



c/o BINDT  
 The Newton Building  
 St. Georges Avenue  
 Northampton  
 NN2 6JB  
 Tel: +44 (0) 1604 893857  
 Secretary: jennifer.cook@bindt.org

**CONFIRMED NOTES OF THE 44<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE  
 UK NATIONAL AEROSPACE NDT BOARD**

Meeting Date: 4 September 2013, 10:00  
 Location: BINDT HQ, Northampton

**NANDTB/2013/M4 rev A**

- 1. Confirmation of the agenda (and any other business)**
- 2. Attendance & apologies for absence (Annex A)**

As per attached attendance sheet.

- 3. Notes of the 43<sup>rd</sup> meeting (distributed earlier)**

- a. Confirmation

The Board reviewed the minutes and they were approved.

- b. Review of allocated actions below with special mention to the following;

**13/2013** – C Sinclair advised the Board members, it was imperative that a statement is placed on the website about the status of UK NANDTB and overseas affiliations as enquiries are constantly being received with no information formally published by the Board.

**31/2013** – K Phillips clarified that only one member per prime company is required to witness and audit.

Again, the Board raised their concerns regarding BINDT auditors and audit processes, specifically that they require auditors to hold relevant NDT Level 3 qualifications in order to review specific examination questions at the agency audits. It was argued that the requirement was unrealistic in expecting auditors to hold level 3 qualifications in all scopes covering agency approvals.

C Sinclair reiterated that not all companies require witnessing only the auditors. T Blacklay suggested that the Board witness one full audit cycle against the updated checklist in order to satisfy themselves and for the audits to 'settle down'. K Phillips stated that one audit per year, per prime company should be witnessed, especially audits not carried out by Karen Reader. It was felt that witnessing audits would provide agencies with the opportunity to speak directly to Primes/Board members and to show that the Board is covering its remit.

K Phillips also added that ALL members should take on an equal share of the workload for example; audit witnessing, working groups and question reviews instead of ignoring their responsibilities as Board members.

Ref	Actions brought forward	Remarks
06/2013	C Worrall (LEAD), G McCully, C Thomas, T Blacklay, S Algar to review NANDTB-18. Comments to be submitted to J Cook by close of business 5th April 2013 for implementation with approval at the next meeting.	Ongoing Document update to be postponed until publication of new issue EN 4179

08/2013	B Scott (LEAD), C Worrall, D Griffin to create a new document, NANDTB-27, on policy. Comments to be submitted to J Cook by close of business 5th April 2013 for implementation with approval at the next meeting.  WG members to arrange teleconference in order to move forward	Ongoing
13/2013	K Phillips (LEAD), B Scott, N Scutt, C Durrant, S Algar P Berkley, A Williams, C Dootson, J Biddulph to review and amend NANDTB-21 document	Ongoing WG to continue outside the main meetings.
21/2013	N Scutt to arrange a date for the review of ET questions	Action reallocated 35/2013
24/2013	K Phillips to collate suggestions from members on 'what the UK NANDTB wants the forum to achieve' and will issue to T Blacklay.	Ongoing (action re-allocated to KP from JB)
27/2013	K Phillips to formalise a response to Jes Dugard/Toby Jefferson at the MOD advising of the rejected nomination and requesting a new, suitable nomination.	Complete
28/2013	R Bright/S Algar to review NANDTB_17 by the next meeting	Amended document to be circulated to members for approval by email prior to next meeting in October.
29/2013	K Phillips to draft letter to EASA informing them of the Board's decision to no longer accept future, overseas affiliations. <b>(relates to 13/2013)</b>	Ongoing Pending amendment to NANDTB-21
30/2013	C Sinclair to come back to the board with a proposal to present to the board.	Complete
31/2013	ALL UK NANDTB members, who have not already done so, to review the oversight matrix and confirm an audit of their choice with J Cook.  T Blacklay to formally write to Primes' employers explaining that oversight of audits is a necessity.	Complete Oversight matrix on the forum and audit dates to be circulated via email once agreed.
32/2013	ALL members - comments to T Blacklay for changes to Part 145.	Ongoing No comments received to date.

c. Other matters arising (not covered by the agenda)

No matters were raised.

