

## **2015 IMRBPB Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting Location:** Federal Aviation Administration  
Southern Region  
1701 Columbia Avenue  
College Park, GA 30337

### **Monday April 20<sup>th</sup>**

#### **1. Welcome(s) and Logistics**

Welcome by the FAA.

Welcome by the IMRBPB Chairman, Jeffrey Phipps.

Introduction of All Participants.

Brief from ASO on building and evacuation plans

#### **2. Review of Agenda.**

As per agenda

#### **3. Update list of attendees. (See attendee list attached)**

Discussion of official representatives vs attendees vs focal points.

Review of Excel spreadsheet focal points

#### **4. General Discussion Regarding the Management Teleconference, MPIG and IMRBPB Working Group meetings. “What went well?”**

TH – MPIG/Mr Harbottle - Normal practice to officially accept minutes.

Chair – Typically posted on the policy board website. Will incorporate PC’s comments and post on site.

Mr .Harbottle – there appears to be an error on AI 13/06. Will address at AI review.

Chair/Secretary – will update minutes and repost.

#### **5. Review of Telecon Decision Record**

Chair - will D/R from 2014 meeting and from now on.

#### **6. General review of the MRB Process Standard and objectives during the 2015 IMRBPB Meeting.**

- Chair – process standard draft with simple order and numbering system provided. Talks about MRB rules, MTB rules, exceptions and adds several appendices. Should be considered a “starting” document. Not looking to accept this document during this meeting. Looking for comments on format, general contents, etc. “How’s it looking?” 3-hr review on Thursday. Looking for general agreement on basic format to provide a basis for technical review after this meeting. Goal is to have a formal draft prepared by September, then work in October telecon. Final draft for review and acceptance for RWG in December.
- Boeing/Dr. Sweers– we have some aircraft in development, will this apply to them? Chair – the idea is to have a consensus standard that is accepted by all. If we approve this document in December, Transport Canada plans to implement new guidance based on that and then that would apply at that point. This generally

will apply to all regulatory in a similar fashion. We don't expect huge changes in administration of MRB/MTB process.

- Mr. Gdalevich – So after December, there will not be the need for other regulatory to participate in MRB? Chair – No, this allows for the common incorporation of IP's and makes national standards easier to implement. Perhaps through a/w agreements, regulatory may take advantage of that. However you may still participate as secondary regulatory agencies.
- Mr. Harbottle – will there be any commitment from regulatory to update their guidance on this revision cycle? Chair – I would expect that.
- Mr. Dumortier – this is a good topic for charter. Chair – the principles will need to get into charter. Will need to look at major revision to charter to support at the next meeting (2016).
- Mr. Lopez – was one topic dropped from the document? (OEM/TCH Recommended Maintenance Process) Chair – yes.
- Mr. Howell - Does validation need to be in bilaterals? Chair – yes. Using TCCA/EASA for example – the TIP has very outdated procedures. What we hope to do is use this document as a basis then rewrite those sections of the TIP based on what's really happening. As long as we both accept the same standard, the idea is that we can then validate each other's work.
- Mr. Bringle – does this include validation of 5's and 8's? Formalizing some of this in IP's. Chair – some things will need to be worked.
- Chair – moving forward, there may need to be a new numbering criteria for CIP's/IP's (numbers identifying if they affect the Process Standard or MSG-3.) Will think about over the next several days.

## **7. Initial presentation of new Regulatory CIPs to MPIG.**

### **a. CIP-FAA 2014-01, Discard Task Interval Incorporation by Reference in the MRBR.**

- Mr. Levesque restates the CIP. Presented last year in Ottawa. Pulled and resubmitted for this meeting. This has been informal policy in the powerplant area for at least 20 years. Went through and used the terminology in the MSG-3 document. Key is that there is reference to life limited tasks. Since the ALI manual is constantly updated, makes more sense to reference there. The recommendation is to establish the policy to reference.
- Mr. Harbottle - MPIG understands the background to this – will confirm position and discuss on Wednesday.

### **b. CIP-FAA 2015-01, Recording Vendor Recommendations – Task Interval Consistency.**

- Mr. Bringle restates the CIP. Highlights the use of the term “V/R.” (Vendor Recommendations) Different OEM/fleets may incorporate the use of this term different ways. Want to establish guidance to have OEM publish guidance as intervals or the MRBR incorporate appendix with information.
- Mr. Harbottle - On implementation. Now onwards? Or retroactive? Mr. Bringle – this is more for future MRB's, but could be incorporated on revisions at will. Up to the ISC for legacy fleets.

- Mr. Harbottle – this generated a lot of discussion, will be discussed tomorrow, not sure if we will have consolidated position by Wednesday. It's in industry's best interest to have a common approach here, but not quite sure this is the right approach. Within MSG-3, all V/R must be reviewed and may be overridden. Mr. Howell – agreed, that's essentially what we're asking to do.
- Chair – will look as implementation from regulatory point of view. Also, this week, let's look at implementation in terms of MSG-3/MRB process.

**c. CIP-IND-2013-06, Clarification of MSG-3 Applicability & Effectiveness Criteria.**

- Mr. Harbottle presented the CIP. He stated that this draft reflects revisions from Ottawa and Toulouse. The CIP addresses criteria for inspection type table 2-3-7.1 and selections from there. This version also reflects a change needed due to CIP EASA-2014-01.
- Mr. Howell - the statement about individual operators seems to be more about Mx scheduling. Mr. Harbottle – no, we're referring to just the operators in the working group.

**d. CIP-IND-2014-02, MSG-3 Analysis and Local Regulations.**

- Mr. Jovanovic presented the CIP. Stated that the problem occurs from time to time – usually associated with changes in personnel. Recommendation for clearer statement to show that the MRB should reflect MSG-3 logic, not regulatory requirements.
- Chair – recommendation – are you saying that you want the reg. requirement to be listed? Mr. Jovanovic – No.
- Chair – second sentence? Mr. Harbottle – that sentence is added solely for escape slide sampling – preferred to have in MRB than in CMR. This wording is to support that. Chair – the danger here is that if you leave this open, could cause expansion. Mr Harbottle – This comes from certification – directing tasks into Op's Mx program. Only two ways, ALI or MRB.
- Chair – is it possible to modify MSG-3 to accommodate this? This suggestion opens door to legitimize non-MSG-3 tasks into the MSG-3 program. Mr. Harbottle – We have similar problems with EWIS and L/HIRF with type certification process. That was later overridden by certification. We have no confidence that certification will allow us to take credit for this. (Increased work/cost.) Chair – this will key into how we interface with CMT process.
- Mr. Harbottle – this paper is talking about the generation process – that only the MSG-3 process should be used to generate the MRBR.
- Mr Sridhar – Does this include appendices? Mr. Harbottle – Yes.

