

**2011 IMRBPB Regulatory & Industry Meeting Civil Aviation Safety
Academy of China 26 – 29 April 2011**

List of attendees Policy Board Members Present:

Jeff Phipps	TCCA – IMRBPB Chairman
Carol Giles	FAA - IMRBPB Co-Chairperson
John Fox	FAA – IMRBPB Secretary
Thomas Newcombe	FAA
Clifford Neudorf	TCCA
Timothy Shaver	EASA
Francis Jouvard	EASA
Jeremie Neveux	EASA
Dominique Dumortier	OSAC
YP Tsang	HKCAD
Raymond Hung	HKCAD
Jose Meirelles	ANAC
Rick Leeds	CASA
Mun Cheok NG	CAAS
Lawrence Lau	CAAS
Shi Jun Xue	CAAC
Jin Wang	CAAC
Bao Liang Xie	CAAC
Jian Bo Bao	CAAC
Gang Lang	CAAC
Jing Zhu Fan	CAAC
Shi Ting Wang	CAAC
Shun AN Dai	CAAC
You Sheing	CAAC
Yun Lei Liu	CAAC
Fumiki Horikoshi	JCAB
Masao Yoshida	JCAB

List of attendees MPIG Members Present:

Peter Osborne	Bombardier MPIG Chairman
Mr. Paul Conn	Air Transport Association
Tony Harbottle	Airbus
Lorenz Wenk	Airbus
Brian McLoughlin	Boeing
Jason Onorati	Boeing
Zoran Jovanovic	Bombardier
Mr. Joel Maisonnobe	Dassault Aviation
Bernhard Schuster	Dornier 328
Wagner Cazzaniga	Embraer
Shoji Kawakami	Mitsubishi Aircraft Corporation

Joakim Sandberg	SAAB
Avril Benson	American Airlines
Max Firouzbakht	American Eagle
Andrew Mcadam	BAE Systems
Kazuo Matsuura	All Nippon Airways
Xin LIU	COMAC
Rong Wan	COMAC
Jiang Sha	COMAC
Hui Ke Bai	ACIC XAC
Ying WANG	AVIC XAC

Tuesday April 26th 2011

Introduction 08:30

1. Chairman welcomes all 2011 IMRBPB Meeting participants - policy board (PB) members, MIPG members and other industry representatives. Gives brief overview of the meeting format.
 - Mr. Xue welcomes all members.
 - 2011 IMRBPB Meeting participants introduced themselves.
 - Both groups breakout to their respective rooms for individual meetings continued.
 - Overview of the agenda and discussed that at the end of this meeting we will be planning for the next two to three years of meetings. This will allow all parties involve to better budget for projected meetings.
 - Group pictures taken then both groups back to their breakout sessions.

Wednesday April 27th 2011

2. Administrative Items

- a) Feedback from regulatory and Industry meeting.
 - Jeff Phips PB Chairman opening remarks on the agenda and meeting. The PB members had sufficient time to review and prep for the meeting. The facility and the logistics for the meeting is good, Thanks goes out to CAAC.
 - Peter Osborne MPIG Chairman stated they had two days of meetings, which gave the members a good opportunity to review open items.
 - Peter did discuss the challenge of getting the IP out and in for comment and review within the 60 day time line as per the charter. Formation of IP with the time line of them being presented and posted as per the charter guidelines. Both sides will work towards this.
- b) Francis gave review of EASA web site for update

- Update list of attendee's the meeting minutes will contain a list of all attendee's along with copy of all business cards supplied. Tony questions why the list is adding names of airline members as he was under the impression the list was only to be MPIG OEM members. MPIG will discuss this internally; Tony stated the ATA was to handle the list for airline members.
 - Update list of contacts. Francis updated this list.
- c) 2010 IMRBPB Meeting minutes review they are accurate and accepted by the regulatory. Peter stated that MPIG had not reviewed the meeting minutes and apologized to the PB and stated that industry will have the minutes reviewed and will comment on them by the end of this meeting.
 - d) Jeff request that Fox will send draft minutes to Jeff and Carol along Peter and Paul within 30 days. This will give 30 days for comment and correction if needed then to have final minutes on the EASA website within 60 days.
 - e) Jeff raises question if any thing else that is not on agenda wanted to be discussed i.e. SHM Tony stats that end of the SIN 2010 meeting there is a document dealing with SHM and will be made available if needed.
 - f) Tony stated that 2010-1 EASA Environmental CIP MPIG still owes some feedback to the PB.

3. Action Item Review

- **AI 08/01, Assess all IP for the need of completion of the Colum "NAA Implementation Reference" of IP index list and provide ref of concerned document**
 1. Jeff gave overview on the status of the incorporation of the regulatory guidance is with this list. There is an effort by all regulatory to update their guidance material within the next few years.
 2. This AI will remain open and take in account of all of the revised guidance; once this is done the charter will be revised.
 3. Peter states that this might actually be beneficial; question from MPIG was will this mean that may be yearly update of guidance. Jeff stated it might.
 4. Cliff does the FAA have ok to list other documents as incorporation by reference (IBR) within FAA documents.
 5. Carol/John yes the FAA can reference other documents in their documents.
 6. EASA aggress with this statement of IBR documents.
 7. **AI remains open and a commitment by PB to make sure that decisions of this PB are incorporated into guidance. This A/I will remain open for the next few years and will be revised as needed.**
- **AI 08/03, Regulatory to define the proposed terms and amend the guideline as required through issue 2 of IP 44**
 1. Francis give update on this item, and stated that he will recover the word document and will update the document.