**4. Membership (current list)**

**a. Status update of Chairman including Chair and Vice Chair election -**

It was noted that J Biddulph tendered his resignation as Chairman of UKNANDTB on 17<sup>th</sup> August 2013 due to a secondment which bases him in the USA for a 3 month period, it was noted that J Biddulph was to remain a Board member.

The Board discussed the options of replacement and after a proposal by K Phillips, seconded by B Scott and it was agreed by all members that K Phillips should remain in the position of 'Acting' Chairman and confirm in the December 2013 meeting if J Biddulph would like to return as Chairman. The NANDTB-06 would be updated accordingly.

**b. MAA member status**

The Board were advised that Paul Marshall officially retired 30 August 2013. As an observing member of the board P Marshall requested that the

**Action 33/2013 - T Blacklay to contact Paul Marshall/Wg Cdr Mark Stubbs to clarify the Boards requirements of MAA observing members.**

**c. Response from MoD on rejected nominee**

An email response from Jes Dugard was presented to the Board. The email expressed disappointment of the Board's decision to reject their nominee but advised that the MoD would defer its nominee until they hold internal discussions.

**d. To note status and confirm contact details**

The status of the membership list including pending amendments to incorporate the chairman changes was accepted.

**5. Documents for discussion and/or approval -**

**a. See table of documents NANDTB\_01**

NANDTB documents 17, 21 and 24 are due amendments.

NANDTB\_17 had been assigned action 28/2013.

NANDTB\_21 had been assigned to action 13/2013. To be reviewed and amended at a working group meeting to be held outside the UK NANDTB meetings. AD-008 to be published once NANDTB\_21 has been reviewed and aligned.

Finally, NANDTB\_24 will be reviewed once the new ISO standard is published.

**b. AD005 Reinstatement of Certification after Termination of Employment**

A follow up query was put to the Board on their view of a specific NCR raised by Nadcap.

A supplier had received a Nadcap NCR because the employer, having reviewed qualification from an individual's previous employment with another company, decided not to administer a general theory exam. Consequently, the UK NANDTB considered at the time that a general theory exam administered by a BINDT approved organisation was equivalent to an ASNT or EN473 cert being accepted in lieu of the general exam following policy

criteria set in advisory 005.

J Biddulph contacted PRI/Nadcap to seek clarification on their opinion of the advisory. A response was received from PRI/Nadcap Staff Engineers confirming that they are 'happy' with AD005 as it currently stands, therefore remaining valid, providing it remains Board policy.

**c. AD008 Overseas Affiliation to the UK NANDTB**

The advisory was circulated to Board members prior to the meeting. K Phillips explained that as it currently stands, the document is in direct conflict with the NANDTB\_21 so cannot yet be published. It was expressed that the documents need to be aligned as a matter of urgency so that the advisory can be published and circulated to all affected parties, especially to agencies.

C Sinclair requested that when the revised NANDTB\_21 document is uploaded on the website the 'review date' should state '**continuous**'. All members were in agreement.

N Scutt recommended that D Griffin take the place of C Thomas on the overseas affiliation working group (referred to hereafter as 13/2013 WG) as TEG representation is necessary.

**6. Overseas Affiliations - Working Group update - Presentation - (KP)**

Following from item 5c above, K Phillips urged as many members of the 13/2013 WG as possible to meet face-to-face, if impossible to meet then members must join the meeting via WebEx/teleconference.

13/2013 WG members are as follows; K Phillips (LEAD), B Scott, D Griffin (TEG), N Scutt, C Durrant, C Dootson, S Algar, P Berkley, A Williams and J Biddulph.

**Action 13/2013 – K Phillips to arrange working group meeting teleconference/WebEx/face-to-face.**

**7. BINDT Audit and Approval of Training and Examination Organisations - Update/Presentation - (C Sinclair)**

C Sinclair re-iterated the reasoning behind the review of BINDT audit processes and presented a proposal on the current position on BINDT support to UK NANDTB.