**e. CIP-IND-2014-04, L/HIRF Structural Protection Identification within the MSG-3 Analysis Process.**

- Dr. Sweers presented the CIP. Discusses instructions on how structural components become LHSI's. Best dealt with in a glossary entry to make clear that MSG-3 analyst can add LHSI if needed. This version resolves various problems with previous text – for example, “critical structure”.
- Mr. Harbottle – we're identifying the need to have interface with design personnel. This is clearly necessary to identify certification concerns.

- Dr. Sweers – an example is an aircraft with an amendment to its TC for a new winglet design. Engineering team evaluated decided that winglet was not LHSI. MSG-3 analyst may decide that there's some reason to include as LHSI.

**f. CIP-IND-2015-02, Approval Status of MRB Report Appendices.**

- Mr. Harbottle presented the CIP. This CIP affects MRB process, not MSG-3 logic. Problem really related to growth of programs over the years. Increasing number of appendices. Each one needs to be considered as to if it needs to be approved by regulatory authority. EASA, for example, has a specific statement showing which appendices it approves. Recommend adding this to MRB process standard.
- Mr. Howell – Is this not retroactive? Mr Harbottle – no. All letters after this agreement would meet this, but no need to resign ones currently in effect.
- Mr. Bringle – We (FAA SEA AEG) are currently doing this (but not formally.) Mr. Jovanovic – Bombardier has not seen this.
- Mr. Kieft – we (EASA) can't issue a negative approval (we can't say we don't approve...) Mr. Harbottle – were only expecting you to say what you do approve.

**g. CIP-IND-2015-03, MRB Requirements Specific to a Signing Authority.**

- Mr. Harbottle presented the CIP and stated that MPIG had started to discuss this morning. The CIP shows the differences between national requirements in MRB and national requirements by operators operating in a given regulatory environment. For example, some requirements are issued by government, but not signing agency (DOT vs FAA, for example.) These are sometimes listed in appendices to the report (which are intended to be for national differences in MRB/MSG-3 logic.) Recommendation is that MRB process standard includes language to avoid influence from other national requirements. Reference back to previous paper to show approval of each of these.
- Chair – Some of these same issues were in place 20 years ago – no point in having policy board make decisions if we don't make changes. Process standard should help with that. All about making process more efficient.
- Mr. Howell – these may also be different for EASA vs national (member state) requirements.
- Mr. Kieft - It is important to distinguish between State of Design and State of Registry (or State of Operation) requirements.
- Mr. Harbottle – This may also be retroactive.

**h. CIP-IND-2015-04, L/HIRF Unacceptable Degradation Definition.**

- Mr. Kostewicz presented the CIP. This CIP proposes to improve the definition of "unacceptable degradation". Proposes new glossary definition.
- Mr Sweers – this may be getting into the ACO side, particularly with the term "adequate".
- Chair – we need to determine "acceptable".
- Mr Sweers – the AWG might analyze – may call out task or request the assurance plan test over time.

**i. CIP- IND-2015-05, MRBR Preamble Statement Expecting Operators to Revise their MRBR Initial Maintenance Schedule based on In-Service Operational Data.**

- Mr. Harbottle restated on behalf of Mr Little (not currently present). The CIP comes from discussions around AC120-17. Relates to the attitude to MRBR once aircraft delivered. In US, not seen as such a critical thing (CASS, etc.) This is not the same around the world. Other regulators not in this room may not encourage revision of operator's maintenance programs based on MRBR revisions.
- Mr. Howell – this appears to blur the line between the MRB Report and the operator's Maintenance Schedule.
- Chair – putting a statement like this in the MRBR competes with the OEM's responsibility to optimize. Doesn't IP 44 give you methodology to include operator concerns?
- Mr. Harbottle - this affects the operator end (program), not the MRBR.
- Mr. Kieft - this statement may not help for countries that don't allow for reliability programs. There is a risk that the MRBR wording will override the national regulations.
- Mr. Beauchemin - This would help to allow for fostering reliability programs.

**j. CIP-RIND-2014-01, Clarification of Human Occupant in Volume 2.**

- Mr. Staggs presented the CIP. This CIP looks to extend the definition of "human occupant" to those in human external load operations and should classify structure as SSI that affects external load occupants.
- Chair – what's the RMPIG preferred option? Mr. Staggs – We're not sure. Mr. Leung - Is this typically included in the initial TC, or it is part of the STC process? Mr. Staggs - Could be either. Should still be analyzed.

**k. CIP-RIND-2014-02, Clarification of FD on Rotors and Drive Systems.**

- Mr. Staggs presented the CIP. CIP looks to clarify that FD tasks on rotors/drive systems must be analyzed the same way as SSI.
- Mr. Perry – How might this be affected by HUMS for credit? (Paragraph 7) – Mr. Staggs – the rating system might be applicable there, but it will depend on how HUMS for credit is implemented.

**l. CIP-RIND-2014-03, Applicability of PSE's for Normal Category Rotorcraft.**

- Mr. Staggs presented the CIP and stated that this applies to Volume 2 only. Originally, the PSE concept was only applicable to transport category. This now is changed (July 8, 2014) and now MSG-3 Vol 2 needs to update to meet it. Recommend revision to 2-4-1.1 to match.
- Chair- Change recommendation to reflect "per standard" and extend to Volume 1.

**Tuesday April 21<sup>st</sup>**

IMRBPB Meeting, **Regulatory Members Only**, reference the IMRBPB Regulatory Meeting Agenda.

MPIG Meeting, **RMPIG and MPIG Members Only**, reference the MPIG agenda.

## **Wednesday April 22<sup>nd</sup> IMRBPB Meeting**

### **8. Review 2015 Revision to the IMRBPB Charter.**

Chair – there are three changes to the charter this cycle:

- In relation to AI 13/01 – working group reference. Added reference to technical working group in paragraph 2.
- Mr. Harbottle - does this include possible MPIG participation? Chair – yes. For example, if we have a WG to finish process standard, MPIG would be invited to participate.
- Change to procedure for elections – Paragraph 3. Old way signatory person was only person allowed to be chair/co-chair. Now, not limited to that.
- Changes to how to change the charter – 30 day prior to meeting. TH – would input be accepted from MPIG/industry? Chair (and policy board) – absolutely – this paragraph doesn't say from whom the changes might come.
- Mr. Lopez – Paragraph 7, will that change for the policy standard document? Chair – huge changes coming for the charter to support that – expect that changes will be drafted for the next meeting.
- Signatories (including Mr. Douglas from AFS-300) have signed except Gerald (Singapore) (absent).
- Mr. Harbottle– is there any discussion of regulatory participation in MPIG working groups? Chair – this may be covered under change to Paragraph 2. Mr. Harbottle – does this imply that regulatory management supports regulatory participation in MPIG working groups? Chair – that would be a separate process outside the charter. Mr. Harbottle - but having it in the charter might make it easier. Mr. Heliker – for FAA, this would be up to office/budget. Chair – if you would like to have a charter addition to support this, the concept of a single regulatory representing the whole regulatory group might be good. Mr. Harbottle – that sounds good, but in past we have had the results of the WG negated later by other regulatory. Chair – this hopefully doesn't happen as much as it did. Recommend adding the change (MPIG proposal) and multiple regulatory vs single regulatory participation into future revisions of the charter.
- Mr. Harbottle – MPIG will take the action. We expect MPIG working groups (specifically structural) to produce significant changes to MSG-3 and regulatory involvement and recognition of this in the charter would be useful.

