Which brings you here. Search on your part number
Which brings you here. **Two things to notice:**

1) Your P/N and the ‘Replacement For’ P/N are exactly the same.

This is because...
Which brings you here. **Two things to notice:**

2) **There is a licensing agreement to do so**
Question: Is this PMA part an ‘Alternate’ part as restricted in the customer’s PO T&C’s?

No it is not.

Question: Will your customer’s Receiving Inspectors accept these clearly marked PMA parts based on this?
Royboy, while we’re on it, is this an alternate?

This is clearly an alternate or substitute part number.
What about this one?

This too is clearly an alternate or substitute part number.
CASE 1: The Issues:

Lessons Learned:

• Before shipping, *always look at the customer’s PO* (when available). DO NOT ASSUME your ERP system and your own POs “covered all the bases.”
  • By the way, if it appears the customer’s PO is not posted, ask the salesperson if they have it. Many times it’s ‘forgotten’ or seemingly misplaced.

• Non-Incident Statements or Incident Clearance Statements, although not required by regulations, are a de-facto practice in the industry required by many customers.

• Although your customer may have restrictions on use of PMA parts, most PMA parts are in fact NOT alternate parts!
CASE 2: The customer requires an Overhauled part
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Approving Civil Aviation Authority/Country:</th>
<th>FAA/UNITED STATES</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>FOR ASATRAINING ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Form Tracking Number:</td>
<td>4343</td>
<td>4. Organization Name and Address:</td>
<td>RR Technics, 1234 West Kilburn Ave, Phoenix, AZ, 1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Work Order/Contract/Invoice Number:</td>
<td>991501</td>
<td>6. Item:</td>
<td>7 of 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Description:</td>
<td>Pressure Switch</td>
<td>8. Part Number:</td>
<td>CG12201R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Quantity:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10. Serial Number:</td>
<td>6167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Status/Work:</td>
<td>Overhauled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Remarks:</td>
<td>Part was Overhauled in accordance with CMM 29-38-01 revision 18 dated 12 October 2015, and detailed in attached Tear-Down Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14a. ☑ 14 CFR 43.9 Return to Service</th>
<th>☐ Other regulation specified in Block 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificate that unless otherwise specified in block 12, the work identified in Block 11 and described in Block 12 was accomplished in accordance with Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, part 43 and in respect to that work, the items are approved for return to service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14b. Authorized Signature:</th>
<th>14c. Approval Certificate No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joel Freeman</td>
<td>9FCM101J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14d. Name (Typed or Printed):</th>
<th>14e. Date (dd/mmm/yyyy):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joel Freeman</td>
<td>11/Mar/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

User/Installer Responsibilities

It is important to understand that the existence of this document alone does not automatically constitute authority to install the aircraft engine/propeller/article.

Where the user/installer performs work in accordance with the national regulations of an airworthiness authority different than the airworthiness authority of the country specified in Block 1, it is essential that the user/installer ensure that his/her airworthiness authority accepts aircraft engine(s)/propeller(s)/article(s) from the airworthiness authority of the country specified in Block 1.

Statements in Blocks 13a and 14a do not constitute installation certification. In all cases, aircraft maintenance records must contain an installation certification issued in accordance with the national regulations by the user/installer before the aircraft may be flown.
CASE 2:

The Tear-Down Report:

---

**RR TECHNICS**

FAA Repair Station 9PCM101J

Customer PO/RO: 991501  Received PN: CG12201R
Date Received: 1 March 2016  S/N: 6167
RRT Work Order: 4343  Work Performed: Repair
Removal Reason: Intermittent

PRELIMINARY INSPECTION: Connector shows signs of corrosion

---

1) Hipot Test: PASSED
2) Continuity Test: PASSED
3) Pressure Switching Test: ADJUSTED, PASSED
4) Final Test: PASSED
TECHNICIAN: [Signature]

Work Performed: Replaced connector, adjusted switch
Parts Replaced:
- 2 O-rings PN MS12345LM  Control 6789
- 1 Connector PN BACC12345RR77  Control 4567

RETURN TO SERVICE: Part was repaired in accordance with CMM 29-38-01 revision 16 dated 12 October 2015 and returned to service on 8130-3 number 4343

INSP: Joel Fream  DATE: 11 March 2017
See anything wrong with this picture besides the obvious?
CASE 2: The Issues:

1) The Serial Numbers don’t match

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Approving Civil Aviation Authority/Country:</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3. Form Tracking Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>991501</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6167</td>
<td>Overhauled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Authorized Release Certificate

