

## **2021 IMRBPB Meeting Summary**

24<sup>th</sup> to 28<sup>th</sup> May 2021

Virtual (WebEx) hosted by EASA

### **1. Reference**

Pre-meeting package can be downloaded from the IMRBPB website:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/newsroom-and-events/events/imrbpb-meeting-2021>

Note: In this document, “MPIG” = “MPIG + RMPiG” unless otherwise specified.

### **2. Attendance List (unaudited)**

ANAC	Fernando LACERDA Sérgio CRUZ André MORETO Rogério POSSI Junior
CAAC	WANG Jin FAN Jingzhu HUANG Jun SUN Bin LI Xiaolei
CASA	Richard ALLEN
CAAS	Gerald POH
EASA	Raffaele IOVINELLA (Co-Chairperson) Luca TOSINI  <a href="#">Dominique DUMORTIER - OSAC</a>
FAA	William (Bill) HELIKER (Chairperson) John DUGAN Rocky JOHNSON
GCAA	Hatem DIBIAN Yahia BATAINEH Zayed BANAFI
HKCAD	Jimmy LEUNG (Secretary) CF CHAN
JCAB	FUKUYAMA Hiroki YOSHIDA Masao
TCCA	Jeff PHIPPS Ryan HENNIGAR



## International MRB Policy Board

	Brad TAYLOR
328 Support Svcs	Markus KOCHS-KAMPER
A4A	Robert IRELAND
Aeronovo	Manny GDALEVITCH
Aerotechna	Leonard BEAUCHEIM
Air Canada/Jazz	Atanu CHAKRABORTY
Airbus	Oliver WEISS Jan HULSMANN Helge KOSTEWICZ Pilar ROJAS-BARCI Lorenz WENK
Airbus Canada	Hamid NOURI (was Bell, RMPIG)
Airbus Helicopter	Elodie CARMONA
American Airlines	Edwin DAVIS Beth LLOYD
ANA	TAWARA Hiroyuki
ATR	Ana-Maria PIVNICERU
Azul	Osvaldo DA SILVA Junior
Bell	Jeremy BURGESS Kyla MARSHALL Skip McLEAN
Boeing	Kayode ARIWODOLA Aden FARAH Jose GOMEZ-ELEGIDO Maciej RAZNIEWSKI
Bombardier	Ahmed HASAN
Breeze	Sanjeev GERA
British Airways	Wayne THOMPSON
Collins	Rhonda WALTHALL
COMAC	SHANG Guie
Dassault	Laurent BOYER
de Havilland	Luc CABANA Cesar LAZARO Matthew SCOTT
Embraer	Paulo DE FREITAS DINIZ Elisabeth GARCIA DE SOUZA Rodrigo CORREA Fernando RODRIGUES DE ARAUJO Calros TEIXEIRA Alan MARTINEZ VARGAS SOUZA
FedEx	Kevin BERGER
Fokker	Hans MOEN
Gulfstream	Armando CHIEFFI Marcelo RAMOS Jamie MOSS Jeff POULIOT



Hexagon	Terry THMOAS
Horizon Air	Nellie SUESS
IATA	Dragos BUDEANU Chris MARKOU
Irkut	K. KUZMICHEV A. SHUMILOVM
jetBlue	William MERCIER
Leonardo	Giacomo GIBILISCO
Lockheed Martin	Keith WELLS
Lufthansa	Joerg COELIUS
Mitsubishi	Margaret HASWELL ZHANG Si
MTU	Friedhelm KAPPEL, Dr.
Oliver-Wyman	Rob GUTHRIE
Rolls Royce	Jenny SILVESTER
Safran	Philippe GALOZIO Franck LIOTTE
Southwest	Michael HANSEN Norman HERBERTZ JUNG Kyung Hee KIM Eunji
Textron	Stephen TAYLOR
United Airlines	Jason ONORATI
University of South Carolina	Rhea MATTHEWS

### **3. IMRBPB Chairperson / Co-Chairperson / Secretary**

- 3.1 Mr William (Bill) HELIKER, 2021 Chair, (will remain through 2022 meeting).
- 3.2 Mr Raffaele IOVINELLA, 2021 Co-Chairperson, (will remain through 2022 meeting).
- 3.3 Mr Jimmy LEUNG, 2021 Secretary, (will remain through 2022 meeting).

### **4. Updates on MPIG / RMPiG**

MPIG and RMPiG provided updates on their respective activities in 2019 and 2020.

### **5. Candidate Issue Papers Introduced and Discussed**

#### **A. CIP Addressed in the Virtual Decision Meetings**

- 5.1 [CIP IND-2020-06](#) [Amendment to IP180](#)



	<b>CIP disposition</b>	<b>Virtual Meeting 1: ACCEPTED as IP 197*</b>
	Presented by <u>MPIG</u> /(O. Weiss): added “on-aircraft” to assure differentiation with ground systems not being in scope. *Forwarded to IMRBPB meeting. CIP amended and accepted as IP 197.	
5.2	<b>CIP IND-2020-09</b> CIP disposition	<b>Amendment to IP180 Examples</b> <b>Virtual Meeting 1: WITHDRAWN</b>
5.3	<b>CIP IND-2019-15</b> CIP disposition	<b>EZAP Definition</b> <b>Virtual Meeting 2: ACCEPTED as IP 189</b>
5.4	<b>CIP IND-2019-19</b> CIP disposition	<b>Freeze-Thaw Effect</b> <b>Virtual Meeting 2: ACCEPTED as IP 198**</b>
	Presented by <u>RMPIG</u> /(E. Carmona): CIP amended / clarified. **Forwarded to IMRBPB meeting. CIP amended and accepted as IP 198.	
5.5	<b>CIP EASA-2020-01</b> CIP disposition	<b>Identification of Failure Causes</b> <b>Virtual Meeting 2: ACCEPTED as IP 190***</b>
	Presented by <u>EASA</u> /(Luca Tosini): Discussed in the virtual decision committee. Agreed on final verbiage, requiring descriptions of why and how a function fails. ***Forwarded to IMRBPB meeting. CIP amended and accepted as IP 190.	
5.6	<b>CIP IND-2020-05</b> CIP disposition	<b>Recognition of the VTOL Aircraft</b> <b>Virtual Meeting 3: WITHDRAWN</b>
5.7	<b>CIP IND-2019-13</b> CIP disposition	<b>IMPS Certification Review Item</b> <b>Virtual Meeting 3: ACCEPTED as IP 191</b> <b>with amendments that followed.</b>
5.8	<b>CIP EASA-2020-04</b> CIP disposition	<b>Periodic Review Updates</b> <b>Virtual Meeting 3: WITHDRAWN</b>

## B. CIP Addressed in the IMRBPB Meeting and **ACCEPTED**

5.9	<b>CIP IND-2019-21</b> CIP disposition	<b>In-flight Loss of Other Structures</b> <b>CIP ACCEPTED with amendments as IP 192</b>
	Presented by <u>RMPIG</u> /(H. Nouri): CIP adds a note that SSI includes structure that if failed presents a safety of flight risk.  <u>ANAC</u> /(F. Lacerda): Note should instead be a sentence in the text in line with EASA comment. (Hamid has made this change on screen and EASA agreed.) <u>EASA</u> /(D. Dumortier): “Note” may not be the best way to expand SSI. ANAC proposal works, and should update Glossary definition of SSI. <u>TCCA</u> /(B. Taylor): Assessing probability seems very difficult. (H. Nouri: must come from OEM design office)	



IATA/(D. Budeanu): Add “Notwithstanding the above...” instead of Glossary update.  
EASA/(R. Iovinella): Support as amended.  
ANAC/(F. Lacerda): Prefer having Glossary updated anyway.  
EASA/(L. Tosini): Check impact of changes here to the other 5 linked structural CIPs.

Accepted with further discussion on the requirement to change Glossary definition of SSI.

26<sup>th</sup> May:

RMPiG/(H. Nouri): Proposal amendment to the CIP to include Glossary changes, recognizing as well that other sections that refer to this definition may need to be reworked. Need for Glossary update debated. Check the IMPS box. Tabled for possible discussion on 27<sup>th</sup> May

27<sup>th</sup> May:

MPiG/H. Nouri presented revisions as discussed on 5/26.

IATA/(D. Budeanu): Logic of the Glossary definition needed clarification (new definition in Glossary withdrawn after discussion)  
 Additional wordsmithing was accomplished.

