revised as suggested.
Cessna	8-6	8-6.d.(4)	Performance issues are very subjective. Do these need to be documented performance issues, or does the FAA have latitude in how to define 'issue'? Also, there is not a definition for 'minimal experience'. How does an ODA holder know when they have sufficient experience in a particular area to eliminate the need for a specific finding? Cessna understands that we could define this in the ODA Procedures Manual or the	Cessna recommends there be some criteria to provide guidance for both the OMT and the ODA holder. As written, any area could be a specific finding based on this subjective criteria.	The FAA recognizes that the areas that might be identified as requiring specific findings is subjective. However, the FAA must make project delegation decisions based on it's assessment of the ODA holder's capability, experience and performance, which will always include some subjective decision-making.

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
			PNL.		<p>The FAA's intention is to always fully delegate program activity unless there is a valid reason for the FAA to retain approval. However, it is not possible to define all of the reasons or indicators of performance which might be used as a basis for specific findings.</p> <p>The FAA expects that the managing OMTs would provide feedback to an ODA holder documenting any performance problems that would cause items to be retained as specific findings. Additionally, the FAA's PNL response will identify the rationale for any specific findings.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>
Boeing Commercial Airplanes	8-11	8-6l.	<p>The proposed text states: <i>"I. Findings to Foreign Regulations. The OMT may authorize a TC ODA unit to find compliance to specific foreign regulations when allowed by the BASA IPA, or written FAA approved arrangement with that country (after consultation with the International Policy Office, AIR-40). ..."</i></p> <p>The wording in proposed Order 8100.15B is inconsistent with that in Order 8100.8D (Designee Management Handbook), which this proposed Order references. Order 8100.8D, paragraph 310.a.(1) states: ". . . The ACO may authorize a DER to make compliance findings to specific foreign regulations delegated to the FAA by a foreign CAA. This can be done in accordance with</p>	<p>Boeing recommends revising the text to use the wording that was used in Order 8100.15A: <i>"I. Findings to Foreign Regulations. The OMT may authorize a TC ODA unit to find compliance to specific foreign regulations delegated to the FAA by a foreign airworthiness authority. This may only be done when allowed by the BASA IPA, or written FAA-approved arrangement with that country (after consultation with the International Policy Office, AIR-40). . . ."</i></p> <p>We also recommend that the phrase "specific foreign regulations" be defined.</p>	<p>The FAA has incorporated the suggested change into paragraphs 8-6l and 11-11.</p> <p>The use of the word "specific" is to mean those regulations specified for FAA review by the foreign authority and is consistent with a normal definition for specific- "Explicitly set forth; particular; definite." No further definition is necessary.</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
			<p>Implementation Procedures for Airworthiness (IPA) under a Bilateral Aviation Safety Agreement (BASA) or some other written FAA-approved arrangement with that country (after consultation with the International Policy Office staff, AIR-40). If the FAA accepts the delegation of a compliance finding from a bilateral or Joint Aviation Authorities (JAA) member country or from the JAA under the BASA IPA, that finding could be made either directly by the FAA or by an appropriately qualified designee.”</p> <p>The phrase “<i>specific foreign regulations</i>” is not clarified or defined in either Order 8100.15B, Order 8100.8D, or the US/EU BASA Technical Implementation Procedures (TIP). If the FAA chooses to not accept our recommendation for changing the proposed Order, then we suggest changes be made to Order 8100.8D to make it aligned and consistent.</p>	<p>Does “<i>specific foreign regulations</i>” mean only those regulations that are different from the FAA regulations?</p>	
Airbus	8-19	8-10	<p>For unsafe condition and mandatory Continuing Airworthiness actions, the AD may refer to one or several SBs or other supplemental documents. For this reason, the global AMOC may be used for more than one SB, including the consistent check in Supplier SB incorporated by reference in the Manufacturer SB.</p>	<p>8-10. Global AMOCs for Revisions to Service Bulletin. <i>The ODA holder may be authorized to approve global AMOCs for administrative (non-technical) corrections to all relevant service bulletins including any supplier service bulletins referenced in an AD.</i> The above proposal for change is based on EASA/FAA TIP (page 3-5)</p>	<p>The FAA does not agree with this suggestion. An ODA holder is not authorized to approve supplier service bulletins nor changes to those bulletins. Therefore, an ODA holder is not authorized to approve a global AMOC based on changes to a referenced supplier service bulletin.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
Airbus	8-19	8-10	<p>Are the ODA holder and AD issuance office using a common procedure or separate procedures? It's better to improve the wording to avoid confusion.</p>	<p>a. <i>The ODA holder and the AD-issuing office must have a their respective procedures (or a common procedure) in place for such approvals. Any The procedures must include at a minimum:</i> <i>(1) A definition of acceptable changes,</i> ...</p>	<p>Partially concur. It is not the intent to have two separate procedures between the ODA holder and the AD issuing office. As such we have revised the language for clarity:</p> <p>The ODA holder must have a procedure in place with the AD issuing office for such approvals. Any procedure must include at a minimum:</p>
