

**2013 IMRBPB Regulatory Meeting hosted by
European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA)
Cologne 26 – 28 April 2013**

**Monday - Day One 22/04/13 – Joint PB/MPIG Meeting
Wupper Room: Horion House**

Attendees:

See attached attendance list.

1. Joint regulatory/Industry Meeting commenced @ 08:40am

1. Our host (Francis Jouvard) commenced discussion with some housekeeping matters including information relating to Internet access and meeting venues for the remainder of the week. Information, including the location (maps) of venues and relevant agenda's was made available to all delegates.

2. Meeting opened/Introductions

- The Chairperson officially opened the meeting @ 08.45 am, welcoming all participants to Cologne.
 - Further, he thanked EASA for hosting this year's meeting.
 - He stated that given the fact there had been some confusion in relation to the intent of various Candidate Issue Papers (CIPs) discussed at the previous Policy Board (PB) meeting, it is proposed we conduct a joint review of the CIPs for this meeting to ensure we have a reasonably full understanding of the issues to be discussed over the next week. All delegates were actively encouraged to participate in order to ensure we have a successful meeting.
 - He also highlighted further proposed changes to the IMRBPB Charter.
- Moved on to group introductions, firstly from the regulators, followed by MPIG.
- The Chairperson thanked participants indicating there were a lot of new faces in the group this year and that he was looking forward to the week's proceedings.
- As an update to our last meeting in Shanghai, the PB and MPIG had the scheduled teleconference followed by the PB working group meeting. Of course 2 regulators were unable to attend the last PB meeting at which the PB Charter was amended. The PB working group meeting in December 2012 was an opportunity for those two authorities to review and agree on the changed Charter.
- Importantly, considering the MSG 3 revision cycle the PB had time to review and consult on decisions taken at the Shanghai meeting and as a result the PB are able to move forward with some confidence. Nonetheless, the PB is considering further changes to the Charter to take into consideration those circumstances where a regulator is unable to attend a PB meeting.
- The main focus this week is a review of CIPs there being very little in the way of outstanding action items. Given time constrains this week it will be very important to concentrate on the CIPs are that are envisioned being ready for the MSG revision, due later this year.

3. Review of Regulatory Candidate Issue Papers

- The Chairperson confirmed we have 5 CIP's from EASA, 2 from TCCA and 5 from industry. MPIG were asked if they had any questions. The MPIG Chairperson stated they had no questions and confirmed the group had a position on the submitted CIPs.
- MPIG, Tony Harbottle, asked whether the additional L/HIRF paper was going to be tabled as there had been an editorial change to titles of the embodied logic diagrams. MPIG would like some discussion on these changes.
- The PB Chairperson indicated that the PB would need to see the CIP and consider it at the PB breakout tomorrow.

CIP EASA 2013-01 – Tolerance Windows

- Francis Jouvard spoke to this CIP stating that some years ago the regulators became aware of the practice of including tolerance windows in the Maintenance Review Board Report (MRBR). This issue was discussed at the PB working group in Washington, where some regulators indicated they were not comfortable with the operational consequences of using tolerance windows. Accordingly this CIP was proposed as a way of seeking industry input on the regulators view that tolerance windows are not an MRBR issue.
- Embraer observed that the CIP mentioned the MRBR and asked whether it was proposed to include the MTB process? Francis confirmed that at this stage the PB is only concerned with the MRBR.

CIP EASA 2013-02 – Zonal Analysis with different levels of access

- Ralf Schneider (EASA) spoke to this CIP suggesting that in the current system we may have multiple tasks for the same zone. He suggested that we may need additional guidance/clarification in MSG-3 to get a more consistent approach where multiple levels of access are required for particular zonal inspections.
- The Chairperson indicated his belief that this is a relatively straight forward issue, although it may take some time to work through in order to ensure wording is consistent with the intent.

CIP EASA 2013-03 – ED Rating System, timely detection evaluation

- EASA indicated that the purpose of this CIP is to clarify the intent of the ED rating system in MSG-3 with a proposal to amend Chapter 2.4.5.
- MPIG indicated that they will need to see an example of how EASA expect this proposal will work. MPIG was unclear of the intent and is looking for an example to confirm the expectations of the PB in order to ensure a standardised methodology can be achieved to address this issue.

CIP EASA 2013-04 – CPCP for Safe Life items

- EASA indicated the issue here is that CPCP items addressing fatigue are currently controlled by AD which is a particularly inflexible outcome – especially for industry/operators.
- MPIG suggested the CIP appeared to limit the expectation to primary structure, they asked whether there's intent to include other structure?
- Further, Tony Harbottle expressed a view that at least some of the content, of the CIP, needed input from the industry structures working group. He asked whether the PB would consider splitting the paper such that we could move forward with the changes as they apply to damage tolerance & safe-life. The other parts – specifically age exploration programs, will need further consideration by MPIG.

Break 10:10 to 10:50

CIP EASA 2013-05 – Adaptation of the fatigue damage analysis logic

- EASA briefed the group on the intent of this CIP which generated a number of questions from industry. The PB Chairperson thanked MPIG for the feedback and suggested these questions were issues the PB will need to discuss later today or tomorrow. We'll come back to this CIP on Thursday.

CIP TCCA 2012-02 – Consolidation of tasks

- Cliff Neudorf spoke to this CIP which he stated was based on a concern about consolidation of tasks relating to IP77. He indicated that recommendations stemming from IP77 do not appear to be working.
- MPIG enquired whether the PB had considered comments, on this matter, made by Airbus last year, and asked whether this paper is a generally agreed position.
- A review of IP77 and the comments from last year appear to suggest that the new CIP contradicts a previously agreed position.
- MPIG asked whether the PB would consider splitting the proposed outcomes as they apply to the retroactive nature of the CIP.
- The PB Chairperson took on board the comments being made and suggested that the PB discussion on this issue may result in a new CIP the outcome of which may lead to there being no need for IP77.

CIP TCCA 2013-01 – CMR/MSG-3 Coordination and the effects on IP44

- TCCA provided some background to this matter and made some general comments in relation to the coordination of CMR and MRB tasks suggesting that IP44 was being used to push established limits. The CIP is making a recommendation to provide further guidance in IP44 requiring manufacturers to respect the limits.
- MPIG stated that in principle they agreed with the CIP, however, they believed it could be improved and that they can provide a revised draft.
- Some general discussion then on the effect of the CIP as it relates to FAA AC25.19A, with both the PB and MPIG agreeing that this matter needs further consideration.