### **9. Review 2014 minutes and approval**

- Discussed AI 13/08 and 13/09
- Removed “being vague” from item 17.
- Checked IP 139 and verified the wording from minutes is in IP 139.
- Minutes approved from 2014.

### **10. CMT Team meeting update**

- Chair went to meeting in DC on behalf of TCCA – 4 regulators attending (TCCA, FAA, EASA and ANAC.) It became fairly obvious that CMT is similar to the IMRBPB for the certification world. CMT, however, is the custodian for the design standards for certification, where we (IMRBPB) don't really own our standard. The big eye-opener was that there were significant members of that board that had no idea what the IMRBPB did. It became a good opportunity to update them on our work and develop a good working relationship. Feeds into the larger idea of the Process Standard and updating MSG-3 and establishes the IMRBPB on an equal level as the CMT and allows better for part of bilateral agreements. This in turn allows for certainty with our own work.
- Additionally, it also allows better for TC validation process. The idea was to establish a governance arrangement/agreement between the IMRBPB and the certification "world". (CMT and others.)
- The Chair's message to the CMT in September 2014 was one more year until PS in place and update reg. guidance would be based on that after implementation. (TCCA and others as well.) Very well received by some, IMRBPB seen as ineffective by others. Certification world may not see our work – they just see a large effort that they don't participate and don't validate. Chair agreed prior to 2009. More work in the last 5 years than the last 15 easily. Showed evidence of that. Message overall was that the IMRBPB was much more efficient and will produce the Process Standard this year. Will update at this year's CMT, and may standardize reporting to them. That relationship was present in the past, but has faded over the years and this may help reintroduce that. Will share CMT IP with MPIG.
- Mr. Harbottle - was anything said about MRB process not being required? Would our work here help getting that agreed to? Chair – that was not discussed. From a TCCA perspective, certainly that's expected, but ICA updates would be needed there. Mr. Harbottle – we've agreed that the process would be followed, but regulations make it optional. Need to change that perhaps. Chair – this relationship might help start that process. Allen Howell – what other options do you have (other than the MRB process)? Mr. Harbottle – we don't have one, but 1529 doesn't *require* the MRB process. Mr. Cox – perhaps the reason that that process comes from 1529 is faulty. The MRB process springs from operational rules, not necessarily 1529. Mr Harbottle – this is probably true, but that's how it's being used. Chair – again, the relationship with the CMT starts that.

## 11. Action Item Review:

- AI 13/01**, IMRBPB Charter to include IMRBPB WG and CIP management.
  - Chair – I'd like to think that this action is now closed with change to charter (including discussion above about MPIG working groups.) Will entertain amendment later. **Closed.**
- AI 13/03**, NAA Implementation Reference. (IP index list, restatement of 08/01).
  - Chair - Additionally, this is one of the reasons for the Process Standard.
  - Chair – we have two options – we can leave open – after this meeting, road map for PS and mature draft reflected against IP's, then close as unneeded as IP integration would be updated and tracked.

- Mr Harbottle – then incorporation would take a while and implementation would take a while.
- Chair - Or we can close now.
- Chair – let’s leave open, look at closing after publication of Process Standard.
- General discussion about implementation of Process Standard into regulatory compliance documents (AC 121-22 etc.), stating compliance and differences to the Process Standard, and how often the Process Standard and the regulatory compliance documents will be amended.
- Mr. Harbottle – in bilaterals, some OEM and regulators are more supportive than others, some more responsive than others. Mr Howell – may have an issue with differing regulatory agencies. The process will need to be firmed up.
- Leaving **Open**, but will modify comments to add new statement that the PS will be validated to all existing IP’s and then will close IP. New IP’s will be evaluated on an ongoing basis.

**c. AI 13/06, Coordination of CIP IND 2008-04 with Certification.**

- Mr. Conn – this was updated in Ottawa to July 14 (due date), then discussed again in MPIG November 2014. Chair – TCCA never heard back. No update. Again, this is a great type of an item for CMT-IMRBPB coordination. Mr. Harbottle – this allows for credit in structural tasks similar to CMR process for system. We fully recognized that this is not something that the policy board can unilaterally approve, but we want to check that the certification branches might support the idea. In December, the FAA committed to having experts on call to discuss this. (Roy Patzke). We are still looking for buy-in and continued support.
- Chair – we are obviously having coordination issues. Perhaps draft an agenda item for concept to the CMT? Chair to take action to draft agenda item. (by July) and will present agenda item to CMT in September. Remains **open** pending CMT action in September.

**d. AI 13/10, Revise IP 44 as per IP 134 recommendation.**

- Chair – in work, will be provided to MPIG after the meeting to ensure that comments are implemented. **Open.**

**e. AI 13/11, Further develop CIP EASA-2013-01. “Windows” or “Tolerances”**

- Mr. Harbottle – the way this was put to MPIG, RMPIG was to take as mostly of interest to rotorcraft and business aircraft. Mr. Kieft – request went out and nothing received. Chair – leave **open**. Mr. Kieft – will discuss internally within EASA and coordinate with RMPIG. Mr Harbottle – this does not appear to be an issue for large aircraft OEM.

**f. AI 13/12, IP 115 comments to be incorporated in IP 129.**

- Mr Conn – MPIG considered this closed. MPIG notes from December were to have Mr. Kerzner discuss with Dave Whalen (who is now retired). Action on the policy board was to review IP 115 comments into IP 129 and coordinate with FAA and reviewing specific MPIG statement – email dated 4 Jun 14 from MPIG chair (Jose) during Cologne meeting.



- Chair – was IP 129 updated? Mr. Conn - MPIG LHIRF WG appears to be ok. Dr. Sweers – IP 129 was incorporated into 2013.1 and should be acceptable. PB accepts MPIG position and **closes AI**.

**g. AI 14/01, IMRBPB MRB process standard to address revision status and implementation of MSG-3.**

- Chair – will become part of the standard validation of the policy standard document against issued IP’s. The implementation reference for MSG-3 on existing and new programs will need to be considered in the policy standard (currently, in para 4.4), similar to the way IP 143 implementation reference statement works now. Leaving **AI open** pending that review and policy standard document draft.