Airbus	8-19	8-10	<p>The wording "non-technical" is first time used in the 8100.15. Does the ODA holder have any guideline to define "non-technical" changes in a Service Bulletin, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is an update of the TC holder's SB to provide more detailed information considered as non-technical? 	<p>No changes proposed to the 8100.15.</p> <p>This is at the discretion of the FAA to provide or incorporate by reference such information in the FAA order 8100.15.</p>	<p>An update of the service bulletin to provide more detailed information would not be considered non-technical. A non-technical change would be correcting a typographical error that had no effect on compliance with the service bulletin. However, the intent is not to define what non-technical is in this order. Paragraph 8-10.a.(1) identifies that the ODA procedure will contain a definition of what changes can be made.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>
Gulfstream Aircraft		8-11a	<p>Obtaining approval of the geographic MIDO where the product is located is unnecessarily restrictive for an ODA whose activities span several FAA regions. Recommend that Order permit a solution agreed by the ODA and its oversight office.</p>		<p>The FAA does not agree with the suggested change. FAA Order 8130.2 requires that limitations issued with experimental airworthiness certificates are to be approved by the relevant Geographic MIDO. This applies to standard certification procedures and also to certification under ODA procedures. However an OMT chooses to facilitate this process is up to them and their ODA. The point is that a Geographic MIDO has to be involved in establishing limitations for</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
					<p>aircraft operating in their area of responsibility. To allow an OMT to issue these limitations without involvement of the geographic MIDO would be in contravention to FAA policy.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>
Garmin	8-20 11-19	8-11.a. 11-13.a.	<p>The changes in these paragraphs require the ODA unit to get written approval from the “geographic MIDO” of limitations, etc. for experimental certificates or special flight permits.</p> <p>With blessing from Seattle MIDO and KC MIDO, Garmin has coordinated all MIDO activity for both its Salem OR and Olathe KS ODA STC units through the KC MIDO including approval of limitations for ODA issued airworthiness certificates. This process has been working well and has had the benefit of consistent oversight and expectations for the entire Garmin ODA (Olathe KS and Salem OR STC Units). It is not clear what is gained by changing from the previously agreed coordination process to one that requires coordination with the “geographic MIDO”.</p>	Change the paragraphs to allow for coordination with a MIDO other than the “geographic MIDO” if the FAA MIDO parties that are signatories to the ODA Manual have agreed to another coordination process.	<p>The FAA does not agree with the suggested change. FAA Order 8130.2 requires that limitations issued with experimental airworthiness certificates are to be approved by the relevant Geographic MIDO. This applies to standard certification procedures and also to certification under ODA procedures. However an OMT chooses to facilitate this process is up to them and their ODA. The point is that a Geographic MIDO has to be involved in establishing limitations for aircraft operating in their area of responsibility. To allow an OMT to issue these limitations without involvement of the geographic MIDO would be in contravention to FAA policy.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>
Bell Helicopter	8-20	8-11(a) Airworthiness Certification	The new requirement that written permission for issuing experimental certificates or special flight permits must come from the geographic MIDO where the product is located is too restrictive. We try to include limitation information in our PNLs so that the PNL response meets the written permission requirement. Unless we have a	Change the wording to allow for permission from either the geographic MIDO or the MIDO rep on the OMT	The FAA does not agree with this suggestion. The not new requirement is that these limitations must come from the geographic MIDO. FAA Order 8130.2 requires that limitations issued with experimental airworthiness certificates are to be approved by the relevant Geographic MIDO. This

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
			representative from the geographic MIDO on our OMT, this proactiveness serves no purpose		<p>applies to standard certification procedures and also to certification under ODA procedures. However an OMT chooses to facilitate this process is up to them and their ODA. The point is that a Geographic MIDO has to be involved in establishing limitations for aircraft operating in their area of responsibility. To allow an OMT to issue these limitations without involvement of the geographic MIDO would be in contravention to FAA policy.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>
Bell Helicopter	8-22	8-14	This paragraph refers to “articles manufactured by the ODA Holder” but the note in 8-3(m) refers to “products manufactured by the ODA holder” as a requirement for using ODA authority	Clarify if this should be products, articles, or both	The intent of this paragraph is that the ODA holder may provide approvals in support of PMA or STC applicants for changes to products manufactured by the ODA holder. Have revised paragraph 8-14 to refer to "products."