2. Peter would like to see the document cleaned up for format before any comment changes to be incorporated, Francis will make sure that make sure rev statut bars and quality issues are in doc with new revision level 3 by June 2011.
 3. Dominique questions about how we are going to implement the changes to the guidelines
 4. Jeff says it not the role of the PB to mandate incorporation of changes at the NAA Level that is for the local regulatory.
 5. Cliff says they put a foot note identifying the reference of this IP.
 6. **AI remains open for EASA: New due date June 2011 per Francis**
- **AI 08/04, Industry to invite IMRBPB to the development activity of a single database.**
 1. Tony states the AI can be closed as 3 Regulatoryies were invited to the Monteral meeting.
 2. **AI will be closed today will discuss later in meeting IP-93**
 - **AI 10/01, TCCA to develop guidance for LUP/HUMP.**
 1. Jeff states that is still open and that TC has yet not started and that the goal is to dedicate resources the calendar year. Should have an update at next PB meeting with a presentation at the next IMRBPB.
 2. Jeff thinks that the guidance should be put into the regulatory guidance.
 3. Tony? Are we doing this as guidance or an IP?
 4. Jeff we will follow IP format
 5. **AI remains open for TCCA: New due date April 2012 reference CIP 2010-01**
 - **AI 10/02, TCCA to combine comments and submit revised IP 97.**
 1. This is done and will be present today.
 2. **AI will be closed today.**
4. **Issue Paper Review**
- **IP 93 Single Data Base for Aircraft Maintenance Specification**
 1. Peter provided presentation that was provide by IATA
 2. Tony provided feedback from last meeting @ SIN, gave the presentation to the members. New name for the process is Scheduled Maintenance Data Standard (SMDS). This is being run by IATA and not ATA due to the worldwide industry impact.
 3. Want to make sure that the regulatory is involved in the development of this process. Should ne a Flight Standards (FS) person with clear knowledge of an airline operation.
 4. No date scheduled for next meeting, possible meeting 4th qtr of this year.
 5. Cliff: How are MRBR and ALI being handled? , Tony says they will be individual bits of data, which will go into the main database.
 6. Jeff: IP was drafted in 2008- he reference MPIG to Ref paragraph 6 of PB Charter. Question how is this issue an MRBPB issue?
 7. Tony says we could say its not. The question was what forum could be used that cover world issue.

8. Jeff states that it should be a Flight Standards issue and not an IMRBPB issue.
 9. Tony feels that with the Support of the PB would be the best place.
 10. Jeff talked about all the different standards that are in place throughout the world the vast diversity. Jeff feels that this is not the correct board to handle this.
 11. Tony just wants to make sure that FS will participate in this forum. Looking for input from FS on the data that will be provided to the operators.
 12. Jeff? on whether the major OEMs will want to incorporate this process, Tony it will have to be voluntary.
 13. Peter says most OEMs are going to S1000D as standard.
 14. Jeff still not sure why the regulatory is required.
 15. Jeff it could be ongoing effort of the PB to recruit the correct people.
 16. Paul ATA says this proposal is to move to a fully electronic data format system.
 17. Tom: He supports the concept and has some issues,
 18. Jeff questions if the IP will need to be revised.
 19. Tony it will be reworded.
 20. Jeff looking for the PB to support this effort, the regulatory will take this back to their management for their feedback and support of this project.
 21. Carol Will take it and staff accordingly.
 22. Jeff question were is the next meeting.
 23. Tom what manufactures will be involved, Tony says the members who produce MRBRs.
 24. Jeff we have determined this is not a PB issue but will use the PB to track the issue.
 25. Cliff: says this in the Appendix H approach.
 26. Tony says this is a big deal and that industry does not want to be in same place in 10 years. It is noted that S1000D alone will not fix this, which is why the need is there to consolidate into one document.
 27. Xue; says he agrees with Jeff.
 28. MPIG would like to use this forum to brief the status and raise awareness.
 29. The presentation that was shown to members will be uploaded on the EASA website.
 30. **New AI for regulatory to coordinate support of the IATA WG**
 - **MPIG will resubmit the IP-93 IP should be revised by 3rd qtr this, MPIG will send to the PB Jeff Carol, John**
 - **PB will update its position from 2011 perspective and get back to MPIG.**
- **IP 96 Integration of systems and Structure**
 1. Francis gave overview of IP.
 2. Tony states this was discussed in Cologne.
 3. Jeff says that the IP was never updated to reflect MPIG position. And that we looked at it in SEA but PB never reviewed MPIG comments.
 4. Zoran: gives MPIG position of this IP, MPIG support the spirit of the IP, It's just that we should be utilizing the existing structures WG.
 5. Review of comments on the IP a lot of discussion about revising the wording in the following sections of MSG 1-3-2, 2-3-1, 3-1, 2-3-2 and 2-4-5. Good feedback from both sides.
 6. Jeff next step is to take the consolidated comments and revise IP.
 7. Jeff PB will defer final position till end of meeting.