**12. Review Regulatory CIPs:**

**a. CIP-FAA 2014-01, Discard Task Interval Incorporation by Reference in the MRBR.**

- Mr. Levesque restated the CIP.
- Mr. Harbottle – MPIG considered this and had discussion on “extensions or deletions of safe-life limits” – want to make clear that the requirement is not conditional – that the LL is approved and that it’s the responsibility of the ISC to “subsequently” review and incorporate to make clear that it’s post LL implementation. MPIG agrees with logic, but wants to make sure that the new number(s) are still valid within MSG-3 and the ISC has a chance to evaluate that.
- Mr. Dumortier – should we refer to the “initial” MRBR here? Mr. Levesque – typically this is an issue on initial approvals, but we shouldn’t limit it.

**Closed as IP 145 R0. Not retroactive.**

- Mr. Harbottle- so as an example here, this will be built into the policy standard in a year, then into national guidance in two years. Will there be pressure on the OEM’s to implement this now (to comply with the IP)? Chair – this will be allowed. Mr. Harbottle – so we can voluntarily comply, but will not be required until built into national guidance. Chair – correct.

**b. CIP-FAA 2015-01, Recording Vendor Recommendations – Task Interval Consistency.**

- Mr. Bringle restated the CIP.
- Mr. Harbottle - MPIG has reviewed. This is an issue over many years. What is proposed here is a resolution and is in current favor. Industry accepts the need for a standard approach, but doesn’t think this is a perfect solution. In view of harmonization, MPIG supports the IP.
- Mr. Kieft – one note – ISC referred to earlier, but not in last section. Mr. Howell – “the normal MRBR revision process” should cover that.

**Closed as IP 146 R0 without change. Not retroactive.**

**13. Review RMPiG CIPs:**

**a. CIP-RIND-2014-01, Clarification of Human Occupant in Volume 2.**

- Mr. Staggs restated the CIP.

- Chair – this gave us two options. The Policy Board position is that we like the first paragraph of Option A and the second paragraph of option B. Can we reformat into that? Mr. Howell – the two options were not quite in synch.
- Mr. Staggs – agreed.

**Closed as IP 147 R0 as discussed above with combination of the two definitions. Not retroactive.**

**b. CIP-RIND-2014-02, Clarification of FD on Rotors and Drive Systems.**

- Mr Staggs restates the CIP. RMPIG would like to revisit this issue based on new information from structures group.
- Chair – rotor & drive systems subject to supplementary analysis.
- Mr. Cox – for Vol 2, this is correct. That structures were subject to AD and ED analysis and the lack of FD was one of the major reasons for the Vol 2 introduction. Why add FD now? Mr Staggs – this is part of the RMPIG discussion.
- Mr. Desrosiers – the initial paper came from EASA remarks. Approach might change. Need to re-evaluate the new information. Mr. Cox – there are two programs currently being worked under Volume 2. Is this lack a risk? Mr. Conn – ...and keep in mind that this is the chance to affect 2015.1 – after this, 2017 implementation. Mr. Staggs – correct. We don't see a risk to current programs.
- RMPIG chooses to withdraw the CIP based on the fact that FD analysis is not required by MSG-3 Vol 2 at this time.

**c. CIP-RIND-2014-03, Applicability of PSE's for Normal Category Rotorcraft.**

- Chair – Policy board accepts, but suggests removing the number 571 and just making a reference to “applicable” certification standards. Mr. Harbottle - will accept deletion of the word “section”. Chair – ok to leave “section” – retroactivity is N.

**Closed as IP 148 R0. Affects Volume 2 only.**

**d. CIP IND 2015-06 Deletion of reference to 14 CFR §25.571 requirement from Section 2-4-1**

TH – similar to the above, for a slightly different reason. Issue here is the current 2-4-1 refers simply to FAA requirements and this is a risk of de-harmonization between regulations and Vol 1 and Vol 2. Removes specific reference to FAR and uses Section as the above.

**Closed as IP 149 R0. Affects Volume 1. Not retroactive.**

**14. Review MPIG CIPs:**

**a. CIP-IND-2013-06, Clarification of MSG-3 Applicability & Effectiveness Criteria.**

- Chair – EASA provided some suggestions last night. Mr. Kieft – to explain a little bit, deletion to text was because policy board did not think discussion of fleet vs individual a/c belonged here. Also, discussion of “repetitive repair” vs “repair:” (Mr. Harbottle agreed) Discussion of typical way that aircraft was operated. This draft increases the number of examples. EASA agrees with concept, but fleshes out. Discussion of cost of repair – MPIG will discuss. Mr. Kieft – perhaps there should be a new definition of “multiple failure” (vs successive failure.) Mr. Harbottle – seems satisfactory in this context, but will check against MSG-3.

- Mr Kieft – finally, IP 143 affects some of this text. “Safe operation” will have to be checked/changed. We would anticipate changes to the table text based on these changes. Mr. Harbottle – we would like to have a closer look in caucus. Potentially close later in the week. **Remains open** for moment (*see 14.d. below*).

**b. CIP-IND-2014-02, MSG-3 Analysis and Local Regulations. – now “Consideration of non-MSG-3 tasks in the MRB Report.”**

- Mr Jovanovic restated the CIP.
- Chair – the policy board is primarily concerned about the paragraph with the blue text. We do not understand the value of the change as this seems to be already stated. Additionally, IP 37 would seem to apply here. Why make a change if the text is already there – what is the additional value of the change? Mr Jovanovic – the most important part is the third sentence and the reference to “additional requirements”. We still experience this problem with most of the OEM’s, so thought that enhancement was needed. Chair – seems to be reiterating the same intent with the new wording. If MPIG/RMPIG feel the change is needed, though, the board can support.
- Mr. Howell – perhaps this might not be limited to escape slide sampling. Chair – is there an impact with this clarification with the CMCC process? Mr Harbottle – no, because all tasks will have route. Mr. Dumortier – perhaps not just tasks, but requirements. Mr. Harbottle – the AWG would make change based only on new information, not CMCC/SSA changes. Mr. Jovanovic – the key is that the decision is up to the ISC. Chair – depends on if you have a task or don’t.
- Mr. Howell – perhaps the CMCC discussion is a sidetrack issue. Mr. Harbottle – these are tasks that are not coming from engineering, just imposed by regulators. Mr. Jovanovic – this CIP is designed to avoid the situation where the regulatory ask for tasks. Chair – we seem to be back to the idea that this reemphasizes existing text. Key is “must be approved by the ISC.” Mr. Dumortier – this CIP may not address that concern. Mr. Howell – why not just specifically state this?
- Chair – slightly difference re-reading today. We all seem to agree that MSG-3 tasks should be the only thing listed in the MRB. Mr. Beauchemin – correct - this comes up all the time. Chair – what do we do with tasks that are outside the logic, but need to be integrated? Proposed additional sentence that additional tasks only accepted with “exceptional circumstances”. Dr. Sweers – For example, the 787 current return network – FAA would not accept program until sampling program developed. Chair – sampling programs exist, but not in the MRB – the results of sampling should feed back into the MRB. TH – this one, the operator should be involved in. Chair – remove whole paragraph? MRBR should be only MSG-3. Maybe we change the paragraph to state this implicitly. Do we want the MSG-3 document to say that? Perhaps rewrite. Also, process standard might be affected.
- Mr. Harbottle – what about a proposal that in 2015, we replace “and” with “for” in the last sentence of the second paragraph and modify the whole area. Mr. Kieft - lead 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence with “non MSG-3 requirements.” Discussion of “any”. Mr. Harbottle – also consider for policy standard here. There was a generalized discussion of wording requirements. Chair – in the past, appendices provided the place for this.
- Mr. Jovanovic – a new statement in second paragraph specifically mentioning national regulatory requirements appears to fully answer the intent of the CIP. Mr Harbottle – I understand where we’re going, but concerned that a task that is

