

MINUTES OF MEETING

Subject: CAS.COM #9

Date: 19 May 2022

Location: Videoconference

Organised by

Safety Intelligence and Performance Department (SM.1)

Ref.

Draft 03

MoM Distribution:

The minutes of the CAS.COM meetings will be published on the [European Advisory Bodies SharePoint Site](#). Please email: Antonio.Gonzalez-Gomez@easa.europa.eu if you don't have access.

MoM prepared	Antonio González Gómez/ John Franklin	22/05/2022	Done
MoM validated	N. Ben Mami and J. Franklin on behalf of Erick Ferrandez (Secretary)	24/05/2022	Done
MoM reviewed	Y. Malinge (Chair) and J. Pegram (Vice Chair)	25/05/2022	Done
MoM sent	Members and Alternates	XX/05/2022	Done

Members – confirmed attendance to the meeting in Cologne

1. Yannick Malinge, ASD Airbus (Chair)
2. Jim Pegram, A4E (Vice-Chair)
3. Pierre Georges, ASD Dassault
4. Simon Graf, ACI
5. Geir Ove Eriksen, AEI
6. Thomas Leoff, IAAPS
7. Alex Segens, EIMG

Members/observers – NOT YET confirmed attendance

- Heino Küster, CANSO
- Osman Saafan, SAB Vice-Chair (invited to the CAS.COM)

Members – confirmed attendance remotely

8. Dragos Munteanu, IATA
9. Johan Glantz, EBAA
10. Dan Banja, ECOGAS
11. Robert Campbell Smith, ERAA

EASA Secretary

- Erick Ferrandez, Head of Safety Intelligence and Performance Department – joined remotely
- Antonio González Gómez, Safety Promotion Officer
- John Franklin, Safety Actions Section Manager
- Nabil Ben Mami, Safety Risk Management Section Manager

Ad-Hoc EASA participants

- Aigars Krastins, Senior Domain Safety Risk Manager
- Emilie Marchais, Senior Domain Safety Risk Manager
- Rowan Powel, Senior Safety Intelligence Coordinator
- Guillaume Aigoin, Senior Flight Data Expert



- Regine Hamelijncx, Senior Safety Management Officer

Apologies - unable to attend this meeting.

12. Ansgar Sickert, ACI
13. Helen Misson, ASD Thales

No updates received

14. Anthony Smoker (IFATCA) – no alternate was ever nominated
15. Paul Reuter (ECA)
16. No members from AIRE appointed yet
17. No members from EIMG appointed yet
18. No members from ETF (UILTRASