

**MINUTES OF MEETING****Subject : CAS.COM #7****Date: 27 January 2021****Location: Videoconference****Organised by****Safety Intelligence and Performance Department (SM.1)****Ref.****Final****MoM Distribution:**

The minutes of the CAS.COM kick-off meetings will be published on the [European Advisory Bodies SharePoint Site](#). Please email: [Antonio.Gonzalez-Gomez@easa.europa.eu](mailto:Antonio.Gonzalez-Gomez@easa.europa.eu) if you don't have access.

<b>MoM prepared</b>	Antonio González Gómez	<b>27/01/2021</b>	Done
<b>MoM validated</b>	N. Ben Mami on behalf of Erick Ferrandez (Secretary)	<b>29/01/2021</b>	Done
<b>MoM reviewed</b>	Y. Malinge (Chair)	<b>01/01/2021</b>	Done
<b>MoM sent</b>	Members and Alternates	<b>02/01/2021</b>	Done

**Members**

1. Yannick Malinge, ASD Airbus (Chair)
2. Jim Pegram, A4E (Vice-Chair)
3. Osman Saafan, SAB Vice-Chair
4. Geir Ove Eriksen, AEI
5. Thomas Leoff, IAAPS
6. Johan Glantz, EBAA
7. Stephen Richardson, EIMG
8. Dan Banja, ECOGAS
9. Hélène Misson, ASD Thales
10. Dragos Munteanu, IATA
11. Pierre Georges, ASD Dassault
12. Richard Williamson, ASD Rolls Royce
13. Mauro Mari (ETF (UILTRASPORTI))
14. Nick Rhodes (ERAA)

**EASA Secretary**

1. Erick Ferrandez, Head of Safety Intelligence and Performance Department
2. Antonio González Gómez, Safety Promotion Officer

**Ad-Hoc EASA participants**

1. Nabil Ben Mami, Safety Risk Management Section Manager
2. Aigars Krastins, Senior Domain Safety Risk Manager
3. John Franklin, Safety Actions Section Manager
4. Regine Hamelijncx, Senior Safety Management Officer

**Apologies**

1. Paul Reuter (ECA)
2. Ansgar Sickert, ACI
3. Gus Garcia, ASD Thales



## AGENDA

1.	Opening and Welcome	2
2.	AB reorganisation	3
3.	Safety Promotion 2020 and 2021	3
4.	EPAS 2021-25 and the 2021 EPAS programming cycle	3
5.	Gap analysis “loop closing” analysis exercise safety areas progress	4
6.	Further input from the CAS.COM on strategic issues	4
7.	FAST – areas of change	5
8.	AOB	5

### Related Links/ Documents:

- Minutes CAS.COM #06 - 2020 – [here](#)
- Meeting documents CAS.COM #07 - 2021 – [here](#)

## 1. Opening and Welcome

**Y. Malinge** welcomed everyone to the meeting. He passed on **E. Ferrandez’s** apologies for not being present due to sickness. No agenda AOB points were added. The minutes from the #6 meeting were adopted at the end of the meeting, all of its action points constitute the #7 meeting’s agenda points.

## 2. AB reorganisation

**Y. Malinge** recalled the main aim of the CAS.COM is to provide safety strategic guidance to the SAB for input on a year on year basis to the EPAS. The group produced and will keep maintaining a list of strategic issues ([here](#)). The contribution from the CAS.COM was in the past overlooked. **Y. Malinge** exchanged with the SAB chair and vicechair on this matter at the end of last year.

**J. Glantz** and **T. Leoff** briefed the CAS.COM on the November 2020 SAB meeting. EASA made a proposal for the restructuring of the ABs groups. Essentially, the new layout would have only the MAB and the SAB in place. The rest of groups would be replaced by temporary, “on demand” ones, more task oriented (except in very few cases, e.g. rotorcraft).

**O. Saafan** – the SAB was taken a bit by surprise by this restructuring proposal. Some concerns were put forwards by the SAB. The group asked for time to work on an alternative to be proposed around mid-2021. The SAB implemented changes in its structure not that long ago (reason why the CAS.COM was formed). Hence the groups are adapting and this must be allowed to evolve.