legitimately from MSG-3 and happens to be a national requirement, it might be dropped. “National regulatory requirements not derived from MSG-3 logic are not part of the MRB Report.” Chair – validation process may lead to task(s). Mr Harbottle – there seem to be several efforts to introduce scheduled national requirement tasks into the MRB simply because they can’t be justified as CMR/ALS. Chair – this appears to mainly be a process standard issue. Modified last sentence to reflect idea of other (non N/R) tasks coming to ISC for approval for inclusion. Discussion of “appendix” vs “section”. “Not *part* of the report” means that the material might still be in an appendix. (Section is part of the report; appendix is not part of the report.) Chair – we should approach that issue in the process standard.

- Mr. Harbottle – “Other” MSG-3 tasks and justification. Wording changed to “Other non-MSG-3 tasks may be submitted to the ISC for consideration for inclusion in the MRB Report only when justification can be provided.” Chair – “May be” hopefully will cover the exceptional circumstance. Decided to remove “regulatory” to hopefully not limit consideration of some national requirements that might be driven by agencies other than the certification or airworthiness standards organizations. Decided to change title to “Consideration of non-MSG-3 tasks in the MRB Report.”

**Agreed to revised wording (see highlighted second paragraph in IP text) as IP 150 R0 – Not retroactive. Will be implemented into the next revision of MSG-3.**

**c. CIP-IND-2014-04, L/HIRF Structural Protection Identification within the MSG-3 Analysis Process.**

- Dr. Sweers restated the CIP.
- Chair – the policy board generally agrees, but asked about duplication in the last sentence of the first paragraph (operational requirements) vs the current note. Adding the word “economic” to that statement may fix that. The note also refers to the idea that the items are brought to the ISC.
- Mr. Dumortier – what if we remove the reference to the MSG-3 analyst in the first paragraph? Mr. Kostewicz – we found the reference to the MSG-3 analyst to be important to show that these things are not coming from engineering. Chair – recommended change to “other”. Mr. Beauchemin – like “operational or economic”. Chair – “operational, economic or other.” Mr Sweers - Agreed. Also, adding the phrase “when accepted by the ISC” might eliminate the need for the note. May be included is not equal to must be analysed.
- Dr. Sweers – there were many revisions to this. The term became so different that we eventually lined it out. In the spirit of moving forward, is this ok? Operational/economic considerations is better. Discussion of what engineering defines (components) and what the analyst defines (the LHSIs). Chair – let’s not take away from the specialist work.

**Agreed to as IP 151 R0 as revised. Not retroactive. Applies to both volumes.**

**Thursday April 23<sup>rd</sup> IMRBPB Meeting**

**14. Continuation of MPIG CIP Review:**

**d. CIP-IND-2013-06, Clarification of MSG-3 Applicability & Effectiveness Criteria (continuation of discussion)**

- Mr. Harbottle – updated to version 2 (dated 4/23/15) based on discussion this week – recommendation statement “later agreed as IP 143” and added new final two sentences. Version 2 generally reflects proposal from EASA. MPIG has one question – we don’t understand “typical operation”. In view of closeness, MPIG proposes to delete this phrase. Mr. Kieft – should be stressed out that no specific impact from abnormal utilization should be assumed. Mr. Harbottle - MPIG believes that discussion of availability (particularly in helicopter and business worlds) is important and should be considered. (4<sup>th</sup> EASA bullet).
- Chair – why should we state these things in MSG-3 rather than define in the PPH? Maybe this is a policy standard issue.
- Mr. Harbottle – what about “while performing typical operations” after the double failure. Mr. Heliker – are we talking about environmental (airport) costs here? Chair – this mostly seems to be a PPH issue. Discussion about the difference between “certified” and “normal”. Mr. Harbottle – removed reference to visual check (IP 143) and moved to paragraph 3. Added multiple failure as a term to the glossary.
- Chair – are we ok removing the fourth bullet? Mr’s Heliker and Kieft – no. Chair – this seems to apply to multiple operators (such as rotorcraft) and may need to be considered. Mr Kieft – given two air carriers, one with support and one without, consideration should not be given to task selection due to the business decision not to buy support. Gulfstream – if you keep this bullet, you remove flexibility. Chair – maybe add reference to “described in the PPH”?
- Mr. Harbottle – only in the fourth bullet. “Unless agreed to by the ISC or documented in the PPH”. The concept is ok. Added term of “user’s guide” to “PPH”. Chair – why not reiterate requirement from 1.2 to consider all operating capabilities. “Certificated operations” MPIG accepts the proposal as version 2. Compromise reached and document amended.

**Closed as IP 152 R0.** Will need comments etc removed (from review this week.)

- Mr. Dumortier – for markup/IP purposes, is it possible to get Word versions for MSG-3? Mr. Conn – yes, on request to A4A by section.

**e. CIP-IND-2015-02, Approval Status of MRB Report Appendices.**

- Chair – obvious impact here on policy standard document.
- Mr. Kieft – it is not possible to issue a “negative approval”, stating what is not approved.
- Mr. Harbottle – we can accept listing all the sections.
- Mr. Kieft – recommend modifying the first bullet to refer to “sections and appendices” and removing the second bullet (in the recommendation.)
- Chair – have approval letter in policy standard, but may need to address this better in the main text. Will add in paragraph 22 or 23 (of the policy standard draft).

