

**MINUTES OF MEETING (MoM)**

**Subject** SM TeB 2021-02 meeting  
**Date, time** 23 November 2020, 09:00-16:30  
**Location** Webex, hosted by EASA  
**Organised by:** SM.2 (Strategy & Programmes Department) in cooperation with FS.0 (Flight Standards Director's Office)

**Agenda Item 00: WebEx opening**

*Connecting in advance and checking video/audio issues.*

**Agenda Item 01: EASA opening – General introduction & review of the agenda**

*Claudio Trevisan, Principal Coordinator Standardisation & SMS (FS.0)*

*Claudio welcomed the participants to the SM TeB 2021-02 meeting and guided them through the final agenda.*

**Agenda Item 02: EASA opening – Review of documents**

Supporting documents:

- 1.) [Final Agenda – SM TeB Meeting 2021-02](#)
- 2.) [MoM – SM TeB Meeting 2021-01](#)
- 3.) [Safety Management TeB – List of Actions \(Version: 18.11.2021\)](#)

*Jean-Pierre Arnaud, Safety Management Expert (FS.0) ;  
Régine Hamelijnc, Senior Safety Management Officer (SM.2)*

Review of the Agenda of the SM TeB 2021-02 meeting

*Claudio presented the final agenda and highlighted changes made compared to that provided on 16.11.21. The participants approved the final agenda.*

Approval of MoM SM TeB 2021-01 meeting

*No comments were received. The participants approved the Minutes of SM TeB 2021-01 meeting.*

Safety Management TeB – List of Actions (Version: 18.11.2021)

*An update on the List of Actions was provided.*

*Action item #5 remained on-hold; action items #8, #15 & #40, #25, #34, #35 remained on-going and action item #43 was closed. No feedback were received about the dissemination of Safety Information: action item #48 is thus proposed for closure.*

*A new List of Actions following this meeting will be posted on DMS (Version: 13.12.2021)*

**Agenda item 03: Results of the SSP Survey on the impact of COVID-19**

Supporting document: [Presentation](#)

*Régine Hamelijnc, Senior Safety Management Officer (SM.2)*

*Régine thanked the States having provided responses to the survey for their contribution. She mentioned that the response rate may have suffered from different surveys launched by ICAO in parallel. Régine recapped the 11 questions (Qs) and highlighted the main outcomes for each of them.*

*In relation to Q8 (Information on the status of implementation of selected MST actions) she informed that the completion target dates/timeframes for MST.0003, MST.0025, MST.0034 and MST.0036 will be extended for the EPAS 2022-2026.*

**Austria (Mario Lenitz)** asked for clarification on the applicability of MST.0036 (Member States should develop proportionate learning objectives in the 'Meteorological Information' part of the PPL/LAPL syllabus), i.e. to which type of training organisations this MST is applicable: It was confirmed this applies both to DTOs and ATOs, meaning any organisation delivering training for PPL or LAPL.

With regard to Q11 (What other comments or documents would you like to share regarding your current SSP implementation and the overall impact of COVID-19 on your SSP?), **Austria (Mario Lenitz)** offered to share their 'Remote Oversight Guidance' (available in German language).

#### **Agenda item 04: Outcome of EPAS 2022-2026 Advisory Body consultation with particular focus on MST actions**

Supporting document: [Presentation](#)

*Régine Hamelijnck, Senior Safety Management Officer (SM.2)*

*Régine* presented the main outcomes of the AB consultation on the draft EPAS 2022-2026. Key comments in relation to systemic safety (SSP, SMS, HF, IRM) and MST deadlines were reviewed in detail.

It was confirmed that MST.0024 (Loss of separation between civil and military aircraft) will remain in EPAS, with a completion target changed from 2021 to Q4 2022. Concerning MST.0040, emphasis will be put on implementing effective coordination mechanisms between safety & security reporting, instead of their alignment. Consequently, the title of MST.0040 will be changed from 'Safety and security reporting' to 'Safety and security reporting coordination mechanism'.