- **IP 97 Fluid Spillage/Fluid Ingress in Composites**
 1. Francis overview of this IP , he states that the basic IP was not changed but the inputs from all parties were incorporated
 2. Peter: some history on the IP back in 2008, he felt that the comments that were presented @ Sin were not incorporated; Cliff says that the MPIG comments were incorporated. MPIG also did not have enough time to review the revised document as it was presented only 14 days prior to this meeting.
 3. MPIG believes the IP does not address the fluid ingress issue. A suggestion was to resubmit revised IP or a new IP dealing with ED/AD.
 4. MPIG noted that some notes that previously taken out somehow were reinstated. Seems like some of the original comments from MPIG along with structures group were not addressed.
 5. Jeff ?MPIG is not happy with the way the comments were dispositioned,
 6. Peter: there is another IP 96 dealing with structures and a dedicated WG and want to see if this IP can be worked in that group.
 7. Jeff: Sounds like the only why we can resolve this if we have an WG to work this with IP 96
 8. This will be discussed at caucus by both parties.

- **IP 108 Fault Tolerant Systems**
 1. This IP was reviewed in SIN and was asked to be incorporated into CIP IND 2010-1 Rev 1. MPIG requests that this IP be withdrawn,
 2. This IP will be withdrawn and replaced CIP IND 2010-1 rev1 all in agreement this will be discussed during caucus.

- 5. **CIP Review Deferred From Last IMRBPB in Singapore**
 - **CIP IND 2008-5, Handling of failures/degradations evident during pre-flight inspection, Systems and Powerplant procedure.**
 1. Jeff feels we should consolidated these nest three issue papers, Tony fells we should discuss individually.
 2. Tony gives some history on the issue as this goes back many years, stating this was once an IP dealing with all of these issues. He states that MPIG decided to divide these into 3 separate IPs.
 3. Tony explains how he will present these IPs to members.
 4. Jeff: ask question is there an inconstancy to the approach in how MSG-3 is dealt with. Tony but because of tribal knowledge it is a question on enhancing the MSG-3 process with this knowledge.
 5. Item 1-5 deals with all 3 of these Ips.
 6. Tony over view of this IP.
 7. Jeff: how can you confirm that there is no doubt that and item will be found during a walkaround?
 8. Jeff: there is a big difference at each location were the aircraft be operated. This can be a huge concern as to the type and quality of inspection is done.

9. **Jeff PB position:** that PB can not support these issue papers and can not come to an agreement due to the lack of confidence. How can you be sure the type of degradation will be found during a walkaround inspection?
10. Tony says these tasks can be detected, **PB disagrees.**
11. MPIG indicated that the crew walkaround is consistent across with operators and that serious damage would be detected during the walkaround. The MSG task would be able to take this into consideration when determining task intervals.
12. Jeff If there was a standard walkaround inspection then maybe this would be possible.
13. Tony the regulatory handles the AFM; Tony says that they should be considered as hidden tasks.
14. Jeff: AFM tasks will not be given a credit towards maintenance.
15. Tom said first we said they could do mx and we said no. It still is subjective as to whether if the task can be verified due to the operation and the conditions of the environment.
16. Tony states that we will need a maintenance person at each location, Tom says no.
17. Tony does not understand Tom's point, Tom says it is subjective.
18. Jeff lets say there is a daily interval item to make sure that there is a safe guard to make sure that it does not happen.
19. Jeff the beauty of MSG-3 is how we look at all the data to come up with tasks
20. without having a clear definition of what.
21. Tony at least we will have a way to identify a way to tasks
22. Cliff stated that there have been a number of accidents where the pilots have missed item on walkaround i.e., Ice on wing, flat tires, these things do exist and that is why we have doubts that everything will be caught during the walkaround.
23. Jeff asks Tony is there is an inconsistency now, Tony no but there is no clear language in MSG, which covers this. He noted that the experienced manufacturers don't seem to have a problem.
24. Jeff states that maybe MPIG should document what they are doing now, lets say reverse engineering validate and formalize the existing process that is being followed today. What if we revise the MSG-3 guidance with this methodology?
25. MPIG wants assurance from the PB that the results they come up with will no result in any action what is proposed.
26. PB states that we cannot change MSG to allow credit for none AFM tasks. It was noted that the Major OEM are producing reports on how to handle daily inspections. PB would like a generic methodology on how this is being handled now in the real world. MPIG should be able to come up with a paragraph on the methodology that is currently being used and document it for the operators.
27. Put a paragraph in MSG-3 on what we are doing now as to how you will cover those items for which you cannot take credit.
28. Tony would like to have a Caucus with MPIG.
29. MPIG feedback-appreciates the time the PB spent on this issue dealing with these IPs. It is MPIG decision that no further discussion on evidences.
30. All 3 IP will be closed and they will have an IP number issued and closed as a matter of record with the PB closing remarks.