C Sinclair explained that it is the view of BINDT that in all industry sectors, the employer has the ultimate responsibility to ensure that their employees are competent. Sometimes this is expressed

as ensuring that 'suitably qualified and experienced personnel' (SQEP) are deployed. Different sectors and different companies within sectors are generally free to adopt any process they wish to 'SQEP' their employees.

For NDT, many employers choose to put their employees through a central certification process which indicates that the respective employees meet a certain standard. In the case of PCN, this standard complies with (and, in many aspects, exceeds) the requirements of BS EN ISO 9712: 2012. In many applications, this is both suitable and sufficient; meaning that the possession of a relevant PCN certificate indicates competence to do a specific job of work. In many other applications, however, the possession of a relevant PCN certificate is suitable but is not sufficient and the employer must provide additional bespoke training and assessment to demonstrate competence.

In the aerospace industry, employer-based certification is mandated. In effect, the regulatory bodies have determined that, for aerospace components and systems, in-manufacture and in-service inspection is sufficiently specialised that generic central certification of employees undertaking NDT work is not sufficient. This does not mean that PCN certification, for example, does not add value. Rather it means that, for aerospace applications, PCN is suitable but not sufficient.

The proposal was also circulated to CAA representatives T Blacklay and S Algar for comment, T Blacklay advised that until EASA have reviewed their requirements there would be no comment on the proposal.

The members took on Board BINDT's views and agreed to setup a working group to review the proposal outside of the NANDTB meetings (via WebEx/teleconference) with a view to responding at the next meeting (16 October 2013). The following members volunteered to join the working group; K Griffiths, G McLeod, B Scott, C Dootson (Lead), G McCully, T Blacklay, R Bright, N Scutt.

**Action 34/2013 – C Dootson to arrange working group teleconference/WebEx meeting to discuss BINDT proposal.**

Concerns were raised about the possible eradication of PCN Aero certification if the Board decided not to recognise the certification scheme and its qualifications due the audit process not meeting the Board's standards and expectations.

**8. Aerospace question review update - (N Scutt)**

It was advised by N Scutt that Aerospace specific, Radiography and Ultrasonic Testing levels 2 and 3 questions were reviewed and some questions were eliminated; some were suitably reallocated and/or amended.

The next review required is for Eddy Current questions.

**Action 35/2013 – N Scutt to email Board members for volunteers for the Eddy Current specific, questions review.**

When all method questions have been reviewed, the areas that do not cover the syllabus would be highlighted and questions created, these new questions would then require review.

N Scutt also advised that the Board carry out a necessary review of the PCN Aerospace syllabus document, it was stated that the document does not reflect CEN TR25107 which covers both general and specific criteria.

The PCN Aerospace Z1 syllabus document was presented and compared with the PCN GEN (NDT) Z1 training syllabus document. Currently the Aerospace Z1 does not separate general and specific and does not meet the requirements of the ISO 9712 standard which refers to TR25107.

N Scutt recommended that a member of the Board volunteer to represent the Aerospace industry on the newly reconstituted GTC (General Technical Committee). It was explained that the GTC, which is a sub-committee of the PCN Certification Management Committee (CMC), would be concerned with technical matters relating to the certification of personnel engaged in Testing, Inspection or Engineering Asset Management. Overall the Board felt that representation was important. G McCully volunteered to represent Aerospace/UK NANDTB on the GTC and report back. A Williams proposed the nomination of G McCully for the GTC all were in favour.

**Action 36/2013 – N Scutt to circulate the GTC constitution (PCN/3) to Board members.**

**Action 37/2013 – K Phillips to issue a letter to N Scutt, formally nominating G McCully as the GTC representative of the Aerospace industry & UK NANDTB.**

The Board agreed that the GTC should review the PCN Aerospace Z1 syllabus document and draft a revision which should then be brought back to the Board for approval.

