

APPENDIX C

Table 1. Reassessment Criteria for Re-certification: Critical Technical Items List

Question for Applicant	Pool of Potentially Affected Airplanes	Implications for Affected Applicants
1. Was full takeoff power used throughout the reference flight path in the determination of the lateral noise level? [3.6.2.1(c), Chap. 3, Annex 16, Vol. 1]	Airplanes certificated prior to Amendment 5 (6 Nov 97).	Re-analysis that could result in a higher lateral noise level (≤ 0.8 dB).
2. Were symmetrical microphones used at every position for the determination of the lateral noise level? [3.3.2.2, Annex 16, Vol. 1]	Propeller-driven large airplanes certificated prior to Amendment 5 (6 Nov 97).	Re-analysis that could result in higher or lower lateral noise level (< 0.5 dB) or re-testing ¹ if symmetrical microphone data does not exist. ¹
3. Was the approach noise level demonstrated at the noisiest configuration? [3.6.3.1(e), Chap. 3, Annex 16, Vol. 1]	Propeller-driven large airplanes certificated prior to Amendment 3 (17 Nov 88).	Re-analysis or re-testing that could result in higher approach level (< 1.5 dB).
4. Was the “average engine” rather than the “minimum engine” power used for the calculation of the take-off reference path? [3.6.2.1(a) and 3.6.2.1(g), Chap. 3, Annex 16, Vol. 1]	Airplanes certificated prior to Amendment 3 (17 Nov 88).	Re-analysis that could result in lower flyover noise level (≤ 0.7 dB) and higher lateral noise level (≤ 0.5 dB).
5. Was the simplified procedure used and, if so, was 7.5log used in the slant distance duration correction? [9.3.3.2, App. 2, Annex 16, Vol. 1]	Airplanes certificated prior to Amendment 2 (21 Nov 85).	Re-calculation that could result in higher or lower flyover (< 1.0 dB), lateral (< 0.2 dB), and approach levels (± 0.3 dB).
6. Was the take-off reference speed between V_2+10 and V_2+20 ? [3.6.2.1(d), Chap. 3, Annex 16, Vol. 1]	Airplanes certificated prior to First Edition (26 Nov 81).	Re-calculation that could result in higher lateral and lower flyover noise levels if speed was greater than V_2+20 (< 0.2 dB).
7. Was the 100% weighted average used for the simulation of the SLOW response? [Note 1 to 3.4.5, App. 2, Annex 16, Vol. 1]	Airplanes certificated prior to Amendment 5 (6 Nov 97).	Re-calculation that could result in higher noise levels (< 0.2 dB)
8. Was test conducted at site below 366 m (1200 ft) MSL and, if not, did calculation include jet source noise correction? [App. 6, ETM]	Jet airplanes certificated prior to Amendment 5 (6 Nov 97).	Re-calculation that could result in higher noise levels (< 0.5 dB)
9. Was lateral noise level determined by a number of flights over a range of heights? [2.1.3.2(b), ETM]	Jet airplanes with bypass ratio less than 2 and certificated prior to Amendment 5 (6 Nov 97).	Re-analysis or re-testing that could result in a different lateral level (< 0.3 dB).
10. Did the test assure that the airspeed was appropriate for the mass of the airplane? [3.1.2(a), ETM]	Propeller-driven large airplanes certificated prior to 1990.	Re-analysis that could result in higher flyover and lateral noise levels (< 0.5 dB).
11. In statistically pooling static and flight data, was the ETM guidance followed (Appendix 1)? [App. 1, ETM]	Airplanes certificated under ‘family plan’ prior to 1980.	Re-testing if confidence interval limitation was exceeded.
12. Did static engine test include the use of turbulence control screen (TCS) or inflow control device (ICD)? [2.3.3.4.1, ETM]	Jet airplanes certificated under ‘family plan’ prior to 1980.	Re-analysis or re-testing that could result in different noise levels (most likely to affect approach level).

⁰ Could use full power flyover alternative in accordance with Amendment 6.