**Closed as IP 153 R0 as amended.**

**f. Update to IP 119.**

- Mr. Harbottle - this is a report back from MPIG AAWG. In Dec 2013 the AAWG was tasked to update Level 1 corrosion definition. They proposed a 4 bullet definition adding information and are proposing an update to IP 119 to change this (Revision 2). Feedback was that it wasn’t clear how this definition would be

- used. New letter from AAWG was received and recommends that the definition be harmonized to the greatest extent possible. Received regulatory input - considered robust as possible. Clearly AAWG doesn't have the ability to require its use, but certainly would encourage its use. AAWG plans to further develop Level 2 and 3, but not publish through us (AAWG mainly concerned with 571, not ICA/1529).
- Mr. Bringle – Was FAA input from Rusty Jones? Mr Harbottle – yes, was fully discussed and his input was concluded to not affect the decisions/definition. Mr Kieft – who from EASA? Mr Harbottle - Richard Minter.
  - Chair – we discussed in caucus, but didn't discuss regulatory involvement with AAWG. We generally agree with Mr. Harbottle that we should all have common definition. In 2012 we accepted a proposal from EASA, and then took to AAWG. Further review developed this four bullet definition. Also, the EASA AMC 20-20 definition is not the same as either the current MSG-3, or the proposed 4-bullet definition. Marc Coile - Richard Minter (EASA) is working, but no idea when/if this might be fixed. Mr. Howell – this might possibly conflict with the published Level 2 definition in AMC 20-20. Mr. Leung – is there impact on the current program? Mr. Harbottle – this is not intended to be retroactive, so should be acceptable. New programs only. Mr. Kieft – two concerns: that we didn't get it earlier, and need to review with EASA Certification to verify. Procedural review. **Leave open until at least tomorrow.**
  - Mr Cox – there is a possible deeper concern here within the 27/29/135 context. All regulations in this area are in the context of airplanes and dispositioning tasks generated this way is difficult for rotor wing. Could be a future CIP from RMPIG to affect Volume 2.

**g. CIP-IND-2015-03, MRB Requirements Specific to a Signing Authority.**

- Chair – generally, the policy board had issues with some of the wording, but agreed with the concept. Noted link to IND-2014-02. Mr. Harbottle – these were intentionally separate to affect both MSG-3 and Process Standard. This is one of the key issues that operators have experienced in the field.
- Chair - Agreed – will be included in the policy standard document (para 10.9). Exact wording to be discussed at that point.

**Closed as IP 154 R0 for inclusion into the Process Standard.**

**h. CIP-IND-2015-04, L/HIRF Unacceptable Degradation Definition.**

- Chair – we recommend two changes here. In Step 9, we're not sure why the change occurred – “susceptible”. Additionally we didn't like “adequate” and possible changing to “required” might be better.
- Dr. Sweers – there is some confusion with “susceptible” with engineering due to EMC susceptibility. Mr Kostewicz – the aim was to make it easier to use. Original intent was to express idea that the thing is “likely” to happen – this has been misinterpreted in the past. Is this acceptable technically? Mr Sweers – this step is intended to get you down the path of task determination. Chair – “expected to experience” is a more conservative approach. Mr. Chieffi– in the context of the flow chart, this makes sense. Mr. Howell – agreed. In the context of step 8, this makes sense.

- Chair – discussion of “adequate” – in limits or out of limits? Not strong enough for protection. The policy board thought “required” might work better. When protection is not effective, that’s when an issue occurs. Mr Brown – “minimum required” might be better. Mr Sweers – “minimum” is a problem for us as it implies a measurement. Mr Heliker – what about striking the word out? Chair – we either have protection or we don’t.
- Mr. Dumortier – I’m concerned that someone might interpret this at the LHSI (system) level. Chair – one of the difficulties in LHIRF is determining when you’ve lost your protection. If you have protection, it should be acceptable. What is this definition going to be used for? Dr. Sweers – the refers to the protections that are needed for LHIRF. Chair – I think I see why “adequate” was proposed now. Mr. Bringle – perhaps “necessary.” Mr Sweers – it’s important to note that this is over the life of the aircraft. Chair – does MPIG have any heartburn over “required”? Mr. Kostewicz – prefers “necessary” or delete. Chair – the sense of the policy board is either ‘necessary’ or ‘required’ but not “adequate”. Ms. de Souza – defining any of these is tough. Chair – we agree we need the definition.

**Closed IP as amended (with “necessary”) as IP 155 R0. Affects both volumes. Non-retroactive.**

**i. CIP- IND-2015-05, MRBR Preamble Statement Expecting Operators to Revise their MRBR Initial Maintenance Schedule based on In-Service Operational Data.**

- Mr. Harbottle - Ron Little is not available and I will present.
- Chair – This appears to be outside of the PB scope.
- Mr Harbottle - the hope is to get support for changing/expanding tasks in countries that are not part of the PB.
- Chair – this is a very complex issue. To interfere in that without understanding the rationale can present a significant risk. Mr. Kieft – the policy board membership authorities provide for this, but not all State of Registries will have national regulations, and if we put words in here about expectations this may pressure such authorities to act in ways that are not appropriate.
- Chair – CIP item is outside the scope of the charter and is not adopted.

**15. Review IMRBPB WG (2014) Results and Initial Draft of the IMRBPB MRB Process Standard.**

- Chair – we started with the review of the Comparison Document (grid). Essentially, took basic requirements from current guidance and organized into topics. Each authority reviewed and comments were provided in December. Not completely updated since the draft but will be (and will be used as validation against the policy standard draft.)
- From that document, developed generic template of topics. Includes policy board items, MRB construction, MTB construction, then common subjects that affect either (and a small section on ICA and coordination of ICA.) From that, the policy standard draft was generated. From this meeting, the idea is to get general comments. Goal is to complete and post the document the first week of January. Want to look at the number of and content of appendices.

**a. General comments from MPIG and others:**

- Mr. Lopez - Any thought of a signature page? Chair – don’t know yet. Needs to be a controlled document, surely – control changes through this process. Mr

