

	AVS Quality Management System	QPM # AIR-001-007-F1	Revision 0
Title: Document Review Log		Date: June 19, 2009	Page 1 of 4

REVISION HISTORY		
Rev	Description of Change	Effective Date
0	Original	6/19/09

	<h1>AVS</h1> <h2>Quality Management System</h2>	QPM # AIR-001-007-F1	Revision 0
		Title: Document Review Log	Date: June 19, 2009

1. Document No.: Draft PS-ANE-33.83-01	2. Project Manager: Dorina Mihail	3. John Tallarovic, ACE-118C, (847) 294-8180 (ACE-100)	4. Date of Review: 5/28/14	5. Date of Disposition:
--	---	---	--	--------------------------------

Instructions for Completing the Document Review Log

Blocks 1 & 2: To be completed by project manager prior to sending out for comments.
Blocks 3 & 4: To be completed by reviewing office. Enter office symbol, reviewers name and phone number.
Block 5: To be completed by project manager after receiving comments from reviewing office. Enter date of disposition.
 The below columns are to be completed by the reviewing office, except for the “Disposition” column.
 Project manager’s disposition in comments in the last column below. Enter the reasons for non-incorporated comments. Identify each disposition as:

- **Adopted;**
- **Partially Adopted;**
- **Non-Concur;**
- **Concur but Outside of Scope (Will be considered in next change/revision); or**
- **Answer to Question or Statement.**

Item No:	Page and Paragraph No:	Comment:	Reason:	Recommendation:	Disposition:
1.	Page 1, Paragraph 2	The use of the phrase “...test vehicle...” implies an aircraft.	Engines or engine parts are not a vehicle, an entire aircraft is a vehicle.	Use “...test engine...” or “...test article...”.	Adopted; replaced “test vehicle” with “test engine”
2.	Page 1, Paragraph 2	Delete “and it is common certification practice in the industry.”	This phrase does not add value to the overall message. We want them to test and it’s been that way since 1952. Besides, if it really is common practice, then we should not have to mention it in a policy memo	End the sentence after 1952.	Nonconcur. Past practices must be addressed in the policy per IR8100.16.

UNCONTROLLED COPY WHEN DOWNLOADED

	<h1>AVS</h1> <h2>Quality Management System</h2>	QPM # AIR-001-007-F1	Revision 0
		Title: Document Review Log	

3.	Page 1, Paragraph 3 a	Use the adjective form of “regulation”.	Regulation is modifying the noun “intent”.	Use “...regulatory intent...”.	Adopted. Replaced “regulation intent” with “regulatory intent.”	
4.	Page 2, Paragraph 3 d	The second sentence is confusing.	The use of the word “implemented to” in this sentence is confusing, “This requirement has been implemented to the development of the engine test plan...”.	Use “This requirement has been included in the development of the engine test plan...”.	Adopted; replaced “implemented” by “included”	
1. Document No.: Draft PS-ANE-33.83-01		2. Project Manager: Dorina Mihail		3. AIR-100	4. Date of Review:	5. Date of Disposition:
5.	Page 2 Paragraph b.	The policy states “...is intended to be implemented during pre-certification test activity in support of conducting the engine vibration test.” By using the term “pre-certification test” it implies that testing conducted prior to the engine test is not certification testing. This may cause some applicants to infer that FAA conformity and test witnessing is not necessary or an option for the FAA as part of FAA oversight.	Change to “applies to activity in support of conducting the engine vibration test.” OR “is intended to be implemented during activity prior to and in support of the engine vibration test.”	By eliminating the qualifier of “certification” to describe the testing it removes the implied distinction that there is certification testing and non-certification testing. Any testing the applicant does to support compliance is subject to FAA oversight.	Adopted; changes were made in agreement with this comment.	

UNCONTROLLED COPY WHEN DOWNLOADED

Check The Master List To Verify That This Is The Correct Revision Before Use /s/ NMB 6/19/09

	<h1>AVS</h1> <h2>Quality Management System</h2>	QPM # AIR-001-007-F1	Revision 0
		Title: Document Review Log	Date: June 19, 2009

1. Document No.: Draft PS-ANE-33.83-01		2. Project Manager: Dorina Mihail	3. ANE-140	4. Date of Review: April 30, 2014	5. Date of Disposition:
6.	2; 3.b	The last sentence concludes with "or major assembly rig vibration test."	This also leads the applicant to consider component tests unless this was meant to address the JAA acceptance of "major assembly rig vibration test.?"	Add additional clarification that this is allowed under the JAA.	Non-Concur. The referenced text is a citation from the NPRM, as stated in the policy. The practice is accepted by the FAA, refer to AC33-83A.
7.	2; 4.b	The last sentence used the word "The" for use of the AC.	AC33-83A is AN acceptable means to find compliance. It is possible that an applicant could come up with another acceptable method.	Change the wording to say; "An acceptable means of compliance are prescribed by AC33-83A."	Non-Concur. The Airworthiness Circular is by definition not mandatory. The referenced sentence does not change that fact. The recommended changes may add confusion as could be interpreted that AC33-83A may not be the only AC. There is a single AC for this regulation.

UNCONTROLLED COPY WHEN DOWNLOADED

Check The Master List To Verify That This Is The Correct Revision Before Use /s/ NMB 6/19/09