Some improvement objectives were also formulated for the next EPAS editions in relation to the strategic priorities, the EPAS structure, the EPAS development process and consistency with the European Aviation Safety Programme.

**Finland (Heli Koivu)** commented that:

- 1.) the new SYS inspection (with the scope extended to cover SSP implementation) is the right direction for the development of a new approach for the next EPAS editions, these could benefit from implementing a Safety II approach;
- 2.) RMT.0706 (Update of authority and organisation requirements) should be re-activated in the EPAS 2023-2027, as this may help a lot with SSP/SPAS and RBO implementation, also considering that safety promotion has some limitations;
- 3.) more should be done to ensure safety in parachute flight operations (related EPAS action SPT.0121), in view of the high number of fatalities in EASA MSs between 2012-2021. To this end, Heli suggested that upgrading and updating the GM1 NCO.SPEC.105 to an AMC would be a first step to mitigate the immediate recognised safety risks.

With regard to point 2, *Jean-Pierre* explained why RMT.0706 is put on hold, pointing to the SM BIS published beginning of 2021 where further explanations are given. With regard to point 3 *Régine* said that a safety issue assessment was ongoing in view of drafting a BIS.



## Agenda item 05: The link between the EPAS and the SPAS

Supporting document: [Presentation](#)

Claudio Trevisan, Principal Coordinator – Standardisation & SMS (FS.0)

Régine Hamelijncx, Senior Safety Management Officer (SM.2)

This agenda item provided further clarification on the EPAS actions and risks that Member States should consider for their State Plan for Aviation Safety (SPAS) in line with Article 8 of EASA Basic Regulation.

Régine mentioned that by definition *all* MSTs should be reflected, and SPTs where these are ‘co-owned’ by EASA and Member States. RMT, SPT, RES and EVT actions are generally owned by EASA. The upcoming EPAS 2022-2026 will include 22 MSTs. Participants were also reminded that this topic had been discussed during the SM TeB 2019-02 meeting, including the need to review the SPAS at least annually.

With regard to ‘EPAS risks relevant for the SPAS’, Régine indicated that as a minimum, the top three Pan-European key risk areas listed in MST.0028 and those listed in the COVID-19 safety risk portfolio, last updated in April 2021, must be considered. In addition, States may consider EPAS Volume III – Safety Risk Portfolios to support State level safety risk management.

Finally, as concerns Article 8(2) of the Basic Regulation ‘Member States shall inform the Agency of the risks and actions identified in the EPAS that it considers not to be relevant for its national aviation safety system and the reasons thereof.’ It was suggested that such information should be ideally included in the SPAS.

Claudio added that during Phase II of the SYS (systemic enablers for safety management) inspections, the implementation of the MST actions will be assessed. A pilot project took place in Austria in November 2021 (more details at Agenda item #10) and the first formal SSP implementation assessment will be conducted in Italy in February 2022. For this, 5 maturity levels will apply in line with the ICAO SSP Implementation Assessment Protocol Questions. It was clarified that new MST actions will not be expected to be fully implemented within the first year of the new reference period, with the exception of MST.0039 (Safety promotion to support ramp-up/safe return to operations). After such period, where an MST action is not implemented and no ‘valid’ justification is provided, a finding will be raised. (‘valid’ = supported by evidence/data).

**Austria (Mario Lenitz)** asked for the legal basis to raise findings related to MSTs implementation. Claudio recapped that the *initial* scope of the SYS inspections will relate to the Authority management system requirements and Regulation (EU) 376/2014, which are compliance-based. Non-compliance leads to findings. However, in the *extended* scope (assessment of the effective implementation of SSP and SPAS) a combination of ‘findings’ and ‘maturity levels’ will be in place. As concerns MSTs, if there is no major issue, no finding will be raised. A major issue could be that an MST is fully relevant for the Member State, but nothing has been done and no justification has been provided. Claudio stated that the outcomes of the first pilot assessment will be considered to refine the process, the intention being to find the best approach together (EASA and Member States).