RAM Aircraft	9-3	9-3.g	A PC-ODA may approve minor changes to its Quality System.	Consider adding same intent to Ch. 13 for PMA-ODA.	<p>The FAA does not agree with the suggested change. Under ODA, a PC ODA holder is permitted to perform an evaluation of its quality system if specifically authorized (Function Code 9120). Function code 9150 is a natural extension of the authority granted under FC 9120. It should not be extended to other ODA types.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
Bell Helicopter	11-3	11-3(n) Note	Unlike in TC section (Ch. 8), "FAA-managed projects" has not been changed to "certification projects"	Be consistent and replace "FAA-Managed projects" with "certification projects" throughout the order	The FAA does not agree with the suggestion, which is not appropriate for all scenarios, For example, STC ODA holders may only rely on approvals provided by the manufacturer of the product involved in the STC. STC ODA holders may not provide approvals for another STC ODA holder's projects. No change has been introduced based on this comment.
US Airways	11-5	11-7a(1)	states: STC Program Data Approval Requirements. All data approvals and conformity inspections necessary for the STC program (except data approvals provided by the product's TC holder ODA) must be accomplished by the STC ODA holder's unit members, unless retained by the FAA.	US Airways recommends this section point to section 3.23, to allow the use of "applicant showings" as another means to show compliance.	The FAA does not agree with this suggestion. This section applies specifically to "data approvals and conformity inspections." These are the "FAA" or "ODA" activities that are required to "find compliance" when applicant showings are not used. Those activities that rely on applicant showings, by definition, do not require FAA activities.
RAM Aircraft	11-7	11-7.a.(8)	"Applicant Showing of Compliance" "ODA holder is responsible as the applicant"	This might not be true in all cases. In the case of Consultant ODA's, the applicant may not be the ODA holder.	Concur. Revised to "The ODA holder may be responsible as the project applicant to show compliance....."
Envoy Aerospace	11-7	11-7(a)(8)	11-7(a)(8) - requires a statement of compliance by the ODA Holder as the applicant. The ODA holder is not always the applicant. With consultant ODA's the Holder is often not the applicant. Part 21 requires the applicant to make the statement of compliance and that is how we have been treating it. I can see the ODA Holder being held responsible for ensuring this is completed as part of an ODA unit's activity. I would recommend eliminating a statement that implies or requires the ODA holder to be the applicant.		Concur. Revised to "The ODA holder may be responsible as the project applicant to show compliance....."