Issued 12 October 2016, and detailed in attached Tear-Down Report

14a. ☑ 14 CFR 43.9 Return to Service ☐ Other regulation specified in Block 12

Certifies that unless otherwise specified in block 12, the work identified in Block 11 and described in Block 12 was accomplished in accordance with Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, part 43 and in respect to that work, the items are approved for return to service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14b. Authorized Signature:</th>
<th>14c. Approval Certificate No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joel Fremi</td>
<td>995CM101J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14d. Name (Typed or Printed):

Joel Fremi

14e. Date (dd/mm/yyyy):

11/Mar/2016
CASE 2: The Issues:

2) A Pin is bent!
HEY DOC:
Pull off those caps and look inside!
CASE 2: The Issues:

3) The Tear-Down Report also has the wrong S/N

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer PO/RO:</th>
<th>991501</th>
<th>Received PN:</th>
<th>CG12201R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Received:</td>
<td>1 March 2016</td>
<td>S/N:</td>
<td>6167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRT Work Order:</td>
<td>4343</td>
<td>Work Performed:</td>
<td>Repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal Reason:</td>
<td>Intermittent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRELIMINARY INSPECTION: Connector shows signs of corrosion

1) Hipot Test: PASSED
2) Continuity Test: PASSED
3) Pressure Switching Test: ADJUSTED, PASSED
4) Final Test: PASSED

TECHNICIAN: [Signature]

Work Performed: Replaced connector, adjusted switch
Parts Replaced: 2 O-rings PN MS12345LM Control 6789
1 Connector PN BACC12345RR77 Control 4567

RETURN TO SERVICE: Part was repaired in accordance with CMM 29-38-01 revision 16 dated 12 October 2015 and returned to service on 8130-3 number 4343

INSP: Joel Frem | DATE: 11 March 2017
CASE 2: The Issues:

4) The Tear-Down Report says the part was repaired, not overhauled
CASE 2: The Issues:

- Always cross check *all* the paperwork for part number and serial
  - Part
  - Tag
  - Tear down report if applicable

- Take off those caps and perform a visual inspection! BTW: If it's an ESD part, make sure you do this at the ESD station

- It is understood that the Tear-down report is not a document generated by yourself, but always check it. It's better you find any issues rather than your customer
BTW: Check out all the blogs! Note the latest is on Tear-Down reports

Take the time to leave a comment!

CAVU Café: Royboy’s Prose & Cons

THE VALUE OF TEAR-DOWN REPORTS
Some documents, as Rodney Dangerfield might say, "...

Read More
Posted By Roy Resto | 6/6/2017 12:17:36 PM | Comments (3)

AFTERMARKET TAGS: Overhauled vs. Repaired vs. 2 Years
Time to stir the pot again I continue to hear moa...

Read More
Posted By Roy Resto | 4/4/2017 1:42:45 PM | Comments (11)

PACKAGING OF AIRCRAFT PARTS
Would you like me to gift-wrap this for you? We wi...

Read More
Posted By Roy Resto | 2/1/2017 10:19:33 AM | Comments (10)

AIRCRAFT BIG DATA, ANALYTICS, AND THE AFTERMARKET
When I hear popular culture terms, I tend to borro...

Read More
Posted By Roy Resto | 12/1/2016 10:34:59 AM | Comments (4)

Consignment Refinement
Roy Resto is an experienced aviation industry professional having served in management positions with several firms, and is currently President of AIM Consulting Solutions. Most recently he was Vice President of Technical Operations for Tracer Corp. and Messier-Bugatti-Tracer, a family of aviation companies. Prior to this position, he was the COO of Quality Management Solutions LP, a consulting firm specializing in aircraft maintenance. In addition, Roy worked with American Airlines in their Maintenance and Engineering center where he retired as a level 5 Manager, and before that, with McDonnell Douglas. He was also a member of the US Air Force in the Reserves/ANG having served 32 years in Electronic Warfare and Avionics. Resto has served on the FAA’s Suspected Unapproved Parts Steering Committee and the Aviation Suppliers Association Board of Directors.

Roy has an MBA in Finance from Oklahoma City University, a BS from Oklahoma State University, an AAS in Avionics from the Community College of the Air Force, and is an Aviation High School graduate. Complementing these, he has an FAA A&P license, an FCC Radiotelephone license with a RADAR endorsement, is an FAA DAR (Designated Airworthiness Representative), Instrument Rated Pilot, and speaks fluent Spanish. His website is: www.AimSolutionsConsulting.com
That’s all folks!