**ACCEPTED** with meeting **Action Item 2021-02**, “Industry Structure WG to review the implication of the SSI definition that may potentially link to “Other Structure” in consideration with “Adverse Effect on Safety” in the framework of MSG-3 and IMPS”

5.10

**CIP EASA-2020-03 Unacceptable Degradation**

**CIP disposition CIP ACCEPTED with amendments as IP 193**

Presented by EASA/(L. Tosini) – L/HIRF protection components may degrade unacceptably, but such degradation is not well defined, nor easy to detect and assess. External corrosion of connectors and chafing *may* be indicators.  
 Recommend adding description of each component, potential degradation, and assessment of the degradation as determined by the OEM for working group review.

TCCA/(J. Phipps): Well written, fully supports.

Airbus/(O. Weiss): Would be better to refer to OEM, “not OEM engineering”.

ANAC/(F. Lacerda): Support as written.

EASA/(D. Dumortier): List items need further explanation. (Explained that this will occur at the working group.) Assurance Plan cannot be used to reject information.)

CAAC/(J. Fan): Fully supports

UAE GCAA/(H. Dibian): Is there a need to check the references mentioned prior to proceed for the final approval?

MPiG/(K. Berger, A. Chieffi): Large volume of industry input (will be attached).

Inordinate burden being placed on OEMs with unclear value. Assurance Plan will identify unacceptable degradation. Concern for burden on labor with no safety



		<p>improvement. Suggest that some of the requested data be gathered at other steps for efficiency. (More efficient burden at lower-level step.)</p> <p><u>EASA</u>/(R. Iovinella): Agrees with some splitting between steps, but not removal of any part points.</p> <p><u>ANAC</u>/(F. Lacerda): Splitting OK, but <u>types</u> of deterioration should remain in step 3.</p> <p><u>EASA</u>/(L. Tosini): Can clear this up and re-present by tomorrow afternoon.</p> <p><u>TCCA</u>/(J. Phipps): Surprised by level of comment. Could be room for re-alignment. Very straightforward and should not go to another group.</p> <p>(26<sup>th</sup> May, continued discussion)</p> <p><u>EASA</u>/(L. Tosini, R. Iovinella): Reviewed all inputs. Split data requirements between step 3 and 8. Cleaned up as needed to accommodate change. Clarifying questions were addressed.</p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b> with amendments.</p>
5.11	<p><b>CIP IND-2020-07</b>      <b>Sampling</b></p> <p>CIP disposition      <b>CIP ACCEPTED with amendments as IP 194</b></p>	<p>Presented by <u>MPIG</u>/(L. Boyer): Sampling may be interpreted as limited to Powerplant/Systems and is not accurately positioned (move it) and needs description of limitations of use.</p> <p><u>EASA</u>/(L. Tosini): Disagree that limiting use of Sampling is an issue.</p> <p><u>MPIG</u>: Removing “and/or design detail”. Was not intended to reduce the data requirement. Remove the word “Note” at the start of the second paragraph.</p> <p><u>ANAC</u>/(F. Lacerda): had asked for available data (not limited to service data). Might be better as “service data or design data”.</p> <p><u>EASA</u>/(D. Dumortier): Concerned with wording in first blue paragraph regarding “degradation not fully known”.</p> <p>26<sup>th</sup> May:</p> <p><u>MPIG</u>/(L. Boyer): CIP modified according to discussion.</p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b> with amendments.</p>
5.12	<p><b>CIP IND-2019-17</b>      <b>Deletion of Duplicated Information in Task Development Section</b></p> <p>CIP disposition      <b>CIP ACCEPTED with amendments as IP 195</b></p>	<p>Presented by <u>MPIG</u>/(L. Boyer): Recommendation – remove duplicated information.</p> <p><u>EASA</u>/(R. Iovinella): Support in general. Comments: 1) add acronym for functional check. 2) be careful with position on Notes that are “orphaned”.</p> <p><u>ANAC</u>/(F. Lacerda): Acknowledge effect of duplicated text and on board to simplify. Concerned about removing these sections because they flow well. Could remove from table but keep text, but that has usefulness as well. Should remove only from Glossary.</p>



MPIG/(K. Berger): Agree floating leftover note is a problem to be addressed. Recognize that in-situ duplication aids flow of document. Longer term – hyperlink references so there is only one source of the reference.