31. MPIG will look at MSG-3 guidance to see if any revision can be made to help standardize this process for a possible revision at a latter date.
 32. This CIP will become IP -109 and closed this meeting.
- **CIP IND 2008-6**, Handling of failures/degradations evident by non-AFM driven flight crew actions.
 1. Tony overview of this IP See comments in CIP IND 2008-5 this IP will be become IP-110 and closed this meeting .
 - **CIP IND 2008-7**, Handling of failures/degradations evident during pre flight inspection, Zonal Analysis Procedure.
 1. Tony overview of this IP See comments in CIP IND 2008-5 – This IP will become IP-111 and closed this meeting .
 - **Update on IP96** – PB we will incorporate MPIG comments, draft revise IP and PB will accept this IP and close.
 1. Francis states is has already been done.
 2. Review of the changes to this IP by all members, PB and MPIG all agree to changes and accept.
 3. This IP closed this meeting will be incorporated in the next revision level of the ATA MSG-3 document.
 - **Update on IP97** – PB did incorporate the comments from MPIG but did not supply MPIG with the table the PB had used.
 1. MPIG will look at the table and see if they can come to position by Friday.
 2. Looks like we will not have to form a WG for this IP MPIG will confirm.
 - **CIP IND 2009-2, Clarification of Glossary Definitions for General Visual (GVI), Detailed (DET), and Special Detailed (SDI) Inspections.**
 1. PB has a position on this CIP but want to hear what MPIG has for its presentation then we will render or position for discussion.
 2. Jason presents review of this IP. He stated that intent of MPIG wasn't to change what's involved with the inspections but rather to reflect how the definitions are applied today.
 3. Jeff: talks about MSG-3 glossary definitions are not used for task development. tasks and the types of inspection. That the industry use. How the industry deals with a GVI with the end user.
 4. Jason says there goal here was to define how these inspections are being done today.
 5. Jeff gives PB comments that we reject the IP, however the new format chart can be of merit and the definitions of SDI and DET may need to be looked at. The GVI issue of using other visual aids cannot be accepted by the PB. The definitions are used in multiple documents today beside the MSG document, Service bulletins Airworthiness Directives etc.
 6. Brian; saying that using mirror is OK, and maybe they can use other aids as needed.

7. Jason keeps asking what defines the level of the insp, is it the equipment used or what you for define the inspection.
8. PB: it could be both. Allowing the use of other visual aids will degrade the use of the DET and inspections be absorbed into the Zonal program.
9. The WG should be coming down to the task selection, I e what are we looking for and aids are we going to use.
10. Jason says goal was to have a clear an consistent definition of inspections.
11. The question to the definitions of DET and SDI inspection being the same. This is true except SDI used specialized equipment to perform the inspection, were will the horoscope inspection fall into.
12. Joel: states that a \$500 low-end video scope and a \$50.000 piece of equipment are much different.
13. Jeff using a low-end scope to a high-end scope is interesting and the SDI and DET first sentence being the same. Possible a general note: that defines the equipment listed in these inspections establish the minimum standards that are to be used and are not intended to preclude the use of equipment for the inspections.
14. PB will caucus and get back to MPIG with its position.

Thursday April 28, 2011

6 New CIP IND Review:

- **CIP IND 2010-1, Fault Tolerant Glossary Definitions**
 1. Zoran: overview of IP. Explains that the current definition in MSG-3 was incomplete, MPIG has 2 intents (1) is to clarify and (2) enhance the definition. The definition is in the text but not clear in the glossary. It needs to be clarified. He also reminded the members that @ SIN there was difficulty with the definition.
 2. Jeff bring up fact the PB has problem with the word Indefinitely.
 3. MPIG feels that this is critical..Indefinitely is the Design Goal of the aircraft.
 4. Tony states that that is what the OEMs are striving for this, If the word is removed then MPIG would have to re look at it.
 5. Jeff do we have definition from Cert on Fault Tolerant , Tony they vary from OEMs
 6. Dominique has issue with on the monitoring as he says it does not say single or multiple faults, say it should be monitored from the beginning.
 7. Tom? Is the FT is part of the sys and part of the amyases
 8. Jeff: MSI selection FT sys design, MSG-3 will go to next failure, we are trying to look at the redundancy for a possible fault and a task if required.
 9. Jeff talks about when we would want to look for a dormant failure,
 10. Tom; if you consider that every safety failure we would have.
 11. Jeff, MSG was designed for redundancy; we would have sys look for a redundant failure.
 12. Zoran just giving the WG the option to decide if a fault can be at a sub LRU level failure.
 13. Dominique: question on why we the last statement of the IP which talks about inherent reliability levels.
 14. Tom had question about the second paragraph being applied.