**Austria (Mario Lenitz)** mentioned that based on the pilot project conducted in November 2021 (more details at Agenda item #10), the use of ‘maturity levels’ was well-received and worked as a motivating factor for the Member State.



## Agenda item 06: SPAS action planning and implementation: examples & challenges

Supporting document: [Presentation](#)

*Heli Koivu, Chief Adviser, SSP/SPAS, EPAS & RASP Focal Point, Traficom, Finland*

*Aila Järveläinen, Senior Inspector, Traficom, Finland*

*Heli* explained that Finland phrased the obliging nature of the FASP (Finnish Aviation Safety Programme) and its Annexes (SPAS & SPIs/SPTs) in section 4 of the Aviation Act (864/2014), in alignment with the requirements of the EASA Basic Regulation (Article 5-8).

As far as the *risk-based action planning* was concerned, the Finnish approach to comply with the requirements of Article 8 (1) was demonstrated with practical examples, incl. overviews on how they build, implement and use national, domain-based risk pictures.

*Aila* briefed the participants on their *performance-based action planning*.

Examples of *EPAS-based SPAS action* description were presented in reflection of the requirements of Article 8 (2) of the EASA Basic Regulation, including

- EPAS: MST.0027 vs FPAS: SYS.006.1 'Just culture',
- *national SRM-based SPAS action* description (EPAS: No reference vs FPAS: SYS.008.1 'Cybersecurity in aviation') and
- an *SPAS action planned with aviation industry* (FPAS: SYS.ADR.001 'Airport safety').

Finally, the 'lessons learnt' and 'challenges faced' during the intensive implementation phase were summarised for the audience.

**Netherlands** (*Jos Wilbrink*) enquired whether Finland is working on continuous improvement of safety. **Finland** replied that all the SRM work is for the purpose of continuous improvement (see slides 5, 6 and 7 of the presentation). Alongside with mitigating risks they are continuously acting to improve their safety performance (CAA's and organisations') as well as fostering and strengthening the systemic safety barriers.

**Netherlands** (*Jos Wilbrink*) also raised a question on how 'smoothly' indicators for safety performance were agreed upon, e.g. in relation to management involvement. **Finland** referred to slide 10 of their presentation and the management part of their organisation profile and explained that they are using an SMS assessment tool that is similar to the EASA SMS Assessment Tool (some modification included), so there are parts for assessing management commitment in comparison to SMS requirements referring to ORO.GEN.200 (2) and its AMCs.

## Agenda item 07: Feedback on SIS data collection on the 'status of compliance with (S)MS requirements', i.a.w. EPAS 2021-2025 Volume I Section 4.2

Supporting document: [Presentation](#)

*Régine Hamelijncx, Senior Safety Management Officer (SM.2)*

*Claudio Trevisan, Principal Coordinator Standardisation & SMS (FS.0)*

The intention of the SIS data collection is to make sufficient data available on the status of compliance with management system requirements; to gain experience with collecting and consolidating such data; to propose process-based indicators to measure SMS effectiveness in industry, complementing outcome-based indicators.

To this end, *Regine* provided an overview of the latest data points (April 2021) and the evolution of the indicators compared to the first data collection cycle (October 2020).

For the way-forward, it was proposed to continue collecting compliance data and data on the use of the EASA Management System Assessment Tool for two more SIS cycles (April and October 2022); to share related results with Member States and then to discuss the results at the SM TeB 2022-02 meeting, in view of deciding on continued suitability and pertinence of such SPIs within the European Safety Risk Management, what adaptations may be required and what else could be monitored in the area of management system compliance

and effectiveness. If confirmed, related data would be reported in the Annual Safety Review (ASR) rather than in the EPAS.

**Finland** (*Aila Järveläinen*) enquired why no difference is made between AOC (H) and AOC (A) for these indicators, as the operational risk levels differ. *Claudio* responded that EASA aggregated AOC (A) and (H), but it is considered to split them.

