

## Audit Reporting and Follow Up

Page 1

|   |                                   |              |                           |
|---|-----------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| <b>MAA Audit Report</b>                 |                                   |              |                           |
| <b>Project Security classification:</b> | Unclassified                      |              |                           |
| <b>Project(s) Title:</b>                | CAMO/CERT/2012/051                |              |                           |
| <b>CAMO:</b>                            | Vigilant T Mk 1 and Viking T Mk 1 |              |                           |
| <b>Completed by:</b>                    | Mr [REDACTED]                     | <b>Date:</b> | 16 Dec 2013               |
| <b>Reviewed by:</b>                     | Cdr [REDACTED] RN                 | <b>Date:</b> | 17 Dec 2013               |
| <b>Audit title and ref:</b>             | CAMO/CERT/2012/051                |              |                           |
| <b>Audit client:</b>                    | DG MAA                            |              |                           |
| <b>Audit team:</b>                      | Mr [REDACTED]                     | <b>Post:</b> | MAA Audit Lead            |
|   | Lt Cdr [REDACTED] RN              | <b>Post:</b> | MAA Auditor               |
| <b>Principal Auditees:</b>              | Gp Capt [REDACTED]                | <b>Post:</b> | DDH                       |
|   | Wg Cdr [REDACTED]                 | <b>Post:</b> | 22 Gp MOD CAM             |
|   | Wg Cdr [REDACTED]                 | <b>Post:</b> | Glider Eng SO1            |
|   | Sqn Ldr [REDACTED]                | <b>Post:</b> | SO2 Safety                |
|   | Sqn Ldr [REDACTED]                | <b>Post:</b> | 22 Gp CAMO QM             |
|   | Sqn Ldr [REDACTED]                | <b>Post:</b> | SO2 EFT                   |
|   | Sqn Ldr [REDACTED]                | <b>Post:</b> | CMT                       |
|   | WO [REDACTED]                     | <b>Post:</b> | 22 Gp WO Ass              |
|   | FS [REDACTED]                     | <b>Post:</b> | FS EFT                    |
|   | Mr [REDACTED]                     | <b>Post:</b> | Hullavington Team Ldr     |
|   | Mr [REDACTED]                     | <b>Post:</b> | SERCO Trg                 |
|   | Mr [REDACTED]                     | <b>Post:</b> | MFTS PT                   |
|   | Mr [REDACTED]                     | <b>Post:</b> | SERCO Chf Eng (part time) |
|   | Mr [REDACTED]                     | <b>Post:</b> | SERCO Maint Ctrlr         |
|   | Mr [REDACTED]                     | <b>Post:</b> | SERCO QA                  |
|   | Mr [REDACTED]                     | <b>Post:</b> | MFTS PT                   |
|   | Mr [REDACTED]                     | <b>Post:</b> | SERCO Docs Ctrl           |
|   | Mr [REDACTED]                     | <b>Post:</b> | 3 FTS QA                  |
| <b>Audit dates:</b>                     | 25 Nov to 10 Dec 13               |              |                           |



|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Audit locations:</b>                         | RAF Syerston, RAFC Cranwell, Hullavington VGS, Bldg 1300   |
| <b>Audit scope, criteria and objectives:</b>    | <p>1. MAA audit question set covering the RA 4900 Series (MRP Part M Sub Part G) continuing airworthiness management responsibilities.</p> <p>2. The objective was to evaluate the adequacy and effectiveness of the Vigilant T Mk 1 and Viking T Mk 1 CAMO and ensure, through the content of the submitted CAME, that the organization is compliant with the requirements of MRP Part M Sub Part G.</p> <p>3. This audit did not include assessment of MRP Part M Sub Part I (Military Airworthiness Review Process (MARP)). This will need to be assessed and approved at a subsequent date, once the MARP regulations have been implemented by 22 Gp with regards to Viking and Vigilant gliders.</p>  |
| <b>Description of approach and methodology:</b> | <p>4. Desktop review of the CAME and supporting documents referenced in the CAME conducted prior to the on-site visit (OSV). Feedback was provided to the SO2 EFT CAMO on a MAA Form 7, this highlighted the lack of clarity of key posts carrying out MRP Part M Sub Part G activity and detail of what procedures were being followed. This was being actioned by the CAMO prior to the OSV.</p> <p>5. On-site assessment was conducted, consisting of interviews with key personnel undertaking CAMO activity on behalf of the MOD CAM. During these interviews personnel were requested to either demonstrate compliance with a procedure or provide hard copy evidence to support any statements they made. Records of each interview and copies of evidence presented to the MAA audit team have been retained and are held as separate enclosures in supporting evidence folders.</p> |
| <b>CAMO Engagement:</b>                         | <p>6. Prior to the OSV the MAA conducted an informal discussion with 22 Gp SO2 EFT and FS EFT, on 22 Oct 13. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the scope and conduct of the OSV and inform the CAMO of the shortcomings of the submitted exposition, identified during the desk top review.</p> <p>7. The MOD CAM should discuss the findings of this approval application with the relevant stake holders in order to determine and agree the actions required to address the identified shortfalls against the MRP. This will ensure that the CAMO is able to adequately demonstrate compliance with the requirements of MRP Part M Sub Part G, through an effective CAME.</p> <p>8. This report contains 6 Level 2 findings,</p>   |
| <b>Areas of strength:</b>                       | <p>9. All personnel within SERCO GMS undertaking MRP Part M Sub Part G activity were conducting their business to a good standard, and there were no immediate airworthiness concerns that needed to be addressed. These personnel clearly demonstrated compliance with regulation, local procedures and fully embraced the CAMO concept.</p> <p>10. FS EFT is carrying out assurance visits at the VGS sites and has already begun to identify shortfalls in existing processes and procedures. A more formal plan is required to establish a route to rectify the shortfalls.</p> <p>11. The establishment of FTRS MOD CAM and FS CAM posts at RAFC Cranwell will strengthen the CAMO and place responsibility at the correct location with the DDH IAW RAs.</p> <p>12. When interviewees were asked if CAMO added value to airworthiness, there was a positive response from all.</p>     |
| <b>Summary of Findings:</b>                     | <p>13. At the time of the approval visit the MOD CAM was not co-located with the DDH in accordance with RA 1016(1) and no Alternative Acceptable Means of Compliance has been applied for.</p> <p><b>(Level 2 Finding, RA 1016, CAMO/CERT/2012/051/001)</b></p> <p>14. The approval team were unable to satisfy themselves that the CAME clearly articulated the organization's scope of work or fully detailed the procedures for how the</p>   |



|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>CAMO ensures compliance with MRP Part M Sub Part G regulation in accordance with RA 4943(1).</p> <p><b>(Level 2 Finding, RA 4943(1), CAMO/CERT/2012/051/002)</b></p> <p>15. It was unclear to the audit team how the CAMO established that they have sufficient suitably qualified and experienced personnel for the expected work or how the competence of personnel was being assessed and recorded in accordance with RA 4945(3).</p> <p><b>(Level 2 Finding, RA 4945(3), CAMO/CERT/2012/051/003)</b></p> <p>16. During the audit it was evident from the personnel interviewed that the CAMO was in not in control of all aspects of continuing airworthiness management in accordance with RA 4947(1).</p> <p><b>(Level 2 Finding, RA 4947(1), CAMO/CERT/2012/051/004 )</b></p> <p>17. The approval team were unable to establish how the CAMO quality system would verify the continued adequacy and effectiveness of all continuing airworthiness processes underpinning the MRP Part M Sub Part G regulated activities in accordance with RA 4951.</p> <p><b>(Level 2 Finding, RA 4951, CAMO/CERT/2012/051/005)</b></p> <p>18. Faults reported, or those discovered during scheduled maintenance, on the Vigilant T Mk 1 and Viking T Mk 1 are not managed by a Military Maintenance Organization or MRP/Mil Part 145 Approved Maintenance Organization in accordance with RA 4947(1)(e).</p> <p><b>(Level 2 Finding, RA 4947, CAMO/CERT/2012/051/006)</b></p> |
| <b>Other issues requiring attention:</b> | <p>19. It is understood that DQAFF are contracted to conduct independent audit activity at GMS. However, the audit team could find no evidence of this, therefore it could not be established whether all contracted maintenance is captured within DQAFF's contracted scope of activity. The required gap analysis between contracted maintenance activity and DQAFF tasking has yet to be conducted.</p> <p>20. The audit team will require early engagement between the new incumbent of the MOD CAM post to identify roles and responsibilities of the new CAMO, including the subsequent interaction of the CAMO QM in support of new MOD CAM.</p> <p>21. The audit team were unable to identify the configuration status report, CSR. This needs to be identified and articulated correctly in the CAME.</p> <p>22. There was evidence that there was a lack of maintenance programme analysis. The audit team was notified of a RCM contract that was about to be signed off by the PT. The evidence of this will be reviewed at the CAP surveillance visit,</p> <p>23. The audit team noticed during the interviews that there was a lack of orders being reviewed to identify if changes to maintenance programme is required and that orders are being followed to conduct aircraft maintenance, ie it is not necessarily approved data.</p>  |
| <b>Conclusions:</b>                      | <p>24. The organization currently lacks maturity and the oversight and control required for the issue of a MRP Part M approval. Therefore, the MAA will conduct a further initial approval visit once the DDH is content that the findings have been adequately addressed, the CAMO has full control of all MRP Part M activity and a full compliance audit against the MRP requirements has been conducted by the CAMO Quality Manager.</p> <p>15. The MOD CAM must respond to these findings with a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) or closure within 28 days from release of this report. Formal MAA approval of 22 Gp Glider CAMO will <b>not</b> be issued until all findings have been closed or a MAA agreed CAP is in place.</p>   |