15. Dominique: You could go beyond LRU, if you remove LRU and leave it at the sub sys level, MPIG can live with that. Change will remove the wording LRU,
 16. PB will accept the changes and will post our position on IP.
 17. Jeff: PB accepts this CIP and will become IP-112 and closed this meeting will be incorporated in the next revision level of the ATA MSG-3 document.
- **CIP IND 2010-2, Clarification of IP 44 (everyone's favorite subject)**
 1. Jason: Overview of IP – states that the intent is to make IP-44 a more useful document.
 2. Jeff: comments stating we are not opposed to revising this IP. He just reminded members it is now incorporated in FAA guidance 8900.1 and AC 121-22B; it would be a little more difficult.
 3. Jeff: do we have enough experience to change the document; we would like to wait to gain experience with the application of the IP before we pursue changes to the document.
 4. PB feels that section 7.6 and 7.8 have some merit with some wordsmith.
 5. Peter questioned to who had control the IP-44. Answer the PB does.
 6. Peter states that the following OEMs have used IP-44 Bombardier on twice, Airbus twice, and Boeing once.
 7. Cliff it is intended to be used by all OEM.
 8. Tony questioned if we are we waiting address the small business aircraft, No we are not;
 9. FAA Fox states that Cesena and Gulfstream are both looking at applying it which has no bearing on the decision as to weather this IP gets revised.
 10. Cliff: it is quite clear in the introduction section that this was meant for all
 11. Tony states that Airbus has no new optimization projects coming along so it will be a while before they apply it again.
 12. Tom: says we do not have enough information to warrant change.
 13. Joel (Dassault) has concerns that IP-44 does not fit all situations. He stated that for the one-off systems you have to better set task intervals correctly at the beginning because you will not have the data to change it.
 14. Andrew: 7.7 is written to solidify position already covered in section 7 but no defined.
 15. Brian: says we are not changing the guidance just expanding on it.
 16. Tom the alternate program does not get you away from the 95%.
 17. Tony feels that paragraph 7.9 is important. As it will throw tasks out of checks during the escalation process. He asked the PB to explain our position.
 18. Jeff: PB will caucus on this and review item and get back to MPIG.
 - **CIP IND 2010-3, 4, and 5** -Lorenz Airbus gives Power Point presentation to members which is and overview of all 3 IP and MPIG status of each.
 - **CIP IND 2010-3, LHIRF Protective Features Within LRU's**
 1. Lorenz – presents IP no comments.
 2. PB accepts issue IP with one change adding word LRU in the revised text is, Application of MSG-3 logic for LRU internal protection features is not required.

This was a concern from Tom Newcombe and Tim Shaver.

3. This CIP will become IP-113 and closed this meeting will be incorporated in the next revision level of the ATA MSG-3 document.

- **CIP IND 2010-4, LHIRF Logic Simplification**

1. Lorenz –Presents IP.
2. Jeff give PB position on block 3 missing a Zone.
3. Cliff on the dictated task
4. Francis question do we need to address the new procedure without affecting the TC holder as to how it will be implemented and used. This became a general? For how all IP changes that are agreed to are put into place.
5. Jeff, Lorenz it is the same it simplifies the process.
6. Jeff explains that this is covered on the revision level of each PPH as they list what level the ATA document is used for that particular aircraft model.
7. EASA: questions retroactivity, but in this case, there is no change in outcome of the flowchart so it will not impact retroactivity.
8. Raymond the application on the certification refers to step 6 of the flow chart.
9. Lorenz says it determined by the OEM.
10. Jeff It the cert Basic of the product.
11. Jeff one of the most difficult is the sampling validating of the task.
12. This CIP will become IP-114 and closed this meeting will be incorporated in the next revision level of the ATA MSG-3 document.

- **CIP IND 2010-5, LHIRF Bonding Network**

1. Lorenz informed PB that this IP is not complete and wants to get feedback from the regulatory as this IP still needs more work. MPIG wants to make sure they have OK to move fwd on this IP.
2. Lorenz Present IP.
 - When you look at what's obvious and what is hidden, how far do you go to ensure that the hidden failures are detected?
 - What is required to A non-selection of task or B selection of the appropriate task
 - Considers disassembly yes or no when considering task.
 - Clearly this is not the end, they have found one element and how they could consider ED80 or not, and the task affectivity.
 - There is a lot of discussion on task selection and the differences between manufacturers.
 - They do not want to preclude disassembly, but they want to address it.
3. Jeff: PB when we developed the logic for LHIRF, we never intended to have a task that would be a disassembly task that would degrade the system.

See attached comments from Dave Walen
 Chief Scientific and Technical Advisor
 Electromagnetic Interference and Lightning
 FAA Aviation Safety

”CIP IND-2010-5 lists appropriate cautions about disassembling protective devices. However, this proposal lists the issue as one related to electrical bonding networks. The concern for disassembling protective devices for inspection is a concern for any protective device. It is not unique to electrical bonding networks. And there may be cases where electrical bonding networks may require disassembly for effective inspections. So this proposal, the issue statement is narrowly defined for 'electrical structure network / bonding features of transport aircraft with non-metal structure components.' But the proposed solution is much broader than that. I suggest that this proposal be re-scoped, either to limit it to the electrical bonding networks, or redefine the issue to all protective elements.”