CIP IND 2012-06 – Limit FEC 8 considerations

- MPIG (Tony Harbottle) spoke to this CIP and provided background information, advising the PB that nothing much if anything had changed from previous submissions.
- The PB chairperson indicated there was some confusion in relation to this matter and whether in fact we had reviewed this CIP in Shanghai.
- Tony confirmed this is a new CIP and should not be confused with a previous paper on acceptance of FEC 8 without tasks (ref: CIP IND-2011-07).

CIP IND 2012-09 – LHIRF Methodology clarifications

- The PB Chairperson indicated there had been further activity on this matter since our last meeting. He asked MPIG whether they wished to make a presentation on L/HIRF.
- MPIG indicated they would prefer to make the presentation after the break.

Break 12:15 to 13:20

CIP IND 2012-09 – LHIRF Methodology clarifications con't

- Greg Sweers for MPIG spoke to a Boeing presentation on L/HIRF.
- This was followed by further group discussion on basic L/HIRF matters including the related MPIG CIP.

- The PB Chairperson confirmed that following the PB working group in Washington last December, it was clear there were still some issues the PB was not comfortable with. Accordingly, the PB had sought further comments from FAA specialists who were familiar with the subject.
- MPIG were provided with a copy of the FAA comments and were asked to consider them and come back to the PB later this week.

CIP IND 2012-01 – Impact of AC25.19A and MSG-3

- In general terms this CIP is about an attempt to provide for the coordination of CMCC and MSG-3. MPIG is not looking to change MSG-3.
- MPIG spoke briefly about their paper and the associated MSG-3 logic which has been simplified to some extent.
- General discussion on relevant matter including the impact on industry with the potential use of reliability programs to escalate tasks beyond established SSA values.
- The PB Chairperson indicated the PB will take the CIP based on comments made today and come back to MPIG on Wednesday.

Break 15:30 to 15:50

CIP IND 2008-03 – Coordination MSG-3 SSI tasks with CDF & DT-ALI

- Brief group discussion on the Structures working group and the results of meetings held over the past year or so.
- The PB Chairperson thanked MPIG for the discussion before bringing the meeting to a close for today to allow the groups to move to our respective (individual) breakout meetings.

Breakout 16:05.

Wednesday - Day three 24/04/13 – Joint PB/MPIG Meeting - Excelsior Hotel

Meeting opened 0830

4. Review of the IMRBPB Charter

- The PB Chairperson welcomed back all participants. He stated that given the reasonable full agenda we will move straight into today's proceedings commencing with the Policy Board Charter.
- The Chair went on to explain the intent of proposed changes to the Charter to cater for those circumstances where a regulator was unable to attend a PB meeting. He advised that after some debate at the PB yesterday, only paragraph 4 was changed. This change was provided (read) to the meeting.
- One question from MPIG in relation to the 75% quorum regulators need to hold a policy board meeting. This matter and that relating to holding elections was clarified.
- MPIG (Boeing) asked whether the Charter includes a commitment for regulatory involvement in working groups.
- The Chairperson confirmed that the current Charter was silent on this matter. Perhaps this was an issue we could further discuss on Friday if time permits.

- The MPIG Chair clarified the industries position on this matter suggesting there was a need, in their view, to explore ways to better achieve regulatory involvement in working groups. MPIG went so far as to suggest that it should in fact be a member of the PB who should participate.
Action Item (AI) 13/01. PB Chair to develop an IMRBPB process to cater for PB involvement in relevant technical working groups.

5. Review of the IMRBPB IP Procedures

- PB Chair alerted participants to PB discussions on the CIP procedures and that on 23/4/13 the IP Procedures were amended to more easily identify who was submitting a CIP. This change was mainly to cater for RMPIG.
- MPIG suggested that in addition the PB might like to consider an applicability check box on the CIP form.
AI 13/02. Change the CIP template form to include a new applicability box, MSG-3 Volume 1, MSG-3 Volume 2, or both. Due date – August 13.

6. Review of relevant Action Items

- PB Chair stated that stemming from the last working group meeting there were a number of Action Items (AI) to resolve. It was confirmed that the PB does not close out AIs at the PB working group meeting.

AI 08/01 – NAA Implementation Reference.

- The FAA reported their intention to complete this work in the summer of 2013. ANAC agreed they have a need to accelerate work in this regard.
- Chairperson proposed we close this item and re-open the matter as another AI to ensure we are better able to track this issue.

AI 13/03. NAA Implementation Reference – Cut and Past from previous action item – all authorities confirm. AI 08/01 – Item Closed.

AI 12/01 – Amend IP procedures

- This action item can be closed based on acceptance of Revision 5 of the IP procedures which was actioned yesterday (23/04/13).
- MPIG (Paul Conn) commented on the situation regarding submission of CIPs and the 60 submission time frame.
- The PB Chair expressed a view that these comments were not necessarily part of this AI which had more to do with including RMPIG. Nonetheless, the 60 day submission time frame is still an issue and so it was proposed that when the PB receives a technical CIP from an Authority or from Industry, that they will be distributed and posted prior to finalising the agenda for the PB meeting.

AI 12/01 – Item Closed.

New AI 13/04. Include further detail on the distribution of CIPs within the 60 day window. Due date – August 13.

AI 12/02 – MPIG to supply comments on IP83 – Letter of confirmation

- Actioned as agreed.
AI 12/02 – Item Closed.
- **AI 12/03 – PB to combine comments on MSG-3 – Volume 2**
- All PB/regulatory comments submitted to Brian Jenkins, of RMPIG, as requested.

AI 12/03 – Item Closed.

AI 12/04 – L/HIRF WG to consider L/HIRF task transfer

- The MPIG chair suggested that if CIP IND 2012-09 is accepted, this matter can be closed.
- Airbus confirmed that L/HIRF did not need to be included in CIP EASA 2011-01 which related to wording improvement and was closed as IP121.

AI 12/03 – Item Closed. No changes to IP121 required.

AI 12/05 – IMRBPB Chair to advise MPIG if CIP TCCA 2012-02 will be closed or re-drafted in lieu of MPIG drafting a new CIP.

