



Senate Economics Legislation Committee

Inquiry into Qantas Sale Amendment Bill 2014

Response to supplementary Questions on Notice from Senator Rhiannon

Qantas notes that in most instances, these questions:

- lack relevance to the Committee's Term of References;
- have been addressed during the course of public hearings at Senate Committee Inquiries on 14 and 18 March 2014; or
- have been responded to previously through Qantas' response to Questions on Notice to the Senate's Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee.

Safety is always the first priority at Qantas and we are very proud of the quality of our maintenance across the Group, the vast majority of which is performed in Australia. It should also be noted that Qantas is the only airline which conducts heavy maintenance in Australia.

1. What is the average licensed aircraft maintenance engineer to un-licensed aircraft maintenance engineer ratio for overseas heavy maintenance facilities used by Qantas?

Ratios depend upon a number of factors, including the:

- criticality of the tasks being undertaken;
- certification system in place; and
- skills of the unlicensed engineer.

2. Can you confirm that every area identified by the 2006 CASA quality assurance reports have been fully addressed?

The 2006 audit reports referred to are Qantas quality assurance reports not CASA reports.

Due to the complex nature of aircraft maintenance, we would expect that every quality assurance report would highlight some areas for improvement. Audit reports associated with the third and subsequent checks at SIAEC during late 2006 and 2007 indicated that all significant matters had been addressed.

3. Can you confirm that the 2007 CASA report did not recommend any further areas of improvement? If it did recommend areas for improvement, has Qantas acted on all of those recommendations?

The 2007 CASA report is included in the ALAEA submission Appendix 3 and it does not recommend further areas for improvement.



4. In relation to allegations of certain maintenance work being carried out at SIAEC, does Qantas maintain a register of where all aircraft have maintenance work done upon them? If not, why not? If so, why can't Qantas confirm without a doubt maintenance work was not done at SIAEC in relation to point 3. b) in Qantas' response to the ALAEA allegations.

Qantas maintain records of work carried out on all of our aircraft.

All scheduled maintenance activity associated with an aircraft is documented. If additional defects or damage are noted during this scheduled maintenance, these matters are rectified and a record of this additional activity is included with the reports. There were no records of escape path lighting repairs for this aircraft.

5. Are the standards required for foreign maintenance sites exactly the same as the standards required for Australian maintenance sites?

Qantas requires the same quality of maintenance from any international facility as we would require from our own Australian facilities. Qantas only undertakes maintenance at overseas facilities which are certified by CASA and which meet our own very high standards.

6. In relation to point 6 of the Qantas response to the ALAEA allegations what was the cause of these errors? What is the full technical details of these errors? Where were these aircraft maintained?

Following a 767 C check at SASCO in Singapore during 2008, two issues were identified:

- one support rod for a fairing (cover) was not attached; and
- several torque tube fasteners were installed but not lock wired, resulting in the fasteners coming loose in service.

When the aircraft maintenance check was completed, a further adjustment was required after a functional check of the aircraft.

Qantas takes all maintenance errors very seriously, regardless of whether they occur within Qantas or a contractor. The aircraft manufacturers understand the challenges of Human Factors and design redundancy into all critical systems.

7. In relation to point 7 of the Qantas response to the ALAEA allegations, how can two separate reports into the same incident produce two different outcomes? Ie. One report claiming 3 washers had been installed incorrectly followed by "further analysis" that says no washers were installed incorrectly.

The number 2 engine of a 747 aircraft was removed for routine maintenance by a Qantas night shift crew in Sydney. The following day, an engineer was checking the engine mount loose hardware in a box and noticed that three engine mount bolt washers were located upside down on the shank of the bolt.



Due to the pattern of grease left on the bolts, the engineer assumed that the washers were upside down when the engine was removed. The engineer raised a report to ensure that this potential problem was investigated.

There were no abnormal marks or distortion noted on the washers and the investigation team could not positively prove that the washers had been installed upside down by HAECO.

Recently, Qantas carried out a series of tests to determine whether upside down washers would be distorted when the bolts are tightened. These tests proved that a washer is very obviously distorted when it has been installed upside down.

As a result, Qantas has confirmed that the washers were in fact installed correctly by HAECO in 2008.

8. How many times in the Qantas fleet have washers been found to have been installed incorrectly? How many times across the Australia aviation industry?

Please see the response to Question 7.

It is not possible to respond to how many times across the Australian aviation industry washers have been installed incorrectly. Qantas is however aware of at least one instance where washers had been incorrectly installed by Qantas engineers in Sydney. As previously advised to the Committee, this experience is not considered to be a significant airworthiness issue.

9. When maintenance issues are recorded, how often does Qantas discuss the issue with CASA before a Service Difficulty Report has to be filed? What are the guidelines that dictate when a Service Difficulty Report has to be filed?

Qantas files Service Difficulty Reports (SDR) with CASA whenever a defect or issue falls within the categories requiring reporting. CASA provides guidance to the industry on this process.

A review of the CASA SDR reporting database will clearly demonstrate Qantas' transparency and pro-disclosure reporting culture.

10. In relation to point 9 of the Qantas response to the ALAEA allegations, at the time of the Manila incident, were there any pre-flight checks to ensure a correct valve position or have these checks been initiated after the incident?

Checks of this system predate the maintenance check referred to. Following this occurrence the check was further refined to ensure that any such condition would always be reliably captured.



11. What is the daily cost for the housing of the 9 A320's owned by Jetstar Hong Kong in Toulouse?

This information is Commercial-in-Confidence.

The Qantas Group is a one-third minority investor in Jetstar Hong Kong. Therefore this is a matter which is the responsibility of Jetstar Hong Kong.

12. Are you aware that a number of submissions to the Australia's Aviation Safety Regulation Review that include criticism of CASA have been withheld from the public? Does this concern you?

Qantas is not aware of the matter referred to.