

281821



**Matsushita Avionics Systems Corporation**  
22333 29th Drive SE, Bothell, WA 98021, USA

Tel: 425-415-9000  
Fax: 425-485-6175  
Customer Care Center: 425-415-9800

Date: May 20, 2004

## TRANSMITTAL SHEET

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
Federal Aviation Administration  
400 Seventh Street SW  
Washington DC

Fax: 1-202-493-2251

3 Pages (including cover)

*FAA - 2003 - 16685 - 29*

**SUBJECT: Docket No. FAA-2003-16685; Notice No. 03-13. COMMENTS TO NPRM**

Reference: Federal Register January 21, 2004, V69, N13; RIN 2120-AH79

**Enclosures:**

Matsushita Avionics Systems Corporation Letter from Scott E. Toner, Titled "Docket No. FAA-2003-16685; Notice No. 03-13. COMMENTS TO NPRM," dated May 20, 2004

Discussion: The enclosure provides commentary and recommendation addressing the Subject NPRM. By way of simple excuse, these comments are being submitted from temporary duty in Colombo, Sri Lanka, where transmission difficulties made it impossible to meet the May 20 submittal deadline. Please accept my apologies, and consider this commentary for formal inclusion in the records.

Sincerely,

Scott E. Toner

Ph: (425) 415-9581

E-mail: toners@mascorp.com



**Matsushita Avionics Systems Corporation**  
22333 29th Drive SE, Bothell, WA 98021, USA

Tel: 425-415-9000  
Fax: 425-485-6175  
Customer Care Center: 425-415-9800

May 20, 2004

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
Federal Aviation Administration  
400 Seventh Street SW  
Washington DC

Fax: 1-202-493-2251

**SUBJECT: Docket No. FAA-2003-16685; Notice No. 03-13. COMMENTS TO NPRM**

**Reference: Federal Register January 21, 2004, V69, N13; RIN 2120-AH79**

Within the text of the Proposed Amendment to Regulation and the extensive preamble detailing the history and intent of the proposed ODA designation, an effect will exist (if implemented as written) that is contradictory to the stated DOT/FAA intent, and will have a negative impact on both the FAA efficiency and industry costs.

With respect to the ODA designation, and in specific reference to the subject of holders of PMA and ODAR, please consider the relationships of the following points:

A) In the proposed regulation, Section 183.47 Eligibility,

(I) Paragraph (b)(1) states;

*"Have been issued and hold a current type certificate, supplemental type certificate (STC), or parts manufacturer approval (PMA) under the standard procedures of part 21 of this chapter for a product under the same or predecessor regulation part for which this ODA is sought."*

(II) Paragraph (d) states;

*"For the purposes of this section, standard procedures do not include transfers and licenses issued under part 21 of this chapter and approvals based on identity under Section 21.303(c)(4) of this chapter." (It is recognized that the text of this paragraph is consistent with the last paragraph of the preamble material of the same section.)*

B) In the preamble material:

I) Section titled "General Discussion of the Proposed Rule," states:

(Located mid-section) *"Organizations that currently have individual designees could –*

- *Continue to use only those designees and operate under standard certification procedures;*
- *Chose to operate under an ODA rather than use individual designees; or*
- *Operate under both systems (but not on the same project or program), depending on the certification needs of the organization and the regulatory needs of the FAA"*

(II) Section titled "Transition to ODA Procedures," states:

*"...Also, all DAS, DOA, SFAR 36, and ODAR designations would be terminated."*

In summary of the preamble/NPRM text excerpts above, an existing ODAR holder with PMAs granted by part 21 licenses would both lose the ODAR and be ineligible to hold ODA, thus reverting back to a system with individually monitored DMIRs. Alternately, and actually worse, would be where a PMA holder has a P/N with aircraft eligibility established under both Test & Computation means in one case AND via part 21 license in another. In this case, is the same P/N to be inspected by ODA in one case and DMIR in the other? Either of these effects is obviously counter to the stated goal of a streamlined organizational delegation process and represents a decrease in FAA oversight efficiency. In addition, the creation and maintenance of two production/inspection systems will hinder or inhibit the ability of industry to produce and deliver airworthy parts.

Using the real case of Matsushita Avionics Systems Corp. (MAS) as case in point, it becomes clear that this situation is not trivial. MAS currently holds PMA on approximately 40,000 P/N-aircraft combinations, flying on approximately 80% of the world's fleets. In each of these, MAS is the designer and physical manufacturer of the part, but in the vast majority of cases – flying on every type of Boeing and Airbus aircraft – PMA was established via part 21 licenses from the manufacturers and/or contracted STC applicants, and are delivered under ODAR authority. While MAS fully intends to apply for ODA, a means must exist to efficiently handle the existing base of PMA items in support of both future installations and the continued airworthiness of the existing aircraft.

It is suggested here that a means must be developed for the continued support of existing MAS production under the ODA system, without reverting back to a DMIR system for pre-ODA product. This may be achieved by revision to or deletion of NPRM paragraph 183.47(d).

Sincerely,



Scott E. Toner  
Principal Certification Engineer, MAS