4. PB position will be that of Mr. Walen comments and acknowledging that this IP need to be reworked.
 5. Cliff points out some problems with the flow chart.
 6. Lorenz to PB- MPIG will put together a working group to develop the recommended changes to address new aircraft concerns. Question to PB can support this effort? The PB agrees that it can be supported.
 7. Dominique EASA questions the wording in step 2-6-1, if it is in line with current policy? MPIG says that it is... there is a difference between the initial selection of whether or not the task is initially selected (block 4).
 8. Cliff? On the WG coming up with tasks,
 9. We need to move all questions to the WG instead of trying to hash them out at this meeting.
 10. Jeff to Lorenz if the Flow chart gets modified the preamble will have to be looked at to make sure the flow chart lines up.
 11. Jeff: MPIG will send invite to Jeff who will disseminate it to regulators and solicit participation. FAA volunteered to support this activity with AIR/CSTA/AFS specialists as required.
 12. MPIG wants the PB to track this CIP, so they will submit it and PB will put in position and will accept as and IP and it will now become IP-115 this IP will remain open.
- **CIP IND 2011-02, Harmonization of MRB Guidance Material**
 1. Peter presents CIP:
 2. Peter did thank FAA and ATA for their efforts on 121-22B and getting comments from public. And to reform the WG to work those comments.
 3. Jeff: opened the charter for review sections reviewed were first paragraph and sections 4 and 6 with a reemphasis on them. This was reviewed to show that the intent of the MRBPB is to strive for harmonization of guidance and policy. We may not always reach harmonization for various reasons, but the commitment of the PB is to strive towards so the PB requests that this CIP be withdrawn.
 4. These are the terms of reference. The intent of this forum is for standardization and Harmonization and is an ongoing effort.
 5. Peter asks question about what happen with 121-22B is reviewed by the PB?
 6. Paul says there are two aspects to this, (1) they are satisfied with FAA comments on how they reacted to this issue. He states this is not what led to this CIP. This issue is ensuring that there is harmonization of guidance within the PB.

7. FAA The charter states it, so we'll try to make sure we do so in the future.
8. Paul still feels the CIP should be kept to track as IP with MPIG comments and closed out.
9. Jeff refers group back to AI 08-0, once we take care of that AI and we have all the latest AA guidance listed then PB will produce a revision process, which will be incorporated into the charter. If we accept this CIP it shows a lack of confidence.
10. MPIG recognizes that with open A/I that PB is working on it. They will withdraw the CIP.
11. Question on cert basic, wants guidance to ask if we if 121-22B is retroactive for old equipment. If an AC were revised how would it be handled? Jeff states he feel we should not take this as AI. That if in future there seems to be an issue with how retroactive guidance is handled then maybe MPIG should issue a generic CIP then.
12. CIP will be withdrawn.

7-Rotorcraft MPIG Updated.

1. Francis gave overview and stated that Brian Jenkins of Bell will be contacting ATA again.
2. Paul wants to know if our PB would be working this issue.
3. Jeff we are at an infancy stage to develop a rotorcraft process, they have done a few projects using the MTB process.
4. They have a long way to have an acceptable process approach.
5. This group is around 60 people and we are primary all fixed wing Air Carrier and the rotorcraft issue should not be part of the forum.
6. The PB will continue to ask for updates from Brian Jenkins to as the status of their effort.

8-Review of Regulatory CIP's:

- **CIP FAA 2010-2, Removal of the word "Initial" from MSG-3**
 1. Tom Newcombe Presents CIP:
 2. Peter MPIG reviewed this CIP on Monday and has two concerns one the word minimum and the other that there is other items to a maint program.
 3. MPIG does not fully support this CIP, they did note that this CIP is completely separate issue with the use of initial from AC 121-22B.
 4. Tony: talks about the survey that was done a while ago by Mr. Henry Dick, which dealt with MSG-3 and RCM.
 5. Tony says we could remove the word initial but the concept of the MSG-3 Logic was to develop the initial program.
 6. Tony if we take the word out then the ATA doc should become a living document and used for the initial and all revisions. Also that IP 44 guidance should be inserted into the ATA document.
 7. Cliff: says Tom as is right that once we sign off on the original and we do a revision it is no longer an initial.
 8. Tony: states the word minimum has no bearing in 121-22B. that the operator is required to do more then what is in the MRBR.

9. Cliff: Scheduled MX you are producing the requirements of appendix H.
10. Tony says that that section also needs to be revised as per 25.3.
11. Peter going back to revision 1 March 1988, which had clarification the MSG-3, is used to develop and “initial scheduled maintenance program”. Chapter 1 section 1-2.
12. Jason disagrees with the concept of removing the word.
13. Zoran says that this program was developed for the initial not for the life.
14. Cliff states that the fact that the MRBR was at one time used at first and then thrown on shelf and was never used again. the MRBR has evolved into a living document.
15. Tony says that if the MSG-3 guidelines are revised then the MSG concept should become a living concept.
16. Jeff the MSG- concept has never been used to evolve the maint program. But it is now.
17. Tony are we asking that MSG -3 should be updated so it is not only for initial but also for the continuing maint program?
18. Jeff the intent is not to open the door to expand the scope of the MSG process.
19. Jeff we will take this CIP back and rethink the IP PB will caucus and we do not want to change the scope of the MSG-3 document.
20. Tom also says we need to look at our approval pages as they still talk about the initial programs and we are doing revisions to the program.

14; 20: Both groups split up to caucus and will rejoin as one meet Friday 08:30 a.m.

Friday April 29, 2011

- **CIP 2009-2 Inspection glossary**
 1. Jeff the PB has issues and concerns with the use of visual aids and inspection procedures for the GVI.
 2. Looked at the DET and SDI –explained that they were both have the same definition except SDI uses specialized equipment.
 3. The PB will not accept this CIP and recommend it be closed, however the PB stated that they would open a new Action Item AI 11-01, which the regulatory will look at all the inspection definitions and bring it to the table at the next PB meeting. The new AI reads as follows “Clarification of glossary Definitions for General Visual (GVI) Detailed (DET) and Special Detailed (SDI) inspections” including cleaning aspect for GVI and Tactile for DET this AI will be lead by EASA.
 4. Peter: on the GVI intent if we were going to change anything.
 5. Jeff we will look at aspect of cleaning and tactile for DET.
 6. Peter is in agreement, but cautions’ that we do not make GVI a more detailed PB agrees.
 7. Brain: comment at the columns format if we were going to look at that.
 8. Jeff not sure, will look at 2009-2.
 9. MPIG Agrees to close this IP.