- Harbottle – we recognize the amount of work needed to generate this document. Very good start. However, clearly not been time for MPIG thorough review. We have some comments, but certainly want to advise that we need time to go through it in detail. Would like to have the ability to have a small number of people to work with the PB to finalize comments. Chair – would appreciate help with time and dates/deadlines/roadmap.
- Mr. Harbottle – We also recognize that behind that although there may be common statements in this document, the regulatory interpretation of those statements may be different and this would affect validation principles. Chair – some of that we can accommodate within the standard. Also firmly believe that for multiple authorities, those differences may become a different way of complying with the requirement(s). Some of that can/will be done/accomplished in the validation process. The real onus will be on the certifying authority – the responsibility of running the process and ensuring that the process is running to standard. Mr Harbottle – that doesn’t mean that the end document will be just “basic” requirements.
  - Mr. Harbottle - we fully support the format and the concept of a revision log. Discussion of maintaining a LEP as well and if this is viable in an electronic format. Perhaps this shouldn’t be required for MRBR either (15.4)
  - Chair – what do you think about the title? Mr. Harbottle – The title is correct. However, MPIG strongly disagrees with the inclusion of an ICA section in a MRB process standard. It appears to be guidance for 1529/App H, not MRBR. (Old 22.7) Chair – that section was based on some other harmonization activity, and felt while drafting that there may be interfaces. Mr. Dumortier – perhaps out of the scope of the policy board. Chair – agreed that ICA is out of the scope of the policy board, but there are parts of the policy board activity that affect ICA. I will look at this section from the PB/MRB perspective and see if there is valuable information in that section. Can also add information about validation of tasks, but should focus on MRB perspective. Will redraft the section.
  - Mr. Harbottle – perhaps look at bullets in MTB sections, as there may be good information there that may apply back to MRB as well. Example 18.10 and 18.17 – no equivalent task/responsibilities in the MRB process.
  - Mr. Harbottle – another general point – we have been using the term “host” and “guest” and avoided the term “foreign”. Inconsistency in the document exists at times.
  - Chair – the thought was that in the future, we will have a “certifying authority” (no definition in the document.) This would be the initial certification authority (state of design) and the authority that provides the “hosting” MRB chairperson. A “validating authority” would be post-certification (probably, but may be in parallel.) The third kind of individual is the authority that is part of the process to issue an approval of the MRBR only. But may not have a bilateral etc. Mr. Harbottle – “signing” vs “non-signing” (like the letters of confirmation) is better. Mr. Ward – typically we approve the ICA and reserve the right to participate, but not sign the MRBR. There’s a difference between a CASA type certificate, and a type acceptance certificate. Chair – so validation of a product might lead to acceptance, not approval. The document needs to identify the certifying authority in the process and then identify other authority.
  - Mr. Harbottle – are you trying to write this document based on bilaterals in place or not? Mr. Ward – the attempt is to describe a common standard. The context



- (bilateral or acceptance regimen etc.) doesn't really matter. Chair – the #1 priority here is to have a common standard that all OEM's and regulators can adopt. Really has nothing to do with technical agreements etc. – they're well outside the scope of the policy board. However, knowing that validation may be coming, it's better to use some of the same terms. Mr Harbottle – given that, we recommend removing “host” and “guest.” Chair – I will think about that.
- Mr. Xue – It's important to look at process and implementation both, but to get the process correct.
  - Chair – we must base the document on the CA POV. If you're not there as the CA, you're a VA. Mr. Harbottle – this may depend if you're signing it or not. How do we handle the non-signing guest authorities? (Inference – all VA sign the MRBR.) Mr. Jovanovic – It's important to get this right.
  - Chair – there are three roles here – keep in mind this is outside of agreements, but we're using terminology that is familiar.
  - Mr. Ward – the idea is to simplify the terminology. At the highest level we would have the Certificating Authority – from the ICAO State of Design. Then we'd have two different kinds of states of registry. A Validation Authority issues a type certificate (and accepts/approves an MRB Report), but an Accepting Authority doesn't issue a type certificate (and doesn't accept/approve an MRB Report.) Chair - There's always confusion on what authorities need to be at meetings. Right now, TCCA is a validating authority on a US/EU/Brazilian product. Currently, part of that validation has us (TCCA) approve the MRBR. In the future, that might not be the case. I'm hoping that when an OEM runs a new program, this standard will help define who needs to be present when. Mr. Fox – this needs a really good/robust glossary to explain all this. Mr. Bringle – why “validating authority” instead of “co-certifying authority”? Chair – trying to identify the terms we need to use. If you sign or not sign is outside of this process.
  - Chair – obviously will have to define signing vs non-signing in the policy standard.
  - Other items – update tomorrow on IP 119, but this should be the major discussion tomorrow, will set up timeline/road map from there. Plan tomorrow to go until we're done – 1300 finish.

## **16. IMRBPB Elections and concurrent MPIG Meeting**

### **Friday April 24<sup>th</sup> IMRBPB Meeting**

#### **17. New IMRBPB Management Announced.**

IMRBPB Chairperson – Bill Heliker, FAA

IMRBPB Co-Chair – Mark Kieft, EASA

Secretary – TBA from TCCA (J Phipps to nominate person by this summer.) (*announced on 26 May 15 as Ryan Hennigar from TCCA.*)

#### **18. Review IMRBPB WG (2014) Results and Initial Draft of the IMRBPB MRB Process Standard (general comments cont.)**

- Chair - Agreement made to use CA/VA terms throughout and will modify letter of confirmation accordingly.

- Mr. Harbottle – the document refers to “NAA” throughout, but since EASA is not an NAA we should state that. Mr Kieft - this is not quite true – EASA can be an NAA for these purposes, as it acts as State of Design. We do agree that this term should be clearly defined for purposes of this document. Chair – will need to address carefully to determine state of design vs state of registry functions. In the glossary as well.
- Mr Harbottle – is this a glossary of terms or a list of abbreviations? Chair – “glossary of terms” is correct right now I think – perhaps need both.
- Mr Conn – many terms used here are defined in MSG-3, how should we handle that (“drift” of definitions between the document)? Chair – will consider that – shouldn’t be a huge task to maintain and correlate both.
- Chair – glossary in front, abbreviations in the back? Maybe everything in the back. Will consider options. Also consolidation with IP 44.

**19. MPIG comments (by paragraph) on policy standard document (Mr. Harbottle stressed that these are not comprehensive yet.)**

- 1.1 appears to be in contradiction to 1.2 and 1.3 – purpose of the document, may need to have some rewording.
- 4.2 – appear to be referring only to transport category “A” helicopters that doesn’t seem to be consistent with current usage – consider changing? Also, worth considering difference between “A” and powered lift? JC – AW609. Volume 2 development and application to powered lift? Need clarity on this point. Chair – wouldn’t mind receiving from signing authorities’ rules/applicability processes for applying the MRB/MTB process. **AI 15/01 due 15 May 15.**
- 5.7 and 5.9 – may want to examine ISC chairperson – you may be really talking about ISC chair and co-chair. Discussion of representation of operators and OEM’s. Chair – need to consider all-inclusive statements. Chair – general references to OEM/TCH may need to be considered – isn’t the OEM also always the TCH? Perhaps define in glossary and then use one term? Perhaps just use TCH alone.
- 10.3 – ISC should review and provide comments on proposed MRBR, but in the previous paragraph the OEM prepares the draft, which doesn’t make sense.
- 10.14 – We’re not going to resolve this today – this is the requirement for annual review. We had much discussion about this – need more clarity about expectations for annual review. Chair – the concept is valid, but what’s involved in the review is worth discussing. We realize that there are different interpretations of this within industry. Looking for standardization, as this has a major impact on workload. Objective is key.
- 10.15 – Today, we review all modifications at time of mod approval, so TR’s are more common than in the past. Needs to be revisited to consider all changes that affect the MRBR/ICA.
- 11.4 - Power down requirement – we may need to revisit – this is from an early IP (Chair to research which one). There may be certification/automated consideration for this now that makes this unneeded.
- 11.8 – Evidency – this may be a PPH issue, or might need to be changed. “Flight Day” vs “24 hours”.