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
Envoy Aerospace	11-17	11-13(a)	<p>The language in the draft Order brings 8100.15B into alignment with 8130.2 regarding the requirement to have the airworthiness limitations approved by the geographic MIDO where the product is located.</p> <p>There are two areas of comment with respect to this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I spoke with AIR-200 in mid-2011 in an attempt to get clarification regarding the “geographic MDIO”. I had chosen to contact AIR-200 directly because they own 8130-2 and because my question transcended multiple offices. I am a member of three different ODA’s and I am also a consultant DAR. As a result, I have several “advisors”. AIR-200 decided not to respond to my question and referred me back to one of my advisors. <p>My understanding of “geographic MIDO where the product is located” means the closet MIDO to the actual physical modification location for the aircraft. I attempted to coordinate limitations (as a DAR and UM) through the geographic office on several occasions only to be told by the MIDO that they had no idea what was going on. I was told by one of my advisors that “geographic” meant the office managing the ODA and had nothing to do with the location of the aircraft. I was further told that this second “definition” had been provided in writing to the MIDO offices from AIR-200 though I have never been able to get a copy of any such writing. In one case, I coordinated with the geographic MIDO and was then reprimanded by the managing MIDO for not coordinating through that office.</p> <p>Although this is not directly an 8100.15 issue since you are only attempting to harmonize with 8130.2, I know that AIR-200 coordinates on the policy and I would like to see some clarification in this area. My issue is with the definition of geographic. It seems open to interpretations that are not intuitively obvious to me.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Envoy applied for and was granted a partial deviation relative to getting airworthiness limitations approved as part of our original appointment. The managing MIDO office was not willing to give carte blanche authorization to all unit members with respect to airworthiness limitations however they were willing to provide this authorization based on individual experience. In many cases, the DAR’s and Unit Members have significantly more experience in airworthiness certification than the FAA advisors managing them. I would like to see that policy recognize this condition and allow the OMT some latitude in dealing with this requirement. The granting of this authorization seems to gel with the definition of “geographic” meaning the “managing office for the ODA”. 		<p>The FAA does not agree with the suggestion. FAA Order 8130.2 requires that limitations issued with experimental airworthiness certificates are to be approved by the relevant Geographic MIDO. This applies to standard certification procedures and also to certification under ODA procedures. However an OMT chooses to facilitate this process is up to them and their ODA. The point is that a Geographic MIDO has to be involved in establishing limitations for aircraft operating in their area of responsibility. To allow an OMT to issue these limitations without involvement of the geographic MIDO would be in contravention to FAA policy.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
			<p>I believe the concept of having the airworthiness limitations approved by the geographic MIDO stems from previous policy that required the DAR to coordinate with the geographic MIDO to let that office know that a DAR was working in the area. The concept of this coordination was to create an exchange such that a local inspector could make the DAR aware of any special requirements for the local area and could also make the DAR aware of any issues that might be germane to the mod facility. In early times, this was direct communication between the MIDO office and the DAR. In later times, the concept gave way to notification via the geographic expansion form. As an ODA, we no longer need to let the MIDO know we are going to be in the area unless there is airworthiness involved – in which case they need to sign off on the airworthiness limitations (assuming my understanding of “geographic” as described in Item 1 above, is correct).</p> <p>I would like to recommend that approval of airworthiness limitations by a UM be a managing office requirement, with the managing office having the authority to grant some freedom to individual UM’s through their ODA manual and I would further recommend that the ODA be required to coordinate with the geographic MIDO when there is a Special Airworthiness for the purposes of ensuring that the local office has the opportunity to share information as they deem necessary.</p>		
Pratt & Whitney	12-1	12-2c	The proposed change requires the MRA ODA holder authorized airworthiness approval functions to hold a part 121, 135, or 145 certificate.	<p>Do not incorporate this suggested change.</p> <p>Pratt & Whitney has a business unit that deals with used parts. This business unit is a stand alone entity and is not part of the manufacturing production certificate or any of the 145 repair stations. Pratt & Whitney is currently reviewing the possibility of adding this business unit to the MRA ODA so that FAA export tags can be issued. If Pratt & Whitney cannot use our MRA ODA to issue the FAA export tags then we will incur an additional cost of hiring a DAR to provide the FAA export tags.</p>	The FAA does not see a need, or benefit to issuing an MRA ODA to a stand alone facility not associated with a 145, 135 or 121 certificate holder. Each ODA appointed by the FAA requires significant resources to manage. The FAA has found that MRA ODAs appointed that are not associated with a current 145, 135 or 121 certificate holder have created a entirely new FAA resource requirement that has not been found to be justified. However, it appears that the commenter might still be eligible for the MRA functions so long as the "ODA holder's" organizational description includes its 145 repair station certificates. There is no requirement