**Austria** (*Mario Lenitz*) expressed some concerns on considering the number of L1 findings at one single date, as L1 findings are normally very short-lived. *Claudio* confirmed that indeed only those L1 findings open at the day of the report would be considered and agreed that ideally the number of open and closed L1 findings during the reference period should be counted. However, this would be more resource-consuming, especially for those authorities that do not have robust IT tools.

### **Agenda item 08: SM TeB Objectives and work programme for 2022**

Supporting document: [Presentation](#)

*Savina Zakoula-Cherdrón, Senior Stakeholder Management Officer, (SM.2)*

*Savina* provided an update on the review of the Advisory Bodies' (ABs) structure and the outcome of the recent MAB meeting (05-06.10.21).

With regard to the MAB, no change is foreseen for its sub-structure. The added value of the SM TeB was confirmed. It is planned to call a MAB workshop in early 2022 and discuss further improvements to the functioning of the ABs, e.g. at "Rules of Procedure" level.

With regard to the SAB, its structure will be streamlined to 6 communities: GA, drones, CAT, rotorcraft, aerodromes and ATM/ANS.

Furthermore, the launch of a new collaborative platform was agreed for 2 pilot projects (Rotorcraft Community, Aerodromes Industry Community) in 2021 and its roll-out to all ABs in 2022.

Concerning the AB Work Programme 2022, *Savina* mentioned that main priorities were identified by EASA in different technical domains. The draft Work Programme will be launched for consultation with MAB and SAB in December 2021. Adoption of the Work Programme is expected in early 2022.

### **Agenda item 09: Update on SMS/SSP activities at EASA and ICAO level**

Supporting document: [Presentation](#)

*Régine Hamelijncx, Senior Safety Management Officer (SM.2)*

*Jean-Pierre Arnaud, Safety Management Expert (FS.0)*

#### **At ICAO level**

The timelines and the proposed changes to *amendment 2 to Annex 19* are the following: review of the proposal beginning of December 2021 by the ICAO Safety Management Panel, then review by the ICAO ANC during 2022 followed by the State Letter consultation where all EU MS are invited to comment to ICAO and finally adoption in 2023/2024 with the view to become applicable in November 2026.

*Jean-Pierre* presented the main changes in 5 batches, based on WP3 of ICAO SMP/5:

1. Enhanced provisions related to SSP,
2. Enhanced provisions related to SMS,
3. Provisions related to the extending SMS applicability,
4. Enhanced provisions related to Safety Performance management,
5. Enhanced provisions related to Safety Intelligence.



Participants were invited to send comments on the WP3 of SMP/5 by 29 November 2021, which was circulated prior to the meeting, to [safety.management@easa.europa.eu](mailto:safety.management@easa.europa.eu).

Secondly, the *outcomes of the recent ICAO High Level Conference on Covid-19 (HLCC)* were discussed. It was highlighted that the holistic/integrated risk management approach was endorsed, but the ICAO proposal for the applicability of Annex 19 SARPs to Groundhandling (GH) was not maintained. ICAO is asked to ‘develop a flexible and balanced approach for the oversight of groundhandling, taking into account views from and impact on different stakeholders’.

With regard to the *GASP Study Group (SG)*, Régine reported on the outcome of the 8<sup>th</sup> GASP SG meeting (16-18.11.21). To this end, some examples of changes proposed by the ORG and OPS subgroups as well as the SMP subgroup for the next GASP edition were brought to the attention of the participants.

The drafting of the GASP 2023-2025 will be closed in March 2022 and it will be endorsed by the ICAO Assembly in October 2022.

In relation to *EUR RASP*, Régine stated that the EPAS and EUR RASP planning cycles were aligned in 2021, e.g. a new focus area ‘Safe Return to Operations’ is also included in Volume I of EUR RASP 2022-2024 and 11 new actions, stemming from the EPAS were introduced. Concerning monitoring of EUR RASP implementation a set of SPIs based on the GASP goals and targets is in place and will be complemented by regular surveys, that are still to be developed. A first EUR RASP survey will be launched early 2022, as a trial phase, to prepare for reporting via the EUROCONTROL LSSIP mechanism. All data collected will feed a single EUR RASP implementation report covering all EUR States and also address the SPIs defined. No separate EPAS survey will be launched.