- Appeared to be some confusion on this matter with the PB chair concluding it was the wrong item for this particular AI number. **Item Closed.**

AI 12/05 – IMRBPB Chair to notify MPIG if CIP TCCA 2012-01 will be re-drafted etc.

- PB Chair confirmed that the TCCA is submitting a re-drafted CIP – TCCA 2012-01.

AI 12/05 – Item Closed.

AI 12/06 – Coordinate CIP IND 2012-01 & CIP TCCA 2011-02 regarding AC 12-19A and arrange a June ‘Net’ meeting.

- Net meeting went ahead as arranged. This resulted in a new CIP IND 1012-01 which has been submitted for this meeting.

AI 12/06 – Item Closed.

AI 12/07 – IMRBPB to coordinate with A4A regarding MSG-3/IP105, SMH use by SAE.

- The MPIG Secretary (Paul Conn) advised SAE that MSG-3 and IP105 was intellectual property. Nonetheless, its use, for the purposes described was authorised.

AI 12/07 – Item Closed.

AI 12/08 – Duplicated item. Closed at AI 12/03.

AI 12/09 – RMPIG to provide comment disposition and revised Volume 2.

- RMPIG provided relevant documents in November 2102.

AI 12/09 – Item Closed.

AI 12/10 – Coordinate revised IP procedures with member authorities and MPIG.

- Procedures coordinated with relevant groups and again reviewed at the Washington WG meeting.

AI 12/10 – Item Closed. IP revision 4 to Revision 5 dated 23 April 2103.

AI 12/11 – Distribute revised CIP IND 2011-07 to all members for comment.

- Revised CIP was tabled at the Washington WG meeting and is now included in the agenda for this meeting.

AI 12/11 – Item Closed.

Break 09:50 to 10:25

7. Issue Paper Review

IP 115 – Considerations addressing bonding network aspects in MSG-3 L/HIRF section

- Following on from the Beijing PB meeting we had comment from the FAA regarding MSG-3 and required L/HIRF procedures. The PB Chair questioned whether those comments have been included in CIP IND 2010-05?

- The MPIG Chair confirmed the comments have been included in a revised CIP IND 2012-09. It was proposed that we keep the IP open until the new L/HIRF paper has been presented, whereupon it's likely we will be able to close this item when the PB is satisfied the FAA's comments have been adequately addressed.
- *The EASA presentation on "Electric Network on Composite Airplanes situation and proposed harmonised approach – withdrawn.*

8. Review of Industry Candidate Issue Papers

CIP IND 2012-10 – Introduction of MSG-3 for Rotorcraft

- The PB chairperson proposed to complete this CIP first as applicability for any further CIPs will be an issue.
- The MPIG Chair introduced Christophe Chazot (Eurocopter) who spoke about the history of the proposed introduction of MSG-3 into the rotorcraft fraternity. It was confirmed that a new version 4 (removing reference to AC25-19A) had been developed and was ready for distribution.
- The PB Chair indicated that the PB had no further comments on the draft and thanked Brian and Christophe for accommodating regulatory input including our more recent comments on the removal of reference to AC25-19A.
- Brian Jenkins thanked the regulators for providing valuable input that allowed him to move this issue forward.
- There being no further comment, the PB position is:
CIP Closed as IP125 – 24April 2013.
Recommended for implementation: At the next revision of MSG-3.
- RMPiG raised the issue of aligning Volume 1 and 2 and the desire to do so when the MSG-3 2013 version is published. This was agreed.
AI 13/05 – RMPiG to access all accepted IP's from 2011 onwards for inclusion in Volume 2.
Due date: 1 June 13.

CIP IND 2012-09 – L/HIRF Methodology Clarifications

- PB Chair expressed a desire to address this CIP now as there have been additional comments made by FAA/TCCA which will need to be considered. Further, and despite the PB recognising the amount of work that has gone into this matter, the PB still considers there are additional matters to be addressed. The intention is to now give MPIG time to consider these comments and to potentially come back with responses prior to weeks end.
- MPIG (Greg Sweeny) concurred with the view that there was still some uncertainty in relation to the 'protection assurance plan' (PAP) and 'certification assurance plan' (CAP). A review of the CIP has confirmed that the language used has added to that confusion and accordingly it was proposed to further amend the CIP.
- Discussion then went on to what was meant by the term "Good Performers"? In this regard, the question to address is what steps have been taken to ensure relevant working groups are provided with consistent information on 'good performers' from OEM to OEM? Clearly the PB need to see what criteria is being used to fully understand what is being agreed.

- The PB Chair suggested that this was an attempt to introduce a new concept of good in-service credit in order to reduce the amount of LHSI protection analysis required. Clearly we need to have a common approach for all working groups in terms of developing the list of ‘good performers’.
- MPIG stated they will take these comments on board and resubmit the revised CIP later this week.
- In terms of the PAP, the PB Chair provided additional information to clarify the regulators concern. He indicated that MPIG may need to go into some detail on this aspect.
- Both Boeing and Bombardier confirmed the intent of the PAP and provided an explanation that in fact addressed the regulators comments. It was suggested that MPIG revise the CIP accordingly to properly elaborate on the intent as explained which, if achieved, will address both the FAA and TCCA concerns.
- EASA then went on to highlight the fact that the previous discussion on step 6 had allayed their particular concerns. In terms of the glossary, however, EASA were still of the opinion that better defines LHSIs.
- Boeing agreed there was a need for such a definition.
- General discussion on relevant matters with the PB chair stating that it was pleasing to see the regulators guidance being accepted – the PB looks forward to receiving the revised CIP.

CIP IND 2008-03 – Process for coordinating MSG-3 derived tasks (MRBR tasks) with Certification Process derived Fatigue and Damage Tolerant Airworthiness Limitation requirements (DT-ALI)

- MPIG (Stefan Koehler) spoke to this CIP confirming the intention, or purpose, was too simply highlight the apparent need to develop a coordination process for DT-ALI/MRB tasks.
- The PB Chair stated that in principal the PB agrees with the intent of the proposal, although it is clear that the PB will need to take an action item for all Authorities to coordinate with their own Certification teams in order to progress this matter.

AI 13/06 – IMRBPB members to coordinate CIP IND 2008-03 within their respective certification offices for acceptability of the concept. Endeavour to get comments back to MPIG prior to their November 13 meeting. Due date: 1 October 2013.