**Action 38/2013 – N Scutt to ensure the PCN Aerospace Z1 is added to the first GTC agenda, G McCully to lead the review of this document on the GTC.**

## **9. Qualifying Agencies**

D Griffin brought to the Boards attention a conflict of interest regarding the review of audit reports. Due to Airbus providing commercial training at the new Testia (EADS) facility in Newport it was noted that K Phillips had a commercial interest. K Phillips advised that EADS would be changing their name to The Airbus Group, although Testia Ltd currently hold no approvals, he was listed at the chief technical officer for the organisation, so is privy to sensitive information. K Phillips therefore agreed to be omitted from the oversight of audits and review of audit reports for Agencies/Training and Examination organisations.

### **a. Oversight Matrix - Update**

It was noted that there were still a number of members not volunteering to witness Aerospace audits. The Board mentioned that due to time and costs incurred it was difficult for members to attend audits.

It was re-iterated that T Blacklay write a letter to Primes' employers to request attendance at audits and asked if the CAA could possibly observe.

**Action 39/2013, T Blacklay to formally correspond with Primes' employers advising why it is important that members of UK NANDTB attend and witness audits of Aerospace agencies/training & examination centres.**

### **b. New applications**

No new applications had been received.

### **c. Audit comments**

Questions from a BINDT agency auditor were presented to the Board for formal response;

First, EN4179 section 7.1.3 states that specific exams SHALL be open book ...Reference material ....MAY be provided. Questions using such material SHALL require understanding.

It was noted that there was little consistency between examinations regarding how the requirement is discharged e.g. guidance on how many questions should use reference material and therefore require understanding and whether it is acceptable to call an exam open book but choose not to supply any reference material and therefore only use fairly simple 'memory call' type questions which don't show understanding of the text. Finally if the responsible level 3 designates the exam 'open book' but chooses not to provide reference material then questions are a memory test and can be simplistic but would still be allowed under EN4179 section 7.1.3.

The Board responded – the new draft of EN4179 states that reference material SHALL be provided but the exam should not be referred to as 'open book'. The number of questions should be at the discretion of the responsible level 3.

Second, EN4179 section 7.1.3.5 states that the Level 3 candidate shall demonstrate proficiency by preparing an NDT procedure or work instruction appropriate to the employer's current requirements although there is no consistency regarding the level of procedure which is accepted for this exam e.g. a PT work instruction may be a simple process flow chart and in this case the Level 3 practical, procedure writing is no harder than the work instruction/technique writing aspect of the Level 2 practical. What is acceptable?

The Board responded – that this is not acceptable, the procedure should be marked against the marking checklist.

Third, the checklist OAQS7 6.2.1 states that the outside agency should review the client's written practice - from the meeting when the checklist was devised, this requirement was included for the school to identify the specific employer's examination requirements. Therefore if the school asks the necessary questions about exam requirements via their contract review procedure but does not actually see the written practice would this be acceptable? And what should the school do if the client will not provide their written practice?

The Board responded – personnel must provide the written practice, and specific questions should be created based on that practice. If no written practice is submitted then the individual must not be examined showing what is 'appropriate' for a particular level how should this question be interpreted?

Fourth, the checklist OAQS-7 sections 8.4 and 8.10 asks whether examination questions are at an appropriate level but EN4179, whilst defining different levels, does not say specifically that the difficulty of the questions should vary between the levels. In the absence of any criteria or published examples showing what is 'appropriate' for a particular level how should this question be interpreted?

The Board responded – questions should be at the appropriate level of difficulty, the Board agreed that it was at the auditor's discretion whether the questions were felt to be 'appropriate'.

**d. Audit approvals (online) –**

It was noted that there are consistent number non conformances raised for the conduct of initial training at an OA/IA organisation which does not hold ATO approval. J Cook requested that the Board discuss creating an advisory for OAs and IAs regarding initial training requirements with a view to authorising 12 month transitions to those organisations which have not already been granted time to apply for ATO status due to this continuing issue which requires addressing.

Overall the Board disagreed and argued that the requirement for OA/IAs to hold ATO status in order to conduct initial training was

**10. ANDTBF including NAS410/EN4179 update - (KP)**

No recent meetings held, therefore, no updates were available.