EASA/(D. Dumortier): Do not support removing second sentence of “5.”

MPIG/(L. Boyer): A couple of revisions necessary. Leave Applicability and Effectiveness sections. Propose changes/edits on Friday 5/28.

26<sup>th</sup> May:

MPIG/(L. Boyer): Added more information in the Issue presentation and Problem description; accounted for other comments.

**ACCEPTED** with amendments.

5.13 **CIP IND-2019-09 Zonal Procedures Scope Adjustment**  
**CIP disposition CIP ACCEPTED with amendments as IP 196**

Presented by MPIG/(M. Ramos): Current Zonal inspections may not adequately address Other Structure. Propose to update flowchart to add “structures and installed systems”. Some dependency on earlier rejected CIP.

EASA/(R. Iovinella): Suggest “structure – including Other Structure”; change second sentence of note to, “In the latter case, the zonal WG to advise Structure WG that any need to inspect the Other Structure must be covered by a task in the structures section.”

ANAC/(F. Lacerda): Agree. Also, add “components” to flowchart.

CAAC/J. Wang): Focus on SSI. For Other Structure current procedure is clear; CIP not needed.

MPIG/(M. Ramos): proposes: “Zonal Analysis is not required if the zone only contains SSI structure or if the zone contains SSI and Other Structure, but the access does not allow for a GVI. In the latter case, the zonal WG to advise Structure WG that any need to inspect the Other Structure must be covered by a task in the structures section.” (Added verbatim.)

**ACCEPTED** with amendments. M. Ramos presented the clean version on 27<sup>th</sup> May.

**C. CIPs Addressed in the IMRBPB Meeting and NOT ACCEPTED**

5.14 **CIP EASA-2020-02 Role of an L-HIRF Assurance Plan**  
**CIP disposition CIP is WITHDRAWN for further work**

Presented by EASA/(Luca Tosini): Potential conflict between MSG-3 and certification guidance requirements which state and a HIRF protection assurance plan “may be necessary”. Philosophy is not clear in current MSG-3 wording. Recommend 1) harmonize wording with MSG-3 and cert guidance. 2) clarify how program can be used, 3) clarify terminology, 4) define standalone tasks.



	<p><u>TCCA</u>/(J. Phipps): Changes being proposed add value; overall positive! Fully support but would expect further work on CIP.</p> <p><u>ANAC</u>/(F. Lacerda): Supports the CIP intent but would expect further work on CIP.</p> <p><u>MPIG</u>/(K. Berger): MPIG provided comments. Industry supports further collaboration.</p> <p><u>EASA</u>/(R. Iovinella): Comments noted. CIP to be further developed with the input by Industry WG.</p> <p>See also CIP EASA-2020-05 on <b>Action Item 2021-01</b>.</p>	
5.15	<p><b>CIP EASA-2020-05</b></p> <p>CIP disposition</p>	<p><b>Analysis of Bonding Devices in MSG-3</b></p> <p><b>CIP REJECTED pending further work, possible reconstitution of the Industry L/HIRF working group</b></p>
	<p><u>Presented by EASA</u>/(L. Tosini): Currently not harmonized and not consistently performed. Some covered by L-HIRF, some by EWIS. Many findings in service. CS-25 analysis result: “any bonding device is linked to L/HIRF”; EZAP is not adequate. Recommend all bonding devices should be covered by the L/HIRF analysis.</p> <p><u>TCCA</u>/(J. Phipps): Supports changes if not being adequately analyzed. Not sure recommended changes go far enough, nor that <u>all</u> should be automatically covered by L/HIRF analyses. Should add examples to highlight bonding devices in this L/HIRF proposal. TCCA would support the WG.</p> <p><u>ANAC</u>/(F. Lacerda): Support intent. Need better understanding if bonding devices should be excluded from EZAP. Further guidance on “critical systems and structures”.</p> <p><u>FAA</u>/(B. Heliker): Would any of this come out of the L/HIRF working group? Should A4A L/HIRF WG re-convene? (EASA responds “why not?” R. Iovinella agrees on re-convene.)</p> <p><u>MPIG</u>/(K. Berger): Airbus focal, file shared. MPIG supports reforming the working group. Standardization not feasible at level of MSG-3 as it is design dependent. Also, EZAP focusses on risk, not loss of function. Remove word “critical” as noted by ANAC above (and being avoided throughout MSG-3). <u>Both L/HIRF CIP EASA 2020-02 and EASA-2020-05 will be resubmitted in the future</u>, either in the IMRBPB annual meeting or dedicated virtual decision meeting.</p> <p>Discussion of reconvening L/HIRF working group: Kevin reports MPIG will discuss during the Industry meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> June 2021.</p> <p><b>Action Item 2021-01</b>, “MPIG Chair to identify the industry L/HIRF experts that would participate in the further refinement of the CIP EASA-2020-02 and EASA-2020-05”</p>	
5.16	<p><b>CIP FAA-2021-01</b></p> <p>CIP disposition</p>	<p><b>Recording Devices</b></p> <p><b>CIP REJECTED pending development</b></p>
	<p><u>Presented by FAA</u>/(R. Johnson): FDR/CVR/DLR not currently safety emergency systems but have safety implications. Critical functions that have failed can remain hidden. Recommend considering as safety emergency systems. Update MSG-3 Glossary definition.</p>	