- **CIP IND 2010-2, Clarification of IP 44**

1. Jeff explains that we were split on two of the issues, we went back and hashed it out made some changes.
 2. Revised 7.6 slightly, rewrite of 7.7 & 7.9 combined into one paragraph 7.8.
 3. 7.6 removed the 95 % conf, and removed the middle sentence.
 4. Old 7.7 & 7.9 changed to 7.8 task having no, or low, on aircraft accomplishment.
 5. Jason; questions on the OEM, that we make sure we take in account operator data
 6. Jeff, Tom this is to be included it is implied.
 7. Jeff felt with this compromise, MPIG should accept.
 8. Lorenz: On removing OEM, and just use any other data supplied.
 9. MPIG agrees to the changes and they will clean up the and will be closed today, this CIP will now be come IP-116.
 10. Peter; questioned PB when will IP-44 be updated? Francis stated it will be update and fwd to Jeff and then it will be coordinated with MPIG before it's incorporated. Due date June 2011.
 11. Peter: question on AC 121-22B if the IP-44 will be referenced: Carol yes.
- **CIP FAA 2010-2, Removal of the word “Initial” from MSG-3**
 1. FAA has withdrawn this CIP.
 2. Jeff PB got very concerned about MPIG concern will with draw the CIP.
 3. There was a lot of talk of the wording of initial but more dealing with the MRBRs and approval letters.
 4. Jeff thanked the members for the input they provided.
 - **IP 97-Update from MPIG**
 1. Jeff stated the changes and acknowledged the comments had been incorporated, but the table was never sent to MPIG for review.
 2. Peter states it was difficult to see the changes from the comments.
 3. Peter still feels they need more time to look at, and will form a dedicated structures WG to address this IP 97, this WG will use WebEx, Would like to have until Nov next MPIG meeting.
 4. Would like to have regulatory support in attending these meetings.
 5. Peter; wants to make sure the scope of the IP is clear.
 6. Francis says he will check with his people.
 7. Jeff IP to remain open, WG to look at comments and new draft to be proposed ant next MPIG meting Nov 8-10 2011 at Montreal.

9- General discussion Items:

Complex Issues Papers

PB chairman Jeff brought up the need to have a better handle on issue papers, which become complex in nature. IP 97 is a good example, this IP was opened in 2008 and here we are in 2011 and still have no closure on this IP. Work groups should be set up on the front end when we have a complex IP. So if the future when the PB or MPIG feel that an issue may be complex a WG should be formed it can start out as a WebEx and at that point it can be determined how complex the IP will become. This way the key players can be indentified

who will be needed for the IP. Jeff states that both sides need to be better instead of the back and forth as we had with IP 97.

Peter: questioned is there a way we can have a document control system to manage documents. MPIG will put together a proposal for a system.

Open invitation for MPIG member to attend PB regulatory

1. Jeff we discussed this at SEA meeting Dec 2010 and the PB agreed to have MPIG attend our meeting say ½ or full day.
2. Tony understood that, but states it's difficult to justify attending ½ day or a one-day meeting.
3. The PB wants MPIG to just give input on open issues, and it cannot be anything more. Jeff stated that it would be difficult for the PB members to have a candid discussion with non-regulatory persons at our meeting.
4. Paul suggest that maybe we should co locate the meetings so we can inter mix sharing of information.
5. Jeff we used to meet once a year. The real sprit of the PB meetings id to look at the guidance of the MRB process.
6. Carol states she is not apposed to other ideas, she asked the question if there could be a meeting with just the leadership of the PB and MPIG.
7. Jeff feels it should be the Chair and co chair, this might work better.
8. Jeff as AA we still need to be transparent, so we should leave as is for now, but the chair and co chair have a telecon say Sept and Feb before the actual scheduled meetings.
9. Lorenz; it is important that we understand what is the actual issue at the beginning which would help all parties.
10. Paul those telecoms would help to set up a WG if needed.
11. Jeff insuring we have the right people to support is important.
12. Jeff general feeling keeps the PB and MPIG status quo and have one telecon in Oct 2011, in attendance will be the PB chair, Co Chair and Secretary and MPIG Chair & Co Chair Prior to telecom; Jeff will make sure all members are aware and have opportunity to submit items before telecom, and then Jeff will provide agenda.
13. Peter will do same.
14. Peter questioned if an SME can be in attendance if needed.
15. Jeff it will not be needed, as we just want to make sure we are ready for next meeting but it will help us if needed.
16. Peter is OK with this format.

Closed Items

CIP IND 2008-5, Handling of failures/degradations evident during pre-flight inspection, Systems and Powerplant procedure IP-109.

CIP IND 2008-6, Handling of failures/degradations evident by non-AFM driven flight crew actions IP-110.