**11. Regulators update - (TB)**

T Blacklay reported that an EASA European forum coordination group meeting was held on July 24<sup>th</sup> 2013. The meeting discussed an EASA rule making task which has been allocated to the CAA specifically to T Blacklay to look at part 145 D ratings. It was advised that the review had been split into 3 sections, with the D rating, NDT, being covered first.

To review the rating and the qualifications of NDT personnel, T Blacklay compared A30 (F) and A30 (E) of part 145. T Blacklay had delivered a number of presentations and learnt from this that EN 4179 produces a framework to comply with the requirements of A30 (E) not A30 (F). One of the first discussions was held and covered the question of EN 4179 being the most appropriate qualification or should ISO 9712 be used as a part 145 requirement for maintenance approvals. The attendees of the meeting were K Phillips, J Biddulph, T Blacklay, an EASA representative and other European members.

T Blacklay advised that the outcome of the meeting was that EN 4179 had its limitations but there was a potential system in place, making it the best option, although it was added, if the group were approaching the topic with no other system in place then the decision could have been different and that things could still change. The definition of NDT was also reviewed which resulted in the discovery of a conflict within part 145 with reference to guidance material, NDT is referred to as defined by the type certificate holder whereas further down the document, NDT is referred to as defined in EN 4179.

Further discussion took place on the competency and the role of an NANDT Board. T Blacklay advised that although EASA and NAAs *have* good auditors and audit processes, there *are no formally trained NDT personnel employed by EASA or European NAAs thus an assessment of the quality of training and examinations cannot be undertaken during competent authority surveillance audits*. It was also noted that part 145 states that a Board oversees examinations but not training, although the GR 23 does state training as well, it was clarified that this was a review of Part 145 only.

EASA and the NAA's have requested some means of saying that examinations that contribute to showing competency of NDT personnel are valid, but it would be difficult to fulfil such a request,

Where part 145 refers to examinations being under the control of a NANDT Board, four alternative options were presented, although the options are to be reviewed and finalised. Option 1 could see an amendment to part 145 stating explicitly what the obligations and the role of a Board should be, which would mean that EASA would require a NANDTB have responsibility for a lot more within their remit as a Board including overseas affiliates. Option 2, may see the removal of the requirement for an NANDT Board, therefore, placing the onus on the responsible level 3, although this may give the NAAs difficulty assessing the quality of the training. Option 3, would see a certification body constituted within European law to ISO 17024 that provides approvals for training and examinations, this would not be central certification, but would be in line with EN 4179. The control of the training and examinations would be under the remit of EASA and CAA not a National NDT Board. Option 4, lay the control wholly within EASAs system and put it through

part 147. This would mean everything would be totally controlled by the NAAs and part 147 would need to be changed to include the scope of NDT, this route would possibly eradicate EN 4179 and use central certification therefore dissolving the NANDT Board.

It was noted that there was only one option which had the requirement of an NANDT Board and within options 2, 3 and 4 overseas affiliations would be acceptable i.e. option 2, overseas training/examination would be at the decision of the responsible level 3, option 3, overseas training/examination would be through a certification body, option 4, overseas training/examination would be through an approved part 147 organisation.

Option 1, would accept overseas affiliations because the remit and responsibilities of a NANDT Board would be changed to ensure overseas affiliations are accepted, the only problem being the willingness of the NANDT Board accepting them.

EASA to circulate the finalised options possibly in January for comments and agreement, then revise part 145 accordingly.

**Continuing action 32/2013, ALL members – comments to T Blacklay for changes to Part 145 including comments on the 4 options discussed above.**

## **12. TEG Report - (DG)**

D Griffin reported that the last TEG meeting was held on 4<sup>th</sup> July 2013. The meeting focused on the pilot of the PCN online examinations which was an overall success, also discussed was the subject of the UK NANDTB decision to reject future overseas affiliations. It was noted that this change had caused a lot of grievance to organisations because they are losing business, money and losing regulation of overseas personnel.