	<p><u>TCCA</u>/(J. Phipps): Agree with general premise that issues exist, however, redefining is not the best solution. Changes needed but raising important issue with MSG-3 being driven by national requirements instead of vice-versa. CIP needs more work. Want to provide technical comment to have analysis method be consistent. Re-present next year with harmonized approach. TCCA would like to work with FAA and industry to enhance the CIP for a re-submission in 2022.</p> <p><u>ANAC</u>/(F. Lacerda): ICAO Annex 6 revision effective November 2022 that acknowledges the FAA issue; in comment phase. Will allow flexibility in national requirements. (ANAC agrees with problem.)</p> <p><u>EASA</u>/(L. Tosini, R. Iovinella): Agree with TCCA position, issue, and problem. Should include other devices with similar accident/safety importance (e.g. ULD attached to the Flight Recorders). Don't understand why IMPS box checked. Not sure on implementation (e.g., retroactive?). Moving away from national requirement status of these devices.</p> <p><u>FAA</u>/(R. Johnson): Don't agree the issue is related to national requirements. IMPS emphasizes importance. Hadn't considered retroactive.</p> <p><u>MPIG</u>/(K. Berger, D. Budeanu): Shared a file. MPIG does not support as written. Recognizes importance and intent. Would like to see regulatory entity harmonization. FDR maintenance is already rule-driven. Glossary update causes logical inconsistency. Support a mature solution as proposed by TCCA.</p>
5.17	<p><b>CIP IND-2018-03      Other Structure Flowchart Update</b></p> <p><b>CIP disposition      CIP REJECTED (open to future discussion/submission)</b></p> <p>Presented by RMPIG/(H. Nouri).</p> <p><u>EASA</u>/(L. Tosini): Questions the communication paths. Where is the issue originating?</p> <p><u>MPIG</u>/(M. Ramos): Information may come from other than SW( (e.g., Zonal)</p> <p><u>TCCA</u>/(B. Taylor): ref revised Figure: The suggestion essentially reverses the process flow so now we have the zonal working group suggesting that the structures working group look at other structure. Desire to inspect is coming from the Zonal group.</p> <p><u>CAAC</u>/(X. Li): The original intention of our discussion is that other structures may have secondary effects, so we should pay attention to these other structures. Instead of analyzing it as SSI. The logic of structural analysis includes the consideration of whether other structures produce tasks. It is suggested that whether there will be secondary impact should be taken as a consideration in judging whether other structures will produce tasks.</p> <p><u>CAAC</u>/(J. Wang): agree with TCCA.</p> <p><u>FAA</u>/(W. Heliker) Could go either way as to whether this adds value.</p> <p><u>JCAB</u>/(H. Fukuyama): More discussion required.</p> <p><u>EASA</u>/(D. Dumortier): Have similar concerns.</p> <p><u>MPIG</u>/(L. Boyer) Transfer of this information is not well described in MSG-3. Create a CIP dealing with transfer. (R. Iovinella states will be discussed at end of meeting in section "Communication Procedures".)</p> <p><u>RMPIG</u>/(H. Nouri): Will bring back next year.</p>



