LRM Material Specification – session comments

- Statement within beginning of document concerning that this document is a general guideline and there are other techniques – these are not requirements – specific intent of document should be stated – “man rated FAA structure” – different level of risk - “a means but not the only means” – language within document should be “guideline language” not “requirement language”
- Who is responsible to ensure quality and safety? Material Supplier / OEM – Document is not intended to move responsibility to material supplier – material supplier does not have control of end product in the case of LRM – different from prepreg – material supplier comes under the OEM quality system
- Certification/Acceptance tests should be reduced to key characteristics
- Classification of parts should be added to document (Must comply with FAA needs, PSEs, Critcal parts)
- Look at level change criteria with respect to prepreg document – make LRM specific – align with MIL-17 change Table
- Discussion of the use of caul plates and single sided molded processes
- Clean room requirements – why? – too specific – possibly reduce

LRM Material Specification – session comments

- For second source – discuss process to qualify and demonstrate allowables
- Equivalence baseline database – why equivalency baseline database (wording?) – page 41
- Binder changes in the future
- What is a batch definition for a cured product? – common to mix resin batches for infusion processes

LRM Material Procurement Specification Path Forward

- Identify applicability of document
- Reinforce document provides guidelines as means of showing compliance to requirements. Eliminate “shall” terminology. Provide examples.
- Evaluate testing requirements: certification, receiving inspection, and qualification.
- Address one-part and two-part resins
- Clarify division of responsibility between suppliers, part fabricators, end-user, and OEM.
- Clarify change level definitions.
- Clarify cured composite definition.