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
					<p>that the authority exercised under an ODA be performed by personnel directly aligned with any organizational element used to satisfy ODA eligibility requirements.</p> <p>No change was introduced based on this comment.</p>
United Airlines ODA	12-6	12-6f	<p>Documentation. An MRA ODA unit must determine and document that the alteration or repair complies with all applicable airworthiness standards. The documentation must include a completed compliance checklist and all applicable FAA Forms 8100-9 approving type design data and compliance substantiation data. The ODA administrator must sign an FAA Form 8100-11, which indicates approval of all aspects of the following, as necessary:"</p> <p>As a transport category operator 14CFR 121.379 (b) we are required to accomplish a major repair in accordance with data approved by the administrator. This is required for return to service.</p> <p>As stated on the 8100-9, the data is approved once the 8100-9 is executed. The 8100-11 doesn't have an effect on the approval. For repairs only we would like to allow 10 days for the approval of the 8100-11 so that we can limit the number of administrators that we have. .</p>	<p>"... The ODA administrator must sign an FAA Form 8100-11, which indicates approval of all aspects of the following, as necessary (For repairs only the ODA administrator must sign the FAA Form 8100-11 within 10 days):"</p>	<p>The intent of requiring an FAA Form 8100-11 for repair data approvals under MRA ODA is to ensure that all aspects of a particular repair are approved before the repair data is released for use and approval for return to service. Allowing the use of the repair data prior to the completion of the 8100-11 circumvents the purpose for having the 8100-11 and does not ensure that all necessary data have been approved. We will clarify in the Order that the 8100-11 must be completed before the 8100-9 data approvals are considered valid and released for use.</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
United Airlines ODA	12-7	12-10(a)(5)	<p>“Ensuring that the ICA or impact assessment was prepared by the applicant and that ICA was prepared in accordance with the checklist contained in FAA Order 8900.1. The procedures manual ...”</p> <p>The ICA checklist in 8900.1 (Fig. 4-66 item 16) has a requirement that does apply to all Applicants. Item 16 would require the Applicant to submit the revised ICA along with the original Form 337 to the Aircraft Registration Branch in Oklahoma City.</p> <p>FAA Order 8900.1 Vol.4 Ch9 Sec 1, Figure 4-66 ICA checklist, item 16 reads as follows: “ICAs are required to be acceptable to the FAA. As such, changes should be documented by submitting the revised ICA along with the original Form 337 to the Aircraft Registration Branch in Oklahoma City. An entry in the aircraft records should indicate the current revision.”</p> <p>The use of Form 337 would not be applicable to Part 121 Operators, and therefore the verbiage “... in accordance with the checklist contained in FAA Order 8900.1 ...” does not provide adequate latitude for situations when a Form 337 is not used. Therefore, the “... in accordance with ...” verbiage should be qualified by “as applicable”</p>	<p>“Ensuring that the ICA or impact assessment was prepared by the applicant and that ICA was prepared, as applicable, in accordance with the checklist contained in FAA Order 8900.1. The procedures manual ...”</p>	<p>The FAA agrees with the intent of this comment and has revised paragraph 12-10a(5) to address this concern:</p> <p>Ensuring that the ICA or impact assessment was prepared by the applicant and that the ICA addresses the content required by the ICA checklist contained in FAA Order 8900.1.</p>
RAM Aircraft	13-5	13.6.a	<p>“Applicant Showing of Compliance”</p> <p>“ODA holder is responsible as the applicant”</p>	<p>This might not be true in all cases. In the case of Consultant ODA’s, the applicant may not be the ODA holder.</p>	<p>The FAA does not agree with this comment. PMA ODA holders are not authorized to conduct PMA test and comp approvals for other PMA holders. The ODA holder is always the applicant for this type of authorized function.</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
					No change has been introduced based on this comment.
Airbus	13-10 13-12	13-7(a) 13-7(e)	The case of PMA supplement issued based upon STC does not make clear if the STC holder is the same organization as the PMA applicant/holder.	No proposed new wording but clarification is needed.	No clarification required. The FAA's PMA approval process only provides for PMA based on STC when the PMA applicant/holder is also the holder of the STC. A PMA based on an STC owned by another entity can only be approved based on licensing agreement with the STC holder. No change has been introduced based on this comment.