CIP IND 2010-08 – Use of TSO during MSG-3 analysis

- MPIG (Jose Gomez-Eligado) spoke to this issues that highlighted the need for this CIP and further explained the recommendations and how they are expected to be implemented.
- The PB Chair explained that the PB understands the issue and the fact that VR can mean different things. The PB therefore expressed a view that a new glossary definition was needed; I.E. Vendor Requirement/Vendor Recommendation (VR).
- MPIG was asked for their thoughts on this approach.
- General discussion with particular emphasis on issues surrounding the meaning of ‘data’. In this regard it was proposed to include in the definition “maintenance instruction, including supporting data.
- This proposal generated more debate during which the PB Chair suggested that given the time, we break for lunch and resume the discussion later this afternoon.

Break 12:20 to 14:30

- Resume discussion on CIP IND 2010-08.....

- The PB Chair advised the group that he had considered the wording of the proposed definition relating to VR suggesting it was still somewhat convoluted. Accordingly he had amended the wording to some extent.
- The revised wording generated some discussion on the context in which the terms vendor requirement & vendor recommendation might be used. In looking at section 1.3.1 of MSG-3, it uses the term vendor requirement. It was suggested that perhaps we should be using the term recommendation and amend MSG-3 accordingly?
- After much discussion the PB documented a position on this matter in line with the Chairpersons final proposal.
- PB position is: CIP Accepted.
The suggestion to include a new definition into MSG-3, Appendix A, and to replace vendor requirements with vendor recommendations within MSG-3 on page 22, Section 1-3-1, paragraph 2.

CIP closed as IP 126 – dated 24 April 2013.

Recommendation for implementation: Amend MSG-3 on the next revision. Also, the applicable section of MSG-3 Volume II will also require revision.

CIP IND 2010-11 – Restoration, remove and replace

- MPIG (Fredric Courtiol) provided some background to this CIP and the reasons for the associated recommendations, which stemmed, he said, from the MDM.056 WG.
- The PB Chair stated that he was on the MDM.056 WG and did not recall ever talking about remove and replace. To be frank, the PB is a little confused about this matter and we do not understand what MPIG are trying to achieve.
- MPIG (Tony Harbottle) clarified this issue, stating that when a component is removed and replaced by a serviceable item, the aircraft is airworthy. When the component then enters a workshop, the CMM for that component is not considered an ICA.....certainly Airbus do not declare a component CMM as an ICA!
- The PB Chair stated that in his view it was inappropriate to use MDM.056 guidance to attempt to change MSG-3 at this time. We have heard from there (3) different OEMs today who are all doing something different in this area.
- MPIG (Tony Harbottle) recommended that this CIP remain open and, subject to further deliberation of the MDM.056 WG, be re-visited at an appropriate time.
- PB position is:
- The IMRBPB does not accept changes to MSG-3 with regard to, or based on, the results of the MDM.056 WG when this issue is still being discussed within the MDM.056 sub-groups. **CIP is not accepted** – CIP to remain open and tracked by MPIG. (Note: The PB agrees there is no reason to identify a CMM in the MRBR, nor to declare a CMM as an ICA).

Break 15:35 to 16:00

CIP IND 2011-07 – Acceptance of FEC8 without tasks

- MPIG (Tony Harbottle) spoke to this CIP and included three (3) examples of the types of issues the proposed change to MSG-3 is designed to address.
- The PB Chair stated that while the PB agrees with the approach, it is recommending some wording changes in order to make it clear that in using the desired philosophy the same outcome (probability of detection) must be achieved.
- General discussion which pointed to the fact that the language being used is still confusing.

- Accordingly, the PB Chair suggested additional wording changes in an attempt to refine the desired statement.
- Having considered the discussion points, MPIG suggested we stop the debate now, allow MPIG to caucus the issue and come back to the PB later this week.

CIP IND 2012-01 – Impacts of AC 25-19A on MSG-3

- The PB Chair gave the meeting an overview of the PBs assessment of this CIP and how it relates to CMCC philosophy and the MSG-3 analysis. In the PBs view, there appears to be a philosophical argument involved and it (the PB) has taken a position that no change is required.
- MPIG (Tony Harbottle) thanked the PB for considering this paper but stated it was disappointing that we cannot get agreement on a method to move this issue forward as industry will now be faced with having to deal with two (2) CMR definitions and will likely need to ignore that included in MSG-3.
- The PB Chair stated that having heard all the issues involved and taking the proposed wording, for CMRs, into consideration, it appears that this is perhaps more of an issue for the CMCC. Fundamentally the PB has no issue with the wording; however, the PB has no desire to take on an issue that is outside the scope of our MSG-3 mandate. Nevertheless, the PB will review/discuss the CIP again and come back to it tomorrow.

Day 3 - Meeting closed 17:20

Thursday - Day four 25/04/13 – Joint PB/MPIG Meeting cont
Jugendherberge Koel Deutz: Room Barcelona

Meeting opened 08:35

- The PB Chairperson opened proceeding stating that it was his intention to finish the remaining IND CIP's this morning before coming back to the L/HIRF CIP. In terms of CIP IND 2012-01, the PB has not had the opportunity to review this matter. The PB intends to do that shortly and will come back to MPIG later today.
- The MPIG Chair reminded the PB that industry have considered CIP IND 2011-07 and wish to respond to that matter today also.

CIP IND 2012-02 – Incorporate AC 25-27A (EWIS/EZAP) into MSG-3

- MPIG (Tom Heller) gave the group a briefing on the CIP and more recent changes that have been incorporated.
- EASA followed up with some questions and recommendations to clarify the intent of the CIP and to highlight their concern with the flow charts which may need minor wording changes.
- The PB Chair confirmed the fact that there is no reference to AC 25-27A in MSG-3 and he raised the legitimacy of referencing National regulatory material in the MSG-3 logic process. He strongly recommended the removal of such reference.
- The rotorcraft group were asked how they would deal with this issue as the quoted regulatory material does not apply to them.
- RMPiG stated they had no difficulty retaining the statement
- TCCA asked for an explanation for the deletion of the flow - from defined task & interval, to the MRB report.
- MPIG confirmed it was simply trying to align with the AC.

- The PB Chair suggested that MPIG make additional changes to address the first two (2) comments and to remove the ‘asterix’ and related statement. Further, he recommended that EASA work with Boeing to make the changes off line and to come back to the issue later today or tomorrow.

CIP IND 2012-03 – Enhancement to Letter of Confirmation

- MPIG (Tony Harbottle) spoke to this CIP highlighting industries concern with the current letter of confirmation process. MPIG are requesting changes to the process in order to achieve a more timely and consistent approach. They are also looking for some wording changes to the letter itself.
- The PB Chair expressed a view that the CIP appears to ask the PB to take the CIP under advisement and too alter the PB process and associated letter.
- Further, the FAA asked for clarification of the process in terms of whether or not there is a need to issue a letter for each revision to the MRBR.
- EASA, on behalf of the PB, have committed to address this matter, stating the intention is to only issue one (1) letter of confirmation. Accordingly EASA is to coordinate the issue with all PB signatories.

PB position is: CIP accepted. IMRBPB will review this IP and update the Letter of Confirmation.
CIP closed as IP 127 – dated 25 April 2013.

- This IP will supersede IP83. IMRBPB to review and update the letter of confirmation.
**AI 13/07 – EASA to incorporate comments of IP127 and coordinate with members of the PB.
 Due Date: December 13.**

CIP IND 2012-06 – Limit FEC 8 considerations

- MPIG (Tony Harbottle) again spoke to this CIP indicating that MPIG was simply requesting the PB to make an enhancement to MSG-3 to address their concern.
- The PB Chair responded by advising MPIG it was the PBs preference to use consistent wording from MSG-3 by using “could” affect in lieu of “would” affect. This will also require a minor change to the glossary in relation to Safety Emergency System or Equipment and what is meant by a Safety Function.
- MPIG to consider such a definition and come back to the group on Friday.

CIP IND 2012-08 – MTB Process in MSG-3

- MPIG (Elizabeth Souza) spoke to this CIP and highlight the various issues involved.
- The PB Chair confirmed that the PB understood the issues involved and why Embraer might want the change. Nonetheless, the PB does not believe it is appropriate to insert regulatory material in and to use that material to define other processes, or to determine what process or processes need to be used.
- The PB Chair went on to say that the MTB is simply a variant of MRB process. If we were to reference the MTB process, where do we stop? At the end of the day we are the MRB policy board not the MTB policy board.
- Accordingly, the PB does not accept this CIP. The PB is of the opinion that the definitions of MRB and MTB process are already properly defined within the relevant guidance material of the regulatory authorities, which define how to apply MSG-3.

Break 09:50 to 10:20

CIP IND 2012-09 – L/HIRF Methodology Clarifications

- MPIG (Greg Sweers) again spoke to the issue and highlighted the reasons for this CIP in consideration of the work undertaken by the L/HIRF working group. In relation to the CIP

itself, it is proposed to include revised text. Further, in regard to specific changes – Section 2 has been quite significantly amended to better describe the intent.

- The PB Chair commented on some of the proposed wording, going so far as to suggest a minor change from “aim” to “intent”.
- General discussion on the requirement to track tasks and the need to provide guidance, perhaps in the PPH? This can be highlighted in the IP.
- Considerable debate and related discussion on various aspects associated with the “no task” criteria. The PB Chair suggesting further wording changes which were accepted.
- Discussion then moved onto the proposed changes to the glossary with general discussion on the intent of those changes.
- The PB Chair expressed his view that changes made to the CIP address both the TCCA and FAA concerns and that he has sufficient information with which to respond to the FAA specialist (Tim Schaffer). **The PB Chair undertook to draft the response.**
- The PB Chair recommended the final CIP – without track changes – should be submitted. The PB Chair will put a recommendation to the PB members, including the need for guidance in the PPH in relation to the Assurance Plan and come back with the PB position tomorrow.

CIP IND 2011-07 – Acceptance of FEC 8 without tasks

- MPIG (Tony Harbottle) highlighted changes made to the CIP to address PB comments made yesterday. In effect the 2nd paragraph was deleted by agreement of the PB and compared to where we were yesterday; the matter now appears to be a lot clearer.
- In terms of a design philosophy (existence of an auto-initiated test), its use must provide for the timely detection of the failure. In addition this detection capability must be considered within the concerned ‘MSI’.
- The PB Chair recommended MPIG amend the CIP accordingly and that they provide him with a clean copy. In turn, he will draft a PB recommendation to finalise this matter tomorrow.
- EASA went on to suggest a further word change from “consider” to “analyse”. While it was understood why EASA wanted this change, it was obvious this would be a significant change. After considerable discussion it was agreed to leave the wording as is.

The PB Chairperson recommended we break for lunch now in order for the PB to consolidate our action items for today. We will resume after the lunch break at 1:15 and commence with the regulatory CIP’s.

Break 12:10 to 13:20

The PB Chairperson welcomed delegates back and stated that we will now move onto reviewing the Regulatory CIPs commencing with the TCCA documents. For the information of MPIG, he also stated that the PB intends to have a regulatory breakout today and so we will be closing this meeting at 16:00 regardless of where we are with the agenda today. We will resume discussions on the regulatory CIPs tomorrow.

CIP TCCA 2012-01 – Consolidation of Tasks

- Cliff Neudorf for TCCA spoke to this CIP which he stated is a follow-up to IP77 and is simply an attempt to develop a process that enables a more consistent mechanism for consolidation of tasks.

- MPIG asked whether this CIP had been tabled for their consideration and whether the PB had a position/decision on the proposal. Clearly from MPIG's perspective they do not see an issue with placing additional guidance in their respective PPH's, although this aspect would need to be carefully considered.
- While generally agreeing that further guidance in IP77 is warranted, MPIG recommended that the PB take an action item (AI) to further refine the document in consultation with MPIG.
- Accordingly, the IMRBPB and MPIG agreed that the proposal needs further development with Cliff Neudorf and Tony Harbottle to progress this matter for our respective groups.
AI 13/08 – IMRBPB (CN) and MPIG (TH) to jointly develop a recommendation in relation to CIP TCCA 2012-02. Due Date: 1 October 2013.

CIP TCCA 2013-01 – CMR/MSG-3 Coordination & the effects on IP44

- The PB Chairperson went straight to the CIP recommendation and proceeded to ask MPIG to provide their feedback before covering the issue in more detail
- MPIG stated their position which is the need to include additional text to clarify the intent of the recommendation.
- The PB Chair stated that as this is effectively a policy issue, the PB had no concerns with the inclusion of the additional text (paragraph) in Sect 3 of IP44. He requested MPIG to cut and paste the wording into the CIP and email the revised document to him. Further, he advised we will then move to close this matter tomorrow morning.