5.18	<b>CIP IND-2018-04</b> CIP disposition	<b>SSI Boundary Determination Guideline</b> <b>CIP REJECTED unanimously, with support for future update and submission</b>
	<p>Presented by <u>RMPIG</u>/(H. Nouri).</p> <p><u>EASA</u>/(L. Tosini): Cannot support for multiple reasons.</p> <p><u>TCCA</u>/(B. Taylor): Need to define the problem being solved. Allow OEM flexibility.</p> <p><u>MPIG</u>/(K. Berger): Has been vetted with OEMs.</p> <p><u>ANAC</u>/(F. Lacerda): We do welcome further guidance on determining the boundaries of an SSI.</p>	
5.19	<b>CIP IND-2019-07</b> CIP disposition	<b>CIC and CPCP Clarification</b> <b>CIP WITHDRAWN</b>
	<p>Presented by <u>RMPIG</u>/(L. Boyer): Created to provide additional information on CPCP clarification and on CIC re-application and related scheduled maintenance tasks.</p> <p><u>CAAC</u>/(J. Huang): Do not limit to CIC re-application. CPCP selection is not clear enough. Need special procedure or steps.</p> <p><u>IATA</u>/(D. Budeanu): To shed more clarity on the aspect raised by CAAC and explained by Hamid, I would suggest the wording "...These tasks should be identified and included in the category of CPCP tasks". This way it would be clear that CPCP tasks represent more than the ones for which a CIC re-application is required.</p> <p><u>RMPIG</u>/(L. Boyer) responds: Did not intend to limit to CIC but first location is just talking about CIC.</p> <p><u>TCCA</u>/(J. Phipps): second sentence could read better: "may require" instead of "may be impacted". Also "task data sheet" is new term to MSG-3. (MPIG/Laurent Boyer will try to define improved wording.)</p> <p><u>EASA</u>/(L. Tosini): Provided EASA supports, however last sentence of first paragraph is anticipating new definition of CPCP in proposed paragraph 5. May improve by moving first change into paragraph 5 as well. (MPIG/Laurent agrees this can be done.)</p> <p><u>EASA</u>/(D. Dumortier): Comments on the supporting preamble only.</p> <p><u>RMPIG</u>/(L. Boyer): Might be better to split this CIP into two to avoid confusions.</p> <p><u>EASA</u>/(L. Tosini): Propose slight change. Instead of "These tasks should be identified as a CPCP task.", substitute "...These tasks should be identified and considered by the WG for inclusion in the category of CPCP tasks." without need to move to Section 5.</p> <p><u>EASA</u>/(R. Iovinella) Supports moving whole sentence to paragraph 5.</p> <p><u>RMPIG</u>/(H. Nouri) will edit and re-discuss on 26<sup>th</sup> May.</p> <p>26<sup>th</sup> May:</p> <p><u>RMPIG</u>/(H. Nouri): Updated according to the discussion. Remove last sentence of second blue paragraph in Section 5; Real-time wordsmithing resulted in questioning what problem is being addressed. Again, raised the possibility of splitting into two CIPs, limiting this to CPCP task selection criteria.</p> <p><u>EASA</u>/(D. Dumortier): CPCP is not determined by in-service experience, it is certification.</p>	