Boeing Commercial Airplanes	C-5	Condition 1-8	<p>The proposed text states: "1-8 . . . <i>ODA administrators have attended an ODA seminar or training as required by the FAA. Engineering ODA unit members have attended a DER standardization seminar and recurrent seminars as required by FAA Order 8100.8. . . ."</i></p> <p>Condition 1-8 should recognize Unit Members' attendance at online ODA Engineering Initial Training -- which is relatively new training that is currently available.</p>	<p>Boeing recommends revising the text as follows: "1-8. . . . <i>ODA administrators have attended an ODA seminar or training as required by the FAA. Engineering ODA unit members have attended completed Online ODA Engineering Initial Training, unless the DER standardization or initial training seminar and recurrent seminars as required by FAA Order 8100.8. . . ."</i></p>	<p>The FAA concurs in principle with the intent of this suggestion, but the proposed language is incomplete. We have revised criteria 1-8 to make it consistent with the description of courses addressed by 8100.8:</p> <p>"Engineering ODA unit members have completed initial and recurrent engineering seminars as required by FAA Orders 8100.8 and 8100.15."</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
Boeing Commercial Airplanes	C-18	Condition 3-3	<p>The proposed text states: <i>“The CEH level for the system is adequate to meet the criticality level assigned in the hazard assessment or the system safety assessments and compliance with RTCA/DO-254() was shown.”</i></p> <p>FAA Order 8110.105, Change 1 (as well as Issue Paper SH-1 that applies to 787-8 and all later airplane models) also applies DO-254 to Simple Electronic Hardware (SEH). In light of this, the text in the proposed Order should be generalized to <i>Airborne Electronic Hardware (AEH)</i> in order to include all cases of applicability.</p>	<p>Boeing recommends revising the text as follows: <i>“The CEHAEH level for the system is adequate to meet the criticality level assigned in the hazard assessment or the system safety assessments and compliance with RTCA/DO-254() was shown.”</i></p>	Concur, revised as suggested.
Boeing Commercial Airplanes	C-23	Condition 3-19	<p>The proposed text states: <i>“3-19 Has the software level been properly assigned using SAE ARP 4754A assurance level assignment process or an equivalent system safety process and has the software verification been accomplished in accordance with RTCA/DO-178()?”</i></p> <p>The text in the proposed Order appears expect that all applicants use SAE ARP 4754A, or benchmark their system safety assessment process against SAE ARP 4754A with the current text Our recommended change would allow applicants to propose use of their preferred and well-understood system safety assessment process, and not have to map their currently approved system safety assessment process strictly against SAE ARP 4754A.</p>	<p>Boeing recommends revising the text as follows: <i>“3-19 Has the software level been properly assigned using an FAA approved system safety process SAE ARP 4754A assurance level assignment process or an equivalent system safety process and has the software verification been accomplished in accordance with RTCA/DO-178()?”</i></p>	<p>The FAA agrees with the intent of the suggestion, but we may not formally approve another system safety process. We have revised the criteria to:</p> <p>3-19 Has the software level been properly assigned using SAE ARP 4754A or other acceptable assurance level assignment process and has the software verification been accomplished in accordance with RTCA/DO-178()?</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
Boeing Commercial Airplanes	C-23	Condition 3-21	<p>The proposed text states: <i>“3-21 Are there procedures to ensure that the software development environment (that is, compilers, loaders, linkers, editors, emulators, and so on) is identified, documented and archived for each version of the delivered airborne software version?”</i></p> <p>The text in the proposed Order shows concern only for software problem reports, when there should be concern about system behavior. Our recommended revised text provides a more encompassing term that includes hardware, AEH, and software, and interactions with other aircraft systems.</p>	<p>the text as follows: <i>“3-21 Are there practices and procedures to ensure that the software development environment (that is, compilers, loaders, linkers, editors, emulators, and so on) is identified, documented and archived for each version of the delivered airborne software version for reporting, tracking, categorizing, evaluating the operational impacts of, and dispositioning system problem reports?</i></p>	<p>The FAA agrees with this comment, but It appears the commenter mistakenly copied text from 3-23 and not 3-21. 3-21 covers only problem reporting while 3-23 covers the software development environment.</p> <p>There may be software, AEH, and system problem reports. We have revised the text for 3-21 state the following: “Are there practices and procedures for reporting, tracking, categorizing, evaluating the operational impacts of, and dispositioning problem reports which may include software, AEH and systems problem reports??”</p>
Cessna	C-23	Appendix C 3-19	<p>This seems redundant with 3-3 Statement of Condition that already addresses DAL assignment for both SW and CEH (added in this revision).</p>	<p>If a dedicated question is considered needed for this element, delete that detail from 3-3 and add another question for Complex Electronic Hardware (CEH).</p>	<p>The FAA recognizes that there are many redundancies throughout the inspection criteria in appendix 3. The FAA is considering changes needed for the ODA inspection program and will address in future revision to Order 8100.15.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based on this comment.</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
Boeing Commercial Airplanes	C-30	Condition 4-11	<p>The current text states: <i>“Software products (version description document, source code, object code, documentation, test procedures, loaded hardware/firmware, and so on) are properly identified, including revision levels, when compared to the hardware and software engineering drawings.”</i></p> <p>Our recommended changes will ensure that the terminology matches that in RTCA DO-178().</p>	<p>We recommend revising this section as follows: “Software products (version description document life cycle data, (version description document software configuration index, source code, object code, documentation, test procedures, loaded hardware/firmware, and so on) are properly identified, including revision levels, when compared to the hardware and software engineering drawings.”</p>	Concur, revised as suggested.