There is always room for improvement in some aspects and methods the SAB structure follows. For this, a SAB Task Force was created early in 2021 that is looking into this. Last week, the different technical group’s restructuring was discussed. The SAB is in favour of an evolution (not a revolution), to accommodate to new demands from it, e.g. less resources available at EASA to support, have less presential meetings and more online ones, better use of online tools for files and to work with, etc. Likewise, the SAB TF was in favour of having some additional permanent groups to the SAB and MAB (like the CAS.COM) and work on improved and agile industry collaboration, including between the MAB+SAB. A focused and meaningful consultation requires a permanent structure commensurate to the task. The new proposal will require the industry to be more proactive with its contributions.

### Additional point - Data 4 Safety in the context of the AB reorganisation

**J. Pegram** enquired if D4S would be involved in this reorganisation. D4S is not part of the ABs structure (the same way as CAGs and NoAs aren’t too). However, it remains to be seen how and if it is affected indirectly. **J. Pegram** will put the question during the next D4S meeting.

**T. Leoff** stated that he considered it important that if the industry is supporting and contributing to a project like D4S. This effort needs to be coupled with a proper and close involvement from the industry. This can’t be arbitrarily decided.

### Summary:

- A parallel proposal for reorganisation is still under development and a final decision is still due.
- Meanwhile, the CAS.COM is continuing its mandate. **Y. Malinge** proposed that the CAS.COM will act with more self-proactiveness.



- D4S and CAS.COM are part of the same formula since technical and strategic input is needed from the position of knowledge and expertise provided by these groups.
- The CAS.COM needs to be better prepared for the 2021 EPAS programming cycle. Its input to the strategy list needs to be considered via the SAB.

#### **Actions:**

- **J. Pegram** to brief on the reply from D4S concerning how it is affected by the AB reorganisation.
- **O. Saafan** to brief the CAS.COM on the progress/ conclusions of the SAB TF on an alternative proposal

### **3. Safety Promotion 2020 and 2021**

**J. Franklin (EASA)** provided a presentation ([here](#)) on the work done by the Safety Promotion team in 2020 and the future activities planned in 2021.

For 2021 **J. Franklin** remarked on the importance of the coordination amongst different organisations in collaborating and developing a range of promotional initiatives in line with EPAS objectives and to meet immediate needs during the COVID pandemic. EASA's Safety Promotion Team has learned a lot about marketing techniques where the message and means to convey is tailored to the need of different audiences and how their attention, problem, reactions, feeling and finally action to act can be grabbed and fostered. The new Air Ops CAN promotion group will meet soon to develop the plans into actionable deliverables. A small number of nominations have been provided by CAS.COM members and provide enough people to have an effective working group.

**J. Pegram** praised the great promotion work presented. Concerning wellbeing he raised that Fatigue Risk Management Systems (FRMS) and wellbeing could be combined in a more strategic way to make people's lives better while achieving operational objectives. FRMS is not only about rostering but plays a key safety role too. The connotation is that fatigue needs to be avoided by rostering and this makes FRMS have a negative perception, when it can be focused from a more fitness or looking after oneself at an individual level. Wellbeing sometimes fall under the scope of HR which don't always make the most of the latest. He prompted safety promotion towards putting some effort in considering what a good programme to cater for both could look like that could have a real impact.

On a separate note **J. Pegram** noted the difference in readiness from long and short haul pilots whereby nature of the flying they did are differently suited by the new conditions posed by the crisis and inactivity or slow frequency. He asked also that the day in the life series of material to be made for other roles in aviation and not only pilots.

**J. Franklin** – will create a position paper in the coming few weeks on organisational wellbeing and how it fits into SMS that will be shared with the CAS.COM. The material put together is geared in a way that does not sound preaching or dogmatic and makes buying in easy. He made a note on the focus needed on “fit to fly”.

**O. Saafan** remarked the relevance of the work done on wellbeing. The concept of “fit to fly” should encompass all roles in aviation and not only pilots (e.g.: “fit to fix”, “fit to control”, etc.). This contributes to a robust performance system.

**D. Banja** – is this work is combined with the RNO programme?. **J. Franklin** – A couple of meetings were held with them. It was agreed the work on wellbeing should not be introduced at the wrong moment as this could confuse the aim of RNO and its communication plan. Work on a promotional campaign is also being done in 2021 to show the interactions between jobs and roles in aviation and how they could understand the impact they have on one another and make it better.

**D. Munteanu** – the activities on safety promotion are all very positive however they should be adequately timed taking into account the realities of the air transport industry in Europe. While currently at less than 10,000 flights per day in Europe and no positive signs for a recovery in the short term, the messages should be timed and adjusted considering the attention span and awareness needs of the aviation personnel.