		Too many issues – CIP withdrawn and send back to Structures Working Group.
5.20	<b>CIP IND-2019-08</b> CIP disposition	<b>Zonal Inspection Program Objectives</b> <b>CIP REJECTED</b>  Presented by MPIG/(M. Ramos).  EASA/(R. Iovinella), TCCA/(J. Phipps), EASA/(R. Iovinella and D. Dumortier) and ANAC/(F. Lacerda) similarly made the comments that the problem statement was not clear, not sure if the CIP recommendation would create additional benefits. The current MSG-3 texts should suffice the associated analysis.
5.21	<b>CIP IND-2019-18</b> CIP disposition	<b>EWIS Definition</b> <b>Withdrawn by MPIG after discussion</b>  Presented by MPIG/(L. Boyer): Recommendation is to provide a more precise reference to Section 1701 or applicable certification standard (rather than “governing regulations”) to aid users in research.  CAAC/(X. Li): Change is not needed. Only Part 25 has the EWIS definition. There is no EWIS definition in Part 23/27/29. EASA/(D. Dumortier): Has been used successfully without this change. EASA/(L. Tosini): Share the CAAC comment. Are there examples of a problem? FAA/(W. Heliker): Number convention could change, may not want to be so exact. ANAC/(F. Lacerda): Share concern that specific number is too precise. Already a reference to Section 571. MPIG/(K. Berger): Withdrawn this CIP. Leave the current MSG-3 content as generic.
5.22	<b>CIP IND-2019-20</b> CIP disposition	<b>List of Other Structures</b> <b>CIP REJECTED</b>  Presented by RMPIG/(H. Nouri): Text conflict in Other Structure logic diagram. “LIST” on flowchart sends wrong message. Remove “and List” here and IMPS Section 4.2.2 (remove “/SSI” at that location).  EASA/(L. Tosini): Actual lists are required especially for follow-up. (Hamid responds true for MSI, but unfeasible for SSI because of huge potential size.) CAAC/(J. Huang via chat): agree with EASA. EASA/(D. Dumortier): points out MSG-3 does not refer to Other Structure and “items”. Also, list may be at the level of “assemblies”. Lists of Other Structure have been useful. OEMs must do it on some way. Reasoning in CIP is not fully correct. MPIG/(J. Hülsmann): Airbus does not provide other structure list.  <b>REJECTED</b> (two acceptance) ANAC/Lacerda supports additional consideration for completeness as basis for current rejection.
5.23	<b>CIP-IND 2020-01</b> CIP disposition	<b>Update of MRB and CMCC Process Interface Description</b> Introduction only. Discussed Day 5. <a href="#">Table for one month</a>



Presented by MPIG/(A. Chieffi): Current MSG-3 not in harmony with latest regulatory guidelines regarding roles, expected process, and procedures used by the ISC when interfacing with the CMCC.

EASA/(R. Iovinella): Flowchart box 3 question is misleading or redundant.

ANAC/(F. Lacerda): Puzzled by box 2.

TCCA/(J. Phipps): Agree with ANAC. Also, certification landscape is every-changing, and harmonization is a constant challenge. Support the intent of this CIP 100%. Needs to stay generic.

- Box and elsewhere, should not say TCH, but rather just the system safety analysis identifies CCMRs.
- Box 2 and 3 too specific.
- Box 5 identifies CMRs. Not part of MRB process. Rather “CMR disposition by CMCC”.
- Box 10 substitute TCH.
- Redevelop the CIP and offers to work with MPIG as a PB member.

EASA/(R. Iovinella): Generally, agree with TCCA. Keep as clean as possible. This should be in the IMPS not MSG-3.

FAA/(W. Heliker): same

**Action Item 2021-03**, CIP to be refined based on the comments provided on 28th May 2021. CIP would be further discussed in a virtual meeting by end June 2021 / early July 2021.

#### D. Other CIP Submitted (but NOT discussed due time constraint)

5.24	<b>CIP IND-2020-02</b> CIP disposition	<b>Scheduling Usage Monitoring Credit for Restoration Tasks</b> Introduction only – DEFERRED, NOT DISCUSSED IN THIS MEETING (POSSIBLY IN THE FORM OF VIRTUAL DECISION MEETING)
------	---	---

## 6. Virtual Decision Meetings (this year only)

- 6.1 27<sup>th</sup> May: Process of three “virtual meetings” was discussed as to which items so identified in Section 5A above were dispositioned with additional discussion as recorded.

## 7. IMRBPB – MPIG Discussion Topics

- 7.1 Update on Certification Management Team (CMT) – TCCA/(J. Phipps)
- TCCA is hosting virtual meeting later this year. Intend to update CMT on this meeting. CCMR coordination CIP IND 2020-01 will be extremely important. Will share with the PB management team to coordinate his presentation.

- Also related to CIP IND 2020-01, continued lack of confidence in coordination with cert colleagues. Have resolved some. Made CCMRs into AWLs.
- AHM is not a dead issue at CMT, though tried twice.

## 7.2 IMRBPB Communication Procedures Document

Working to formalizing communication procedures between regulatory bodies and industry. Presentation by R. Iovinella.

Summary document from November 2020 has not changed; will be uploaded to the EASA website.

Showed a timeline for annual flow. Importantly CIPs distribution is 2 months before IMRBPB meeting.

Presented at this meeting to get “green light” from PB.