Finally, with regards to *SL66/2021 - the ICAO survey on ‘Annex 19 – Safety Management, Implementation Challenges’*- Jean-Pierre informed that EASA pre-filled a version, addressing tasks delegated to the Agency, indicating it would be available very soon on the EC platform, CIRCABC. EU Member States were invited to respond to the survey via [SafetyManagement@icao.int](mailto:SafetyManagement@icao.int) no later than 17 December 2021.

#### **At EASA level**

Jean-Pierre reported that the Regulation (EU) 2021/1963 amending Regulation (EU) No 1321/2014 was published on 12 November 2021. It introduces (S)MS into Part-145 and enters into force on 02 December 2021. Applicability date will be 02 December 2022.

Similar process is expected for Part-21. The Rules have been adopted during the EASA Committee end of October 2021 and the publication is planned for end 2021/beginning of 2022.

*Post-meeting note: due to the delegated act that needs to be reviewed by the Parliament, the whole process will be a bit longer and the final publication is expected in February or March 2022.*

In relation to the *EASA MS Assessment Tool*, it was announced that a new version is expected by the end of Q2 2022, with an editable version to follow. It will be built on the latest version of the SMICG tool and reference will be considered to the Part-CAMO, Part-145 and Part-21 requirements. Currently, the draft Part-CAMO version is available upon request at ‘[safety.management@easa.europa.eu](mailto:safety.management@easa.europa.eu)’. Needs were also identified to develop a tool for the assessment of ‘safety culture’ but no decision has been taken on how to tackle that issue.

**Action 1:** To provide comments on WP3 of SMP/5 (Consolidated amendment proposals for Annex 19 – Safety Management)

**Who:** SM TeB members

**Deadline:** 29.11.21

**Action 2:** To provide responses to the ICAO survey on ‘Annex 19 – Safety Management, Implementation Challenges’ (SL66/2021)

**Who:** EU Member States

**Deadline:** 17.12.21



<b>Agenda item 10: Debrief o the SYS 2.0 visit in Austria - Sharing of SYS.AT.11.2021 experience</b>
Supporting document: <a href="#">Presentation</a>
<b>Mario Lenitz</b> , Austro Control <b>Tino Schill</b> , MOT, Austria
<p><b>Austria</b> (<i>Mario Lenitz and Tino Schill</i>) shared the experience gained during the pilot SYS 2.0 assessment (SYS.AT.11.2021).</p> <p>The areas of inspection covered SSP.GEN and SSP.SDA, whereas SSP.AREA was excluded. Austria participated in the preparation of the questionnaires before the inspection, which was helpful for both parties. The partnership spirit contributed to the success of the inspection. Austria summarised the main challenges and proposed improvements with regard to the approach, the questionnaires and the on-site inspection, and highlighted the need for change in the mindset, when conducting the ‘hybrid’ assessment (maturity levels and findings).</p> <p><b>Finland</b> (<i>Aila Järveläinen</i>) raised a question on how the possible contradictions between the self-assessment results and the EASA assessment results were handled and solved. <b>Austria</b> (<i>Mario Lenitz</i>) indicated that the self-assessment was more strict that the EASA evaluation.</p>

<b>Agenda item 11: SPT.0057: Safety Management implementation and international cooperation</b>
Supporting document: <a href="#">Presentation</a>
<b>John Franklin</b> , Safety Promotion Section Manager (SM.1)
<p><b>John</b> presented the ramp-up campaign, which was launched in May 2021. End of June 2021, anticipating the COVID-19 ramp-up of operations before summer, a ‘Safety week’ was organised in the form of domain specific webinars and as of September the industry-wide ‘Conversation Aviation’ (webinar/cast series) took place, covering the ‘Be Ready’ and ‘Stay Safe’ aspects. ‘Conversation Aviation’ is a way to engage with industry and enable them to share their experience with specific focus on SPT.0057, supporting SMS effectiveness from January 2022. A 4-weekly cycle is planned on a key theme.</p> <p><b>John</b> called for support of NAAs to be involved in the SMS Promotion Task Team. To this end, EASA would like to have at least 5 NAAs to work with the Agency and industry partners to plan the promotion work and launch the promotion. Continual feedback through the SM TeB was also sought, i.e. to evolve the promotion plan based on the needs of the Member States and to help align the approach/messages on SMS at national level, where possible.</p>
<p><b>Action 3:</b> <i>To express interest in joining the SMS Promotion Task Team</i></p> <p><b>Who:</b> SM TeB</p> <p><b>Deadline:</b> ASAP</p>