CIP EASA 2013-01 – Tolerance windows – in MRBRs

- Francis again spoke to this CIP stating that the PB had determined that the MRBR was not the place for this proposal. Clearly there is no issue with large transport category aircraft; it appeared to be more of an issue for Rotorcraft and the business aircraft community.
- MPIG suggested that we make a simple change to the wording to say “when used for Part 121 or equivalent operations”?
- General discussion with the PB chair encouraging further debate in an attempt to resolve any concerns and finish this item. This generated some discussion on the effect of this CIP and the fact that all things considered it will not lead to an MSG-3 change.
- After considerable debate, the PB Chair proposed we leave the item open for now and come back to the issue tomorrow.

CIP EASA 2013-02 – Zonal Analysis, for zones with different levels of access

- EASA (Ralf Schneider) spoke to this CIP and clarified the intent of the proposed changes to MSG-3 wording that are intended to address EASA concerns in relation to Zonal inspection requirements.
- The MPIG Chair confirmed that MPIG had received the paper and that by and large they agree with the intent, however, MPIG believes some further clarification of wording is needed and they suggested some changes.
- PB Chair suggested that MPIG formalise their comments and submit them to Ralf who can then liaise with PB members. The question is do we attempt to complete the matter this week or do we work remotely for 30 days and have it accepted off-line in order to get the change into the next revision of MSG-3?

AI 13/09 – MPIG to coordinate final comments on CIP EASA 2013-02 before 10 May 2013. EASA to confirm the disposition of comments before 24 May 2013 and coordinate with PB members accordingly.

Break 15:10 to 15:30

The PB Chair confirmed the AI for the previous item before moving onto;

CIP EASA 2013-04 – CPCP for Safe-Life items

- EASA (Ralf Schneider) spoke to this CIP, stating that it is proposed to clarify, with additional wording that CPCP applies to both damage tolerant and safe-life structures. Additionally that for safe-life items with a life limit below the CPCP threshold, an age exploration program may be necessary.
- MPIG stated that they agree with the intent of the CIP and support it, being comfortable with the wording in so far as CPCP is concerned. MPIG, however, proposed other wording for the “Age Exploration Program”....as there appeared to be some confusion about the terminology being used.
- It was confirmed that the additional wording in paragraph 5 was acceptable; however, the remainder was not without further work.
- **Closing action:** This CIP needs further development by MPIG in coordination with RMPIG.

Joint Meeting closed; 16:05

Friday - Day five 26/04/13 – Joint PB/MPIG Meeting cont
Wupper Room ; Horion House

Meeting opened 08:30

9. General IMRBPB and MPIG items

- The PB Chairperson welcomed all participants to today’s meeting. In terms of proceedings today we will have a short break at 09:00 to welcome the Executive Director of EASA, Patrick Goudou, who wishes to address the group.
- Further, we have a number of CIPs to complete and others to discuss if time permits. At this point in time it’s envisaged that we will be in a position to close the meeting around 15:00 this afternoon.
- MPIG then advised the results of their elections held at the last MPIG meeting in Scotland where Jose Gomez-Elegido was elected MPIG Chairperson. Vice-Chair was Ron Little from Delta, with the position of Secretary remaining with Paul Conn.
- In terms of the IMRBPB elections, the PB Chair advised the group that Todd Perry from the FAA had been elected Secretary. Francis Jouvard was elected Co-Chair and that he (Jeff Phipps) has retained the Chairmanship.
- The PB Chair then went on to advise the group that the PB a reviewed the PB meeting cycle. Given the fact that the FAA and ANAC were not able to attend last year’s meeting the PB believed it was prudent to assess whether we should continue to hold both the Working Group and PB meeting every year when the MSG-3 revision was based on a two (2) yearly amendment cycle.
- It was pointed out that an analysis of the 124 IPs on the data base was undertaken in order to identify any obvious trends. Statistics from this analysis were tabled and explained.

- Stemming from the PB discussion on this matter it was determined that it was appropriate to plan for and hold the working group meeting in Hong Kong this year. The date for this meeting is set for the week commencing 2 December 2013.
- MPIG (Boeing and A4A) asked for some clarification surrounding the statement that the Board is exploring avenues to become more policy/process driven. The PB Chair clarified what was meant by this statement.
- Moving onto the meeting schedule for this 13/14 then, the PB Chair confirmed the Teleconference will go ahead on 23 October 13, followed by the Hong Kong WG. The next Policy Board meeting will be held in Ottawa in the week commencing 26 May 14. The PB meeting schedule and locations for the following three (3) years will be determined at the Ottawa meeting.
- A further question, from the PB Chair, was directed to Paul Conn who was asked whether or not he is Secretary of RMPIG?
- RMPIG confirmed they have a meeting scheduled for 14 May to discuss this matter among other things. They will advise who will take on the secretariat role for RMPIG after this meeting.
- The PB Chair suggested that if RMPIG did not have any CIPs for the next PB then they may not need to participate in the October teleconference. If there are CIPs to be submitted, then their involvement would be beneficial.
- **RMPIG to advise Paul Conn and the PB Chairperson in this regard after their May meeting.**
- Further to the question of meeting cycles, MPIG advised that they too have had discussions in this area. They highlighted to the PB that they spend quite a bit of time developing CIP's for submission to the PB. It would be a shame to see that work come to nothing.....

Break in proceedings at 0905 to welcome the Executive Director of EASA.

- Francis welcomed and introduced Patrick Goudou who addressed the group. He stated that he, on behalf of EASA; totally supported the work of the Policy Board and it was pleasing to see so many participants involved. He went on to say that he was also pleased to see the MRB/MSG-3 philosophy being expanded to include the Rotorcraft sector and possibly other sectors in the future. Patrick advised the group that he was stepping down on the 1st of September this year but was confident that the new Director would also be very supportive of the work performed by the PB. He wished all participants well and a safe journey home where ever that might be.

Resume 0915

- Following on from the previous discussion, the PB Chair commented on the issue raised by MPIG regarding meeting cycles and the PB process. He assured the group there was no intention to unnecessarily complicate matters but clearly, given the fiscal discipline required by all Governments in the current global financial climate, we had an obligation to continually look for ways to improve our processes in order to meet identified challenges.
- There being no other comments, we move on to completing outstanding CIPs.