**PB approves**, replacing current management procedure immediately.

**PB prefers to keep the document stand-alone** as is the current management procedure, with reference on the Charter.

## 7.3 Meeting Locations – DISCUSSION DEFERRED

	2022	TBD	City TBD, Brazil	Hosted by ANAC
	2023	TBD	Cologne, Germany	Hosted by EASA

## 7.4 2022 Leadership team vote

Sought a vote to maintain leadership team through 2022. **ACCEPTED**

## 7.5 Status of FAA AC 121-22D and FAA AC 25-19B – Todd Perry

PowerPoint presentation to be included with minutes (or distributed to IMRBPB and Industry). AC 121-22 MRB and AC 25-19 CMR will be published for public comment “soon”.

## 7.6 IAHM Briefing SAE International IVHM Working Group - Dr. Ravi Rajamani, Principal Consultant, drR2 Consulting, and Chair of SAE International IVHM Working Group

Overview of history of IVHM at SAE, committees and documents.

Request for SAE documents to be made available to Policy Board. Presentation will be on EASA website.

**Action Item 2021-04**, FAA to coordinate with A4A to make available the SAE documents associated with IVHM to the IMRBPB regulatory members.

# 8. Disposition of CIPs and miscellaneous items

## 8.1 Disposition of CIP.

CIP EASA-2020-01	Identification of Failure Causes	IP 190
CIP EASA-2020-03	Unacceptable Degradation	IP 193
CIP IND-2019-09	Zonal Procedures Scope Adjustment	IP 196
CIP IND-2019-13	IMPS Certification Review Item	IP 191
CIP IND-2019-15	EZAP Definition	IP 189
CIP-IND-2019-17	Deletion of Duplicated Information in Task Development Section	IP 195
CIP-IND 2019-19	Freeze-Thaw Effect	IP 198
CIP IND-2019-21	In Flight Loss of Other Structures	IP 192
CIP IND 2020-06	Amendment to IP180	IP 197
CIP IND 2020-07	Sampling	IP 194

8.2 Review of proposed amendment to the Charter/Signing of revised Charter and IMPS EASA/(R. Iovinella) provided an overview of proposed charter amendments. To be followed by email communication / transmission.

8.3 Review of Action Items

AI #		Action by
---	<p>IMRBPB Secretary to send the updated contact list to IMRBPB Chair at the end of 24<sup>th</sup> May 2021.</p> <p><u>Status as of 24<sup>th</sup> May 2021</u></p> <p>Contact list in the EASA IMRBPB web site currently has the regulatory member list updated, the same list was sent to MPIG Secretary at the end of Day 1 for updating the MPIG/RMPIG member list.</p>	<p><b>IMRBPB Secretary (J. Leung)</b></p> <p><b>MPIG Secretary (B. Ireland)</b></p>
2021-01	<p>MPIG Chair to identify the industry L/HIRF experts that would participate in the further refinement of the CIP EASA-2020-02 and EASA-2020-05. <b>Ref. 5.14 and 5.15.</b></p> <p><u>Status as of 25<sup>th</sup> May 2021</u></p> <p>MPIG/RMPIG would discuss during the 9<sup>th</sup> June 2021 Industry Meeting and feedback to EASA afterwards.</p>	<b>MPIG Chair (K. Berger)</b>
2021-02	<p>With the acceptance of CIP IND-2019-21 as amended as IP 192, Industry Structure WG to review the implication of the SSI definition that may potentially link to “Other Structure” in consideration with “Adverse Effect on Safety” in the framework of MSG-3 and IMPS. <b>Ref. 5.9.</b></p>	<b>Industry Structure WG</b>
2021-03	<p>CIP IND-2020-01 to be refined based on the comments provided on 28<sup>th</sup> May 2021. CIP would be further discussed in a virtual meeting by end June 2021 / early July 2021. <b>Ref. 5.23.</b></p>	<b>Gulfstream (A. Chieffi)</b>
2021-04	<p>FAA to coordinate with A4A to make available the SAE documents associated with IVHM to the IMRBPB regulatory members. <b>Ref. 7.6.</b></p>	<b>FAA (B. Heliker)</b>



---	IMRBPB Chair to send out (1) the draft amended Charter, and (2) Communication Procedures Document, to IMRBPB regulatory members by early June 2021.	<b>IMRBPB Chair (B. Heliker)</b>
-----	---	--------------------------------------

#### 8.4 Final remarks

**Meeting Adjourned.**