**Y. Malinge** – One of safety promotion's pillars is repeating the message. The safety promotion is thus to be used in support of a robust return to service, by reminding the basics, by raising the attention on the risk of distractions created by the COVID situation (in light of Karachi accident).

#### **Action:**

- **J. Franklin** – to circulate for comments his position paper on how organisational wellbeing fits into SMS.

### **4. EPAS 2021-25 and the 2021 EPAS programming cycle**

**R. Hamelijncx** provided an overview ([here](#)) of the recently published EPAS 2021-2025 including new actions and key rulemaking deliverables expected in 2021. She recalled that the main driver was to adapt rulemaking output to cope with the impact of COVID-19 and that the normal consultation process could not be followed in 2020. This issue of EPAS includes links from the relevant safety issues from the domain portfolios to the relevant actions. Also the brand new Vol III on safety portfolios that was published for the first time.



Regarding this year's programming cycle she indicated that it is too early to provide details on how precisely the next EPAS will be developed, in particular in relation to the review of the strategic priorities. Nevertheless, 2021 should see a return to the normal AB consultation process, as it was in place before 2020. Also, the review of the strategic priorities may take more time than initially projected and the new priorities should remain valid for some years to come. In this context, it will also be necessary to review the European Aviation Safety Programme (EASP), being the State Safety Programme (SSP) equivalent at EU level and managed by the EU Commission. The last EASP update took place in 2015.

#### Discussion:

**Y. Malinge** – If a complete draft EPAS is expected for consultation in May, the CAS.COM strategic priorities part could be made available to EASA (via the SAB) upstream of the draft EPAS circulation.

**R. Hamelijncx** – confirmed that such CAS.COM input to defining new EPAS strategic priorities could indeed be provided ahead of the start of the formal consultation (normally in May), in coordination with the SAB. **O. Saafan** – asked not to think too much of hierarchies and provide the list in tandem to both the SAB and the CAS.COM.

**J. Glantz** – inquired about the exact scope of the evaluation task for small aeroplane operations under Part-CAT and Part-SPO in terms of a/c types.

#### Ex post meeting addition

This evaluation task will deal with a/c < 5700 kg MTOM. The proposal affects the commercial and specialised operators in EASA MS, operating non-complex aeroplane (e.g. below 5700 kg MTOW), performing:

- Flight training,
- Parachute dropping
- Commercial A-A sightseeing flights.
- Agriculture, photography, etc

**O. Saafan** – inquired about the role of industry in the EASP revision process and proposed to include the industry via the SAB in the review and commenting of the EASP. The document could have a more strategic spin. It also describes how to set up priorities, arbitrations, etc., therefore it would be beneficial to involve the industry in its review.

He also asked how EPAS will deal with emerging issues in particular those affecting the total aviation system such as for example the work underway on [GAIA-X](#). **R. Hamelijncx** explained that EPAS Vol. I provides information on a number of new technologies and concepts where preparatory work is being done and that the approach to new technologies and concepts could be reviewed when defining the new strategic priorities.

**Y. Malinge** – Health of the passenger is an aspect that need to be considered in the CAS.COM list as well. Indeed, beyond the COVID crisis, there is likewise the need to add airplane occupant's health as a permanent aviation item, as it is the case for flight safety, security.

#### Actions:

- To organise a CAS.COM meeting around April to discuss strategic priorities and be able to provide inputs to the next EPAS planning cycle, via the SAB

### 5. Gap analysis "loop closing" analysis exercise safety areas progress

**A. Krastins** presented ([here](#)) the progress made on the review of the three topics chosen: Runway Excursion safety and Security, Cybersecurity (impacting safety) and System resilience.

- Runway Excursion Safety and Security – slide 8 & 15-17, provide the gap analysis and observations on the topic respectively.
- System resilience – Slide 25 & 26 show the conclusions and recommendations.
- Cybersecurity – Slide 28 shows the conclusions and key actions.

**A. Krastins** - in the recent EPAS edition there is additional content for Runway Excursions and Cybersecurity. The loop closing was done comparing with the previous EPAS 2020-2024 for cyber/security and EPAS 2021-2025 for Runway Excursions. Strategic areas are pointed out in the CAS.COM list, however not on the key elements on how to address them.