10. Review of Industry Candidate Issue Papers con't

CIP EASA 2013-03 – ED Rating System, timely detection evaluation

- Cecile Ben Mami spoke to this CIP stating that there needs to be some further assurance of the detection of corrosion before it reaches level 1.
- MPIG thanked the PB for providing them with relevant information that enabled them to better understand the issue – which they now did. Nevertheless, the industry was of the view that

they are already addressing the timely assessment of corrosion consistent with metal thickness, type and location, based on sound engineering advice, to ensure corrosion is detected before it exceeds level 1.

- Notwithstanding, industry sees some advantage in the paper and they would like to do some further work on it, through the Structures Working Group. Furthermore, MPIG advised the PB that the AAWG is meeting next week in order to determine ongoing CPCP corrosion level definitions. Industry believes it is appropriate to wait for this information and to take it into consideration when reviewing this paper.
- MPIG (Airbus) stated that more and more we are seeing requests to address issues using data that stems from the Design Office.....They asked whether this is necessarily a sensible approach for the MRB group?
- General discussion that indicated that everyone seemed to understand the issue. **The proposed way forward is for the MPIG Structures Working Group to address this issue being cognizant of the outcomes from the AAWG meeting.**

CIP EASA 2013-05 – Adaptation of the Fatigue Damage Analysis Logic

- MPIG (Frederic Courtiol) introduced this CIP which raises the possibility of adding wording to better reflect the Zonal transfer of structural maintenance requirements as described in MSG-3.
- Frederic described the desired outcome using a revised flow diagram
- MPIG stated that they had reviewed the paper and had provided some comments based on their in-principle agreement with the CIP. MPIG confirmed that while the intent is clear, their comments were simply an attempt to clear up the wording to be consistent with that intent.
- EASA stated that in general terms they agreed with the changed wording.
- The PB Chair enquired whether there is a desire to include these changes in the next revision to MSG-3 which confirmed in the affirmative. Accordingly the Chair requested changes to the paper to be made today and for it to be resubmitted to the PB at which time the paper will be closed.

Break 10:00 to 10:20

CIP IND 2012-01 – AC 25-19A and its impact on MSG-3

- The PB Chair returned to the subject CIP and highlighted changes he had made to the document based on discussions this week.
- Various comments with general agreement for the changes to Section 6. For the Flow Chart, Paragraph 1 change agreed.
- PB position is: CIP Accepted.

The IMRBPB has determined that the current CMR and MSG-3 coordination process is to be used to identify when a CMR designation may not be necessary if there is an equivalent MSG-3 task to accommodate the CCMR.

Additional information contained within AC25-19A is to be used during the CMCC process to determine the equivalency of an MSG-3 task and the MSG-3 analysis. Based on this, AC25-19A does not impact the current flowchart contained in figure 2-3-8.6 but paragraph 2-3-8.6 has been updated to reflect AC25-19A, including reference to SSA, which has been changed to safety analysis (SA).

CIP closed as IP 128 – dated 26 April 2013.

Implement new paragraph 2.3.8.6 and paragraph 1, 2 & 3 of the flow chart procedure, which are contained within section 2.0 of this IP. Also, the flowchart figure 2-3-8.6 will require revision to change SSA references to SA.

- Some further discussion then on the relevant flow chart as it relates to CMR vs MSG-3 task selection. The PB Chair clarified the intent stating that MSG-3 already addressed the concerns being raised.

CIP IND 2012-09 – L/HIRF Methodology Clarifications

- Based on the discussions yesterday, the PB Chair included agreed changes to the CIP. The flow chart was also updated and the glossary changed.
- Two (2) final comments from Boeing which related to Step 6 and whether additional proposed wording is required. We eventually settled on “is necessary”. This led to some further amendment of the PB position.
- General discussion relating to the list of LHSI’s and who ultimately determines whether maintenance is required.
- Industry confirmed that the engineering group only provides a list of components they do not determine whether maintenance is required, although Engineering may be asked for input in terms of identifying ‘good performers’.
- PB position is: CIP Accepted.

The IMRBPB has accepted the current text within this CIP, which was amended on April 25, 2013, to address the remainder for the FAA and TCCA L/HIRF comments concerning the assurance plan, level of analysis and good performance philosophy.

Prior to the use of this new L/HIRF process an agreement is to be reached with the manufacturer regarding the use of the assurance plan. If an assurance plan is to be used during the L/HIRF MSG-3 analysis the applicable PPH must be updated to include this agreement, which will indicate roles and responsibilities.

Note: flowchart 2-6-1.3 requires amendment to remove the word Protection from the assurance plan reference.

CIP closed as IP 129 – dated 26 April 2013.

Implementation: Incorporate at next revision of MSG-3 Volume 1 and volume 2.

- On a final note, the PB Chair confirmed his intention to write to Tim Shaffer at the FAA, in regard to this outcome.

CIP EASA 2013-05 – Adaptation of the Fatigue Damage Analysis Logic

- This CIP has been amended consistent with the comments received this morning. Frederic highlight those changes including the revised flow diagram

- PB position is: CIP accepted.

Additional changes have been included in the CIP and flowchart based on input from MPIG. Title changed to “Zonal transfer of structural maintenance requirements”.

CIP closed as IP 130 – dated 26 April 2013.

Implementation: Incorporate at next revision of MSG-3 Volume 1 and volume 2.

CIP IND 2011-07 – Acceptance of FEC8 without tasks

- The PB Chair confirmed agreed wording for paragraph 2.3.6.4 has been inserted. Figure 2.3.6.4 has also been amended to read “redesign is mandatory unless there is “justification for no task””.
- EASA (Francesca Tanzi) highlighted her concerns with to the term “consider” in relation to the hidden failure scenario. In EASA’s view, there is a need to ensure ‘analysis’ is retained I.E. – “in addition the function of the detection capability must be analysed using MSG-3”
- Further general discussion on related matters with acceptance of the following statement:
 - * If there are no tasks found effective the redesign is mandatory unless it can be justified in the analysis that no task selection is acceptable based on the design philosophy (eg: the existence of an auto-initiated test). The use of this design philosophy must provide for the timely detection of a failure. In addition the function of the detection capability must be analysed in the relevant MSI.
- PB position is: CIP accepted.