The TEG committee requested that D Griffin ask the NANDTB if they would reconsider their decision on overseas affiliations.

C Sinclair advised that BINDT sees restricting training/examinations to the UK as an element of partiality, although the Board are entitled refuse overseas affiliations it forces another tension between the Board and BINDT whose operations are global. It was clarified that all (International) BINDT examination and training organisations are invited to attend TEG meetings, they receive all TEG correspondence, minutes and updates and can forward comments to the committee if attendance is not an option.

The Board as a whole agreed that the NANDTB\_21 requires amendment to reflect the decision to no longer accept future affiliations, bringing it in line with advisory 008. Once the process and document has been reviewed, it would be marked as a continual review process/document, therefore, any decision changes to the policy could be reviewed after it reflects the Board's decision, although it was stated that the decision may not change.

The Board advised that the French NANDTB does accept overseas affiliations, although the CAA suggested their process for affiliations was tenuous.

## **13. Pt. 145 Orgs, QAs and SIG members Update - (GMc)**

Questions raised for the Boards response were presented.

Following a recent OA audit it was queried why a Level 3 Procedure had not been marked against the usual marking guide. The reason was historic, if a candidate had provided a Procedure under the 3 month rule it was deemed an approved document and therefore graded with a minimum of 80%. Clarification was requested on whether this was acceptable or whether the auditor was correct by saying that the procedure should still be marked and graded against the marking guide?

The Board responded – Part 145 organisations must mark against a marking guide and use the marking checklist. It was also noted that the new version of EN 4179 shows that candidates will have to write a procedure then and there.

A scenario was presented to the Board. If an OA were to mark a weak procedure that ended in the candidate failing, what are the responsibilities of the OA? Do they inform the candidate's employer that they are using an inadequate document or do they do nothing and assume that the employer would take the necessary action to rectify the procedure on the basis of the exam failure notice?

The Board responded – the Board stated that this would be down to the OAs discretion and that the Board would be working outside their remit if they officially answer question. Although it was an opinion of the Board that if a candidate fails, their employer should be informed.

Regarding the use of logo's, the Board only requires the removal of its logo from certificates issued to NDT personnel operating outside the UK or at organisations affiliated to the Board as

listed in NANDTB/21 to avoid personnel working for overseas organisations not affiliated to the UK NANDTB thinking they are under the control of the UK NANDTB. Is this correct?

The Board responded – the UK NANDTB will only allow its logo to be used on training and examination certificates issued to those overseas organisations where affiliation has been agreed. This is to protect the UK NANDTB from the assumption that a training and/or examination certificate with the UK NANDTB logo indicates that the training and/or examination is under the general control of the UK NANDTB.

The last question related to companies that exist in a country where there is a National Aerospace Board in existence what is the mechanism for control of the examinations for these countries e. g. is several Aerospace Boards have given an OA their approval to conduct NDT training and examinations based on their BINDT approval and hence UK NANDTB recognition. Under these circumstances who should have control of the examinations?

The Board responded – if the other (not UK) Board has authorised the OA to conduct their training and examinations then that National Board will assume the risk, not UK NANDTB or BINDT.

#### **14. Any other business**

No business was raised

#### **15. Date and location of the next meeting - 16th October 2013**

B Scott tendered his apologies for the next meeting. The Bridge House Hotel in Reigate was requested as an alternative venue TBC by G McCully.

D Griffin advised that he and C Thomas would be sharing representation of TEG at the UK NANDTB meetings, attending 3 meetings each.