Garmin	D-1	Appendix D	<p>It seems like this appendix should be updated to include the requirement to discuss:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended areas of FAA involvement • Areas where applicant showing or conformity determinations will be used without subsequent ODA finding 	For consistency, this appendix should be updated to include the wording required by other changes included in draft Order 8100.15B.	Concur. Have revised appendix D to account for projects which might rely on applicant findings.
Boeing Commercial Airplanes	D-1		<p>The heading sentence of proposed Appendix D states: <i>“THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION MUST BE IN THE CERTIFICATION PLAN:”</i></p> <p>The statement, as written in the proposed Order, requires inclusion in every new certification plan or every revision to any existing certification plan all the information listed in Appendix D; thus, limiting the ODA in this regard. Every ODA is different. Boeing ODA has systems, software, and processes approved by the FAA that meet the intent of Order 8100.15. Boeing can demonstrate (and has demonstrated) and has evidence that we</p>	<p>Boeing recommends changing the text to read as follows: <i>“THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION, OR AS APPROVED IN THE ODA PROCEDURES MANUAL, MUST BE IN THE CERTIFICATION PLAN:”</i></p>	<p>The FAA does not agree with the proposed change. The minimum certification plan content defined by Order 8100.15 is meant to establish a minimum amount of information that must be provided to the FAA during the project initiation phase. The proposed language does not provide for submittal and FAA review of any specific information and would not provide any assurance that the certification plan contains the basic information required for the FAA to make any delegation decisions regarding the project.</p> <p>No change has been introduced based</p>

Commenter	Page	Paragraph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
			<p>meet the requirements via a combination of certification plan content and supporting certification tools. By adding the text “<i>or as approved in the ODA procedures manual</i>” will reduce the number of deviation requests that the FAA will likely receive and be required to evaluate; it will also allow each ODA to meet the intent of Order 8100.15 in accordance with their own procedures manual.</p>		<p>on this comment.</p>
Boeing Commercial Airplanes	D-1	Item 12	<p>The proposed text states: “12. State how equipment is qualified. (For example, RTCA DO-160, PMA, TSO, DO-178 and software level, and so on)”</p> <p>The text in the proposed Order implies that “software level” is a means of equipment qualification; however, it is not. Therefore, this term should be removed. Including DO-254 in this section is appropriate, as it will provide a consistent list of industry documents as examples.</p>	<p>Boeing recommends revising the text as follows: “12. State how equipment is qualified. (For example, RTCA DO-160, , PMA, TSO, DO-178 and software level DO-254, and so on)”</p>	<p>The FAA agrees that DO-254 should be included and has added a reference to DO-254 as suggested. The FAA recognizes that criticality level of software (or hardware) is not a means of equipment qualification. However, we do feel that it's an important piece of information necessary for the certification plan. Although this information could be moved to a new section of the requirements listed in the Order, the FAA prefers to leave reference to criticality level of software or hardware in this section for the sake of consistency.</p>
Boeing Commercial Airplanes	Appendix F		<p>There are no definitions for: Remedial action Corrective action</p> <p>Boeing recommends adding definitions for these two terms.</p>	<p>The terms “<i>corrective action</i>” and “<i>remedial action</i>” are used throughout the Order. Clear definitions providing the intent for each type of action would provide consistent application of these terms.</p>	<p>Original language including the use of remedial action was meant to ensure that all aspects of corrective action (both correction of the identified discrepancy and correction of the procedures/performance that led to the discrepancy).</p> <p>We agree that the use of both terms might be confusing to the reader, and have eliminated the usage of "remedial action" throughout the Order and use only "corrective action" We have included definition for the term</p>

Comment er	Pag e	Parag raph	Comment	Suggested Change	Comment Resolution
					corrective action to address both aspects of corrective action.