#### Discussions:

**D. Banja** enquired whether collaboration between EASA and SESAR was taking place.

#### Ex post meeting addition:

No formal cooperation is in place for the time being. However, SESAR is a member of the ESCP (European Strategic Coordination Platform) which discusses cyber security issues at European level. So this could be seen as a coordination mechanism to some extent. The ESCP has however a wider representation and membership.



**J. Pegram** asked if EASA was working on determining how regulations overlap, e.g. EASA's, national, FRMS, etc. It was noted that effort was placed in aligning the different regulations during the development and subsequent updating process with a constant view not to ask for conflicting requirements. However, the AMC/GM were set to cater for new eventualities without the need to wait for new rules.

**A. Krastins** explained that the CAS.COM priority areas are not including recommendations on how to address them and therefore the closing the loop exercise is difficult as these strategic areas are of a large scope and it is not possible to affirm that the actions listed in the EPAS are sufficient to consider the loop closed.

**Y. Malinge** - the CAS.COM priority areas list are issues for which the group considers the need to be addressed in EPAS. However, recommendations on the way to address them was not included and could be a useful complement. This could involve a bit more work in breaking up the topic further and would make discussions and agreement a bit more complex. If the group wants to be more efficient closing the loop, it could try to break down the areas a level down to include for example: how to address them, which sectors they affect or what focus should be given, etc. This would provide significant added value to the CAS.COM safety area list.

**O. Saafan** pointed out that this concept is fine but would need to be raised with the SAB chair first. There is a possibility it could enter into conflict with the aim and work of other technical groups. A process to request additional evaluation of the safety strategic areas or answer to queries from the SAB/CAS.COM and to whom to place these could be added in this concept.

#### Summary:

**Y. Malinge** proposed to retake Runway Excursions and try to apply the approach proposed of looking further down this issue and define it more in detail. In doing so the different aspects that comprise a good analysis could be delineated and proposed. He emphasised that this called for some preparation ahead of the next CAS.COM by the members.

Likewise, the mechanism on how to send requests to other technical groups needs to be revisited to close the loop within the technical communities of the SAB.

#### Action:

- Preparation ahead of the next CAS.COM is needed by the group members (see summary above). Members to send in advance proposals to **A. Gonzalez** ahead of April 2021.

## 6. Further input from the CAS.COM on strategic issues

**Y. Malinge** - The three areas picked in previous CAS.COM meetings, i.e.: Additional COVID risks, Governance of Management Systems and the Future of Aviation Systems Capacity (or rather re-emerging) are to be reviewed during the next CAS.COM meeting in April, together with the updated strategy areas in the new EPAS edition.

All are being tested in the wake of the pandemic and recovery efforts and are part of the way the industry is organised.

#### Action:

- These areas need to be looked at with a renewed focus during the dedicated CAS.COM meeting to be planned in April 2021.

## 7. FAST – areas of change

**Rudi den Hertog** provided a presentation ([here](#)) on the rationale and ethos behind the group, i.e.: to provide prospective and predictive safety. He made a standpoint of where the work is and a request to the group:

- To support the prioritisation of the list of AoC (last done in 2002) and its possible update (last done in 2018)
- To write to EASA's innovation cell proposing cooperation between the two.

A summary of the presentation can be seen in slide 14 and the request to the CAS.COM in slide 16. The group is asking for endorsement and not for funding.

**R. Williamson** - remarked that DOA organisations appear not to be in the scope of the FAST work.

#### Summary:

**Y. Malinge** - the presentation will be circulated to the group. It is consistent with the value to move from reactive to proactive safety mindset in line with SMS principles.

#### Actions

The presentation will be circulated to the group. A decision needs to be made to support the FAST during the next meeting. Some of the group's input could be input for the next CAS.COM meeting.

## 8. AOB

### COVID portfolio update



**N. Ben Mami** – presented the COVID risk portfolio updated with recent input ([here](#)). The first version was published in June 2020 and received a lot of positive feedbacks from industry. This updated portfolio, with new issues that emerged since then, (see slide 5), will also be released hopefully by end of February through a dedicated safety review. This report should also include some metrics as well as address the main safety promotion mitigation documents that were published for supporting the aviation community since the pandemic started.

The COVID risks can no longer be solely data driven. The safety issues rather rely on expert's assessment. To face this drastic reduction of occurrence data that was feeding the EASA SRM, a global safety risk index with a scoring has been developed and has been applied in an experimental way to the COVID portfolio safety issues. The results are shown in slides 7 and 8.

**Actions:**

- The presentation will be circulated to the group. Its content could be input for the April CAS.COM meeting.