- Questions review - 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2013, BINDT, Northampton
- 46<sup>th</sup> meeting – 4th December 2013 - BINDT, Northampton



**Annex A – attendance and apologies for absence at the 4<sup>th</sup> September 2013 UK NANDTB meeting**

Name	Representing	In attendance	Apologies for absence
Alun Williams	(Airbus UK)	1	
Bobby Scott	(Bombardier)	1	
Carl Sheppard	(British Airways)	1	
Chris Dootson	(BAE Systems)	1	
Chris Durrant	(Messier-Bugatti-Dowty)	1	
Clive Worrall	(British Airways)		1
Colin Thomas	(Training & Examination Group)		1
Dave Griffin	(Training & Examination Group Deputy)	1	
Graham Mcleod	(Honeywell)	1 (Question review)	
Graham McCully	(Pt. 145 Orgs, QAs and SIG members)	1	
Jon Biddulph	(Rolls Royce)		1
Keith Griffiths	(Rolls Royce)	1 (Question review)	
Keith Phillips (acting Chairman)	(Airbus UK)	1	
Jennifer Cook (Secretary)	(BINDT)	1	
Nicole Scutt	(BINDT)	1	
Cameron Sinclair	(BINDT)	1	
Paul Marshall	(MAA)		1
Phil Berkley	(Agusta Westland)	1 (Question review)	
Rob Bright	(Flybe)	1 (Question review)	
Ted Blacklay	(Civil Aviation Authority)	1	
Stuart Algar	(Civil Aviation Authority)		1
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>5</b>

Actions allocated and carried over from meeting 44, 4<sup>th</sup> September 2013.

Ref	Actions brought forward	Remarks
06/2013	<b>C Worrall (LEAD), G McCully, C Thomas, T Blacklay, S Algar to review NANDTB-18. Comments to be submitted to J Cook by close of business 5th April 2013 for implementation with approval at the next meeting.</b>	<b>OVERDUE</b> Ongoing Document update to be postponed until publication of new issue EN 4179
08/2013	<b>B Scott (LEAD), C Worrall, D Griffin to create a new document, NANDTB-27, on policy. Comments to be submitted to J Cook by close of business 5th April 2013 for implementation with approval at the next meeting.</b>  <b>WG members to arrange teleconference in order to move forward</b>	<b>OVERDUE</b> Ongoing
13/2013	<b>K Phillips (LEAD), B Scott, D Griffin (TEG), N Scutt, C Durrant, S Algar, P Berkley, A Williams, C Dootson and J Biddulph to review and amend NANDTB-21 document in-line with AD008</b>  <b>K Phillips to arrange working group meeting teleconference/WebEx/face-to-face.</b>	Ongoing
24/2013	<b>K Phillips to collate suggestions from members on 'what the UK NANDTB wants the forum to achieve' and will issue to T Blacklay.</b>	Ongoing (action re-allocated to KP from JB)
28/2013	<b>R Bright/S Algar to review NANDTB_17 by the next meeting</b>	Amended document to be circulated to members for approval by email prior to next meeting in October.
29/2013	<b>K Phillips to draft letter to EASA informing them of the Board's decision to no longer accept future, overseas affiliations. (relates to 13/2013)</b>	Ongoing Pending amendment to NANDTB-21
32/2013	<b>ALL members - comments to T Blacklay for changes to Part 145 including comments on the 4 options discussed at meeting 44, 04-09-2013.</b>	<b>OVERDUE</b> Ongoing No comments received to date.
33/2013	<b>T Blacklay to contact Paul Marshall/Wg Cdr Mark Stubbs to clarify the Boards requirements of MAA observing members.</b>	
34/2013	<b>C Dootson to arrange working group teleconference/WebEx meeting to discuss BINDT proposal on audit processes. (LINKED WITH 13/2013)</b>	
35/2013	<b>N Scutt to email Board members for volunteers for the Eddy Current specific, questions review to be held 3<sup>rd</sup> December.</b>	
36/2013	<b>N Scutt to circulate the GTC constitution (PCN/3) to Board members.</b>	
37/2013	<b>K Phillips to issue a letter to N Scutt, formally nominating G McCully as the GTC representative of the Aerospace industry &amp; UK NANDTB.</b>	
38/2013	<b>N Scutt to ensure the PCN Aerospace Z1 is added to the first GTC agenda, G McCully to lead the review of this document on the GTC.</b>	
39/2013	<b>T Blacklay to formally correspond with Primes' employers advising why it is important that members of UK NANDTB attend and witness audits of Aerospace agencies/training &amp; examination centres.</b>	