CIP IND 2008-7, Handling of failures/degradations evident during pre flight inspection, Zonal Analysis Procedure IP 111.

IP-96 Integration of systems and Structure.

CIP IND 2010-1, Fault Tolerant Glossary Definitions IP-112.

CIP IND 2010-3, LHIRF Protective Features within LRU's 1P-113.

CIP IND 2010-4, LHIRF Logic Simplification IP 114.

CIP IND 2010-2, Clarification of IP 44 IP 116.

CIP 2009-2 Inspection glossary IP-117.

Withdrawn IPs

IP 108 Fault Tolerant Systems.

CIP FAA 2010-2, Removal of the word "Initial" from MSG-3.

CIP IND 2011-02, Harmonization of MRB Guidance Material.

Open Action Items

AI 08/01, Assess all IP for the need of completion of the Colum "NAA Implementation Reference" of IP index list and provide ref of concerned document.

AI 08/03, Regulatory to define the proposed terms and amend the guideline as required through issue 2 of IP 44.

AI 10/01, TCCA to develop guidance for LUP/HUMP.

AI 11/01, EASA to issue a new IP "Clarification of glossary Definitions for General Visual (GVI) Detailed (DET) and Special Detailed (SDI) inspections" including cleaning aspect for GVI and Tactile for DET.

Open Issue papers

IP 93 Single Data Base for Aircraft Maintenance Specification.

IP 97 Fluid Spillage/Fluid Ingress in Composites.

IP-115, LHIRF Bonding Network.

Next three years meetings schedules

PB/MPIG Planning Telecon Oct – 26th 2011

MPIG @ Montréal Bombardier and Bell host Nov 8-10 2011

Next regulatory PB @ Ottawa TCCA host Dec 6-8 2011

Next IMRBPB @ SEA FAA host April 23-27 2012

PB/MPIG Planning Telecon Oct- 24th 2012

MPIG @ Scotland BAE host Dec 6-8 2012

Next regulatory PB @HKG host Dec 4-6 2012

Next IMRBPB @ Cologne EASA host April 22-26 2013

PB/MPIG Planning Telecon Oct 23rd 2013

MPIG Location @ Boeing location TBD Nov 5-7 2013

Next PB regulatory PB @CASA host Dec 3-5 2013

Next IMRBPB @ Ottawa host TCCA April 28-May 2nd 2014

Jeff general statement on the format of this meeting, the way we did this meeting was held seemed to work well worked well for us and will keep this schedule for next meeting. The meetings will continue to run from Monday – Fridays.

Jeff asks if there are any other round table items.

Carol thanks Jeff for his leadership in this meeting and the leadership shown by all parties involved a very productive meeting.

Peter a few comments on Meeting minutes review from Sin 2010.

CIP IND 2010-1: Environment pollution

1. This CIP was cancelled in 2010 SIN with MPIG coming back with a new CIP, which was presented as CIP IND 2010-6, which was discussed at MPIG but was rejected.
2. At that meeting Tony gave overview as to why it was cancelled. Strong reactions from the operator community on this subject as there no rules in the ICA regulations on this subject, so this will be a NAA requirement and will not be in any MRBR reports.
3. MPIG will not proceed with this item.
4. Joel this who thing should be operator agreement issue.
5. Cliff has concerns about the ICAO requirements, for the noise issues would fall under the MRBR
6. Tony says if there is a feature for those requirements then the current MRB covers it already.

IP 105 SHM

1. Peter will continue to report on the status was missed for this meeting and the ATA site will be updated.
2. Lorenz –update Airbus looked at and say they are not yet there to incorporated into a PPH 2-4 years.
3. Lorenz- drafting the guide book from SAE. He states that are not in line with the IP 105 and the MSG-2 2009 content and what we agreed it. He has concerns that they are not following what is in the IP and the MSG document.
4. Cliff anyone from transport FAA Sandia lab, guide book drive from cert.
5. It would be no good if they drifted off so far.
6. Francis case by case see what happens.
7. Tony would a talk from the IMRBPB help to talk to the chair of SAE help, Lorenz It can't hurt.
8. Jeff states that MPIG Lorenz needs to describe in email the problem and we do have a responsibility to insure we can do what we said in IP105, send concerns and how you want to validate.

1P 107 was closed

1. What did MPIG mean about in optimization, Peter stated that this was not addressed by MPIG, will says it was not address which will be looked at next peter sorry it was missed.

- Peter as far members list, request a attendance list at the beginning of the meeting, this will help if info is needed to be shared during the meeting, This should be done first day.
- Kazuo ANA? On CIP 2009-2 Inspection glossary this CIP was not closed correctly we will lose data on the glossary and what happens to CIP that get closed, IP-2009-2 IP 117 Jeff will correct and give PB position on this closed IP.
- Question was raised that if we do not accept a CIP should we still track. CIP will not be posited on the site Jeff stated we have an IP procedure and Jeff reviewed it and we will make sure that this procedure is followed.

Any issues from MPIG

- Question when will we make the changes to the MSG-3 document,
- Jeff from July 2011 and later,
- Paul ATA says it will be the 2011 reversion.
-

Any issues from PB- No

MPIG closing remarks thanks all and the host and all MPIG and PB members, very productive meeting.

PB Closing remarks thanks every one as to the quality of the meeting. Meeting closed.