<b>Agenda item 12: Annual Safety Review 2021 – ECR Occurrence Reporting Rates</b>
Supporting document: <a href="#">Presentation</a>
<b>Florent Morel</b> , Domain Safety Risk Manager (SM.1)
<p><b>Florent</b> informed the audience that a new chapter (Chapter 8) was introduced in the <a href="#">EASA’s Annual Safety Review 2021</a> with ‘Occurrence Reporting Rates’. It intends to measure the volume of occurrence reports collected since 2015 in the European Central Repository (ECR) under Regulation (EU) 376/2014 and puts the changing levels of occurrence reporting in perspective with change to the level of aviation activity in Europe.</p> <p>This chapter was developed by the Safety Performance Indicators Working Group (SPI WG), under the Network of Aviation Safety Analysts. Occurrence reporting rates are important to monitor as they are an indicator of the changes to safety culture in Europe.</p>

In order to assess the level of aviation safety reporting in Europe, the SPI WG developed a set of indicators based on ECR occurrences, other safety related information and traffic data.

It should be highlighted that figures shown in the presentation are highly dependent on the quality and completeness of the coding of the occurrences collected in the ECR, in particular on the attribute 'Reporting Entity'.

In order to reach more accurate figures from which more solid interpretations can be built, it is important that reporting organisations and competent authorities continue their effort to improve the coding quality of occurrence records submitted under Regulation (EU) 376/2014.

*Florent* indicated that SPIs could not be updated on a regular basis for 2021 due to the transition of ECR to ECCAIRS 2.0 (E2).

**Austria** (*Mario Lenitz*) commented that the transfer of ECR data to E2 is difficult due to technical issues.

**Poland** (*Piotr Peter Michalak*) enquired whether the data for the previous years were going to be re-migrated to make the ECCAIRS 2.0/ECR data usable again or whether the work would focus on new data only. Indication of any dates or schedule for that was also requested. *Florent* responded that EASA intends to update the SPIs on the ECR data and offered to get back in writing, so that the understanding of the various scopes of data is properly aligned.

### Agenda item 13: EPAS Volume III 'Safety Risk Portfolios' second edition

Supporting document: [Presentation](#)

*Nabil Ben Mami*, Safety Risk Management Section Manager (SM.1)

*Aigars Krastins*, Senior Domain Safety Risk Manager (SM.1)

After a brief recap of the objectives of the European Safety Risk Management (SRM) process, *Nabil presented* the EPAS Volume III, which provides EASA's Safety Risk Portfolios (SRPs).

The SRM steps on the identification, prioritisation (incl. prioritisation principles) and assessment of safety issues were reviewed in details.

*Aigars* drew the attention of participants, among others, to the new domain Safety Risk Portfolio on rotorcraft and the introduction of 5 new safety issues in the second edition of EPAS Volume III for the period of 2022-2026.

For easy reference, a typical structure of a domain Safety Risk Portfolio and a short guidance on the use of EPAS Volume III at SM TeB level were also presented.

**Finland** (*Heli Koivu*) congratulated EASA on its approach on safety risk management.

### Agenda item 14: Closure - Meeting conclusions

*Athanassios Tziolas*, Head of Strategy & Programmes Department (SM.2)

*Athanassios (Sakis)* thanked the organisers and presenters for their contributions to the success of the meeting. Special thanks went to Finland (Agenda item #6) and Austria (Agenda item #10) for sharing their experience on the given subjects as well as to Louise Mastenbroek-Jansen (Germany) for her dedicated SM TeB work over the last 4 years.