- 12.2 – This doesn't seem to be needed in the MRBR – shouldn't this be controlled by the ALS already.
- 13.8 – This bullet doesn't seem to be appropriate for the MRBR. Chair – covered in MSG-3 already.
- 15.12 – Optimization procedures – this appears to be more of a PPH requirement than a MRBR one. Chair - Also ties to 15.13. Mr. Cox– perhaps operator reporting considerations should be there. Chair – perhaps reference. Mr. Harbottle – we would want to avoid any *requirement* to perform IP44 processes – this should be the OEM's choice to support or not.
- 15.17 – We feel that this wording applies only to deletion. (ref FAA SE-172). Seems to be a misunderstanding. (This is MPIG's biggest issue with the policy standard document). Chair – perhaps delete EWIS etc. too. Discussion of FAA certification request for escalation.
- Section 17 (general) – perhaps we need to clarify under the MTB that one or the other process needs to be selected and discuss operator participation in the AWG process.
- 22.2 – wording? TCH utilization “parameters” vs utilization “envelope” or scope of utilization.
- 22.4 – We may want to discuss TCH recommendations outside utilization envelope. We've never reached agreement on high utilization. MPIG will be seeking guidance on what to do in this case. Chair – two choices – just talk about low utilization, or just utilization outside TCH parameters. Mr. Harbottle – in re 1529 compliance – what is approval status would there be of/for task sets outside MRBR parameters? Mr Beauchemin – I have done this. Mr. Harbottle – can we just say that this is outside the MRBR process? Chair – will revisit idea. Mr. Harbottle – we would want to ensure that we're clear that it's outside the MRBR process.
- 24.1 – IP44 – second sentence is welcome, but is it true? Chair – will change 24 anyway, as IP 44 will be Appendix 4 now.
- 26 appears to duplicate itself in section 5.
- Generally, MPIG proposes to continue review with this draft. Chair – time is of the essence for this topic. Confident that new draft can be generated by end of May. Does MPIG want to wait for next draft or further review this one?
- MPIG – we will wait for next draft and then provide company input(s) and coordination of comments by the end of July.
- Chair – can regulatories meet this standard? Mid-July agreed for comment submission.
- MPIG – recommend small working group to discuss if needed. Chair – depends on extent of comments, but some sort of coordination will need to occur.
- Mr. Xue – perhaps the name of the report should no longer be the MRB Report in this document?

## **20. Road map forward for policy standard document:**

- 29 May 15 – New draft from Jeff. Jeff will sent draft to chairs and co-chair of regulatory and MPIG groups.
- 15 July 15 – Comments back to Jeff from regulatory and MPIG

- From June to July – TC will validate IP's up to 155 to ensure that they're in draft.
  - 4 Sept 15 (+/- week) – new draft back from Jeff back to chairs/co-chairs with IP reference and comments incorporated and possible differences statement.
  - 9 Oct 15 – comments from new draft back to Jeff
  - Week of 19 October 15 – telecon or meeting in Ottawa (as needed) to finalize work.
  - 21 October 15 – IMRBPB management telecon.
  - 27-29 October MPIG meeting – presentation of final draft (RMPIG the week prior).
  - December RWG meeting – acceptance of draft document
  - Thereafter – posting of document on EASA site.
  - 2016 (as per national requirements) – implementation of document into national guidance document(s).
- Mr Conn – MPIG comments should be back by 19 June and Ms. Hasse to consolidate by 30 June – we will discuss on conference call (1 July) and then submit.
  - Chair – please remember that this document is on a revision cycle – what can we live with/accept at this point? We can revise as needed.
  - Mr. Harbottle – after we adopt this standard, then have it added to national guidance, how would we manage national level differences? Chair – firstly, hope that the national documents would be able to show compliance. Then the national documents would hopefully identify differences and then address during validation of products/MRB. Mr Harbottle – if differences are clearly identified in national guidance, this makes things easier for CA and OEM.
  - Mr Bringle – IP 127 (confirmation letters), will that be needed now? Chair – as historical record, certainly – concept will be built into policy standard document.
  - Mr Bringle – Also, validation with “differences” – when do we plan to discuss those? Chair – we don't know that yet (either internally or externally).
  - Mr Cox – the biggest pitfall with validation is that while there is harmonization, there is still retention of authority (through CRI's) – the group here needs to be aware of that and may need to adjust procedurally to adjust. (Type Validation Principles.)

## **21 Next Meetings/Calendar**

- Management telecon 21 Oct 15 organized by Mr Heliker.
- MPIG – 27-29 Oct 15, Yokohama, Japan (hosted by Mitsubishi)
- RWG 1 Dec – 4 Dec in Tokyo (at JCAB HQ), Japan (JCAB has reserved the whole week.) (MPIG/RMPIG leadership invited.)
- 2016 PB meeting – April 25<sup>th</sup> to 29<sup>th</sup> 2016 in Brazil hosted by ANAC – Sao Jose dos Campos
- 2016 MPIG 25-27 October, 2016, Location TBD.
- 2016 RWG - Dec 2016 Beijing, CN
- 2017 PB meeting - April 2017 Cologne, GER.

**22 IP 119 update (cont.)** – Mr. Kieft - Discussed with Richard Minter and confirmed that AMC 20-20 will be revised as discussed yesterday. EASA now agrees with the

revision to the IP text as per the revised MPIG submission. **IP updated to revision 2 to amend corrosion level 1 definition.**

**23. Meeting summary –**

- One new action item. Closed multiple old AI.
- 11 new IP's.
- One revision to an existing IP (IP 119).
- Significant discussion of policy standard document and road map forward

**IMRBPB Closing Remarks.**

- MPIG thanks to Jeff for chairmanship. MPIG recognizes Jeff's contribution and encouraged by this week. Particularly appreciate Jeff's management style and professionalism. Appreciate Jeff's drive to succeed. Many thanks for a job well done.
- Mr. Harbottle – there will also be a change in the MPIG in the next few months, and this likely is Paul Conn's last meeting. Paul has been with MPIG a long time and we owe him a great deal for his contribution. Want to put on record the appreciation from MPIG for the engagement and work Paul has provided.
- Mr Harbottle - Also, thanks to FAA for hosting the meeting this week.
- Chair – thanks to all for the work this week. We're handing over the process/board at a high level. Our role in safety and the people involved in the process will do a great job. Thanks to the FAA to hosting this and the RWG meeting.

**Meeting Adjourned.**