Examples 1 and 2 have been validated to further develop the MPIG recommendation for paragraph 2-3-6.4. Example 3 has not been accepted by the IMRBPB and therefore the 2-3-6.4 recommendation will not apply to this type of scenario.

CIP closed as IP 131 – dated 26 April 2013.

Implementation: Incorporate at next revision of MSG-3 Volume 1 and volume 2.

CIP IND 2012-06 – Limit FEC8 considerations

- We left the subject CIP with MPIG to come back to the PB with a recommendation.
- MPIG has responded by adding the following definition that describes the “safety function”
 - For a safety/emergency function: “ The function of the safety/emergency equipment that provides a means to address the safety/emergency related event that is included in the type design”
- When considering the discussion on this matter MPIG originally proposed the term “that would prevent the safety/emergency function”.
- The PB desired a word change to “could effect the safety/emergency function”.
- MPIG having caucused on this matter had some concern with adding effect and responded by saying there preferred wording was “that could prevent the safety/emergency function”
- General discussion with various views from both the PB and MPIG being expressed on the use of the term Type Design. MPIG suggested that perhaps the better term might be ‘aircraft design’.
- Further discussion on the wording in paragraph 3 of Section 2.3.5 with a proposed amended wording, put forward by MPIG, being accepted.
- On the basis of this amended wording, a new recommendation was developed during the IMRBPB meeting. This recommendation was accepted.
- PB position is: CIP Accepted

A new recommendation has been developed during the IMRBPB, which has been accepted.

CIP closed as IP 132 – dated 26 April 2013.

Implementation: Incorporate at next revision of MSG-3 Volume 1 and volume 2.

CIP IND 2012-02 – Incorporate AC25-27A (EWIS/EZAP) into MSG-3

- MPIG advised the PB that Boeing and EASA had caucused and consequently amended the flow charts.
- General discussion with some concern being expressed with a suggestion that further amendments were taking us away from the intent of the AC. Accordingly there was a further minor amendment to the 1st flow chart only.
- On this basis, the IMRBPB position is:
- Additional changes incorporated and agreed during the IMRBPB meeting. CIP accepted.
- **CIP closed as IP 133 – dated 26 April 2013.**

Implementation: Incorporate at next revision of MSG-3 Volume 1 and volume 2.

CIP TCCA 2013-01 – CMR/MSG-3 Coordination and the effects on IP44

- MPIG provided their revised text which was acceptable.
- PB position is: CIP Accepted

A revised proposal was developed by MPIG and accepted by the IMRBPB.

CIP closed as IP 134 – dated 26 April 2013.

Implementation: Revise IP44 Section 3.0, with the new recommendation for CMR/MSG-3 coordinated tasks. AI 13-10 taken to revise IP44 with the new paragraph.

AI 13/10 – Revise IP44 with the paragraph for CMR/MSG-3 coordination task.
Due date: 1 June 2013.

Break 15:05 to 15:20

CIP EASA 2013-01 – Tolerance Windows

- The PB Chair confirmed the PB position on this CIP and advised the group that the CIP will be further developed by the Board, taking applicability and retroactivity into consideration. The paper will then be submitted for a future meeting.
 - PB position is: CIP to remain open.
- AI 13/11 – EASA to further develop this CIP.**

CIP IND 2008-03 – Process for coordinating MSG-3 derived tasks (MRBR tasks) with Certification Process derived Fatigue and Damage Tolerant Airworthiness Limitation requirements (DT-ALI)

- The PB Chair referred the group to AI 13/06 and stated that the PB position is: The IMRBPB to coordinate this CIP within each authority's certification office for additional comment on the acceptability of this concept/process. AI 13/06 requests comments to be submitted to MPIG prior to 1 October 2013 in order for them to further discuss this matter during their annual meeting.

AI 13/12 – MPIG to confirm the disposition of comments on IP115 and whether this will impact on IP129. Due date: November 13.

9. General Business

That concluded the discussion on CIPs submitted for this meeting. The PB Chairman thanked all participants for their input and asked whether there were any questions or clarification needed.

There being no questions, the PB Chair moved on to give a short brief on e-enable which is not a design standard but a special condition on relevant type certificates. Further, he asked what those special conditions are and how they impact on ICA's. Also what is the relationship with the ANZOG document put together by Boeing?

This brief was simply being provided to ensure that the group was aware that a EUROCAE working group (ED-204) meeting is scheduled to be held in Cologne over the period 13 to 17 May 2013. It is envisaged that this WG will develop the standards for future e-enable systems and he encouraged everyone involved in MRB activity to keep a watch brief on the associated activity.

10. Meeting Summary

There are 12 Action items stemming from this meeting. 11 for the PB and 1 for MPIG. We have also approved 9 IPs which, all things considered, has required an awful lot of work by both groups.

Just to recap on the next meeting dates and locations for the Policy Board which are;

- Working group meeting – week of 2 December 13 in Hong Kong, and
- Policy Board meeting – week of 26 May 14 in Ottawa.
- The meeting schedule post 2014 will be determined at the Ottawa PB meeting.

11. General discussion then into closing remarks

RMPIG (Brian Jenkins) thanked the Policy Board for assisting the Rotorcraft industry to get through the process that has led to the acceptance of MSG-3 Volume 2. This work was sincerely appreciated.

The outgoing Chair of MPIG (Peter Osborne) also thanked the Board for their support over the past week. To Francis and his staff at EASA, on behalf of the industry, a big thank you for the warm welcome and for hosting and arranging a successful meeting.....despite the obvious challenges. To the members of MPIG Peter express his sincere appreciation for the support they have given him over the past few years. He congratulated Jose as the incoming MPIG Chair and stated that he looked forward to continuing the relationship with MPIG, albeit in a different capacity.

The PB Chair also thanked Peter, MPIG and RMPIG for being open to the comments of the PB and for taking those comments in the spirit in which they were meant. Recognizing the extremely technical nature of the subject matter it was pleasing to see how professional the group has worked together to solve these issues to the mutual benefit of all parties. Clearly aviation safety has also benefited from this collaboration.

To Francis and his staff, a special thanks for what was clearly a significant undertaking to host this meeting. A job well done which was sincerely appreciated by all participants. To members of the Policy Board also thank you for your ongoing support.

To all those leaving Cologne today...have a safe trip and I look forward to seeing you at our next meeting.

Meeting closed 1600

Post script...Reference IP93 – will be posted on the CIRCA website following this meeting.