*Sakis* summarised the *key points* of the meeting as follows:

- **Agenda item #3:**  
The results of the SSP survey on the impact of COVID-19 show that the pandemic provided opportunities for maturing risk management capabilities and COVID-19 was a catalyst to better understand the value of an SSP.



- Agenda item #4:  
The quite conservative approach for the update of EPAS for the period of 2022-2026 will be followed by a more ambitious method in the future.
- Agenda item #5:  
Aligning EPAS and SPAS remains a challenge, in particular in relation to Article 8 (2) of the Basic Regulation. SYS 2.0 (SSP implementation assessments) will be fully deployed in 2022. Maturing the SSP and its assessment will be a shared objective.
- Agenda item #6:  
Sharing implementation challenges on the FPAS by Finland was well received, it might also be of help to other Member States.
- Agenda item #9:  
The ICAO HLCC and the future amendment of Annex 19 increasingly push towards maturing risk management capabilities. One enabler will be the use of 'safety intelligence'. Furthermore, the enhanced provisions on 'safety performance' and monitoring will bring us to the next level. The future development of GASP will also contribute to that effort.
- Agenda item #10:  
The share of the SYS.AT.11.2021 experience by Austria was well received. EASA will pay attention to the 'lessons learnt' and suggestions made by Austria during the pilot case on testing the assessment questionnaires.
- Agenda item #11:  
Major progress was achieved on SPT.0057. SM TeB members are invited to join the SMS Promotion Task Team (Cf. Action 3.)
- Agenda item #12:  
Further maturation of EASA's Annual Safety Review was acknowledged, in particular in relation to the establishment of safety performance indicators for occurrence reporting rates, other safety related information and traffic data.
- Agenda item #13:  
The principles for the prioritisation of safety issues were further refined. The second edition of EPAS Volume III on Safety Risk Portfolios will be published in January 2022.

**Norway** (Aslak Kjølstad) and **Poland** (Piotr Peter Michalak) inquired whether EPAS Volume III would be available in a machine-readable format, like EPAS Volume II. *Régine offered* that EASA would look into the possibility to provide EPAS Volume III in such a format.

Finally, *Sakis* indicated *the next steps*:

1. An ad-hoc SM TeB meeting will be called beginning of 2022 to discuss and agree objectives for the SM TeB, and confirm the 2022 Work Programme.
2. The next SM TeB meeting is planned for May 2022. Depending on the evolution of the pandemic, EASA will consider reverting back to the usual meeting format with 1 day formal AB meeting and 1 day thematic workshop on a specific EPAS/SSP/SMS related topic.
3. Minutes and presentations of the meeting will be posted on the SM TeB Sharepoint site.

Post meeting note: All presentations were uploaded on the SM TeB site on the day of the meeting.

*Sakis* closed the meeting at 16:12.



MoM prepared by	Andrea Schneider-Sutak (SM.2)	08 December 2021
MoM reviewed by	Régine Hamelijnck (SM.2)/Jean-Pierre Arnaud (FS.0)	13 December 2021
MoM approved by	Athanassios Tziolas (SM.2)/Claudio Trevisan (FS.0)	14 January 2022

**New actions from this meeting:**

**SM TeB Meeting 2021-02 (WebEx) – 23 November 2021**

Action No.	Action Description	Action Owner	Deadline
<b>Action 1</b>	To provide comments on WP3 of ICAO SMP/5 (Consolidated amendment proposals for Annex 19 – Safety Management)	SM TeB members	29.11.21
<b>Action 2</b>	To provide responses to the ICAO survey on ‘Annex 19 – Safety Management, Implementation Challenges’ (SL66/2021)	EU Member States	17.12.21
<b>Action 3</b>	To express interest in joining the SMS Promotion Task Team	SM TeB Members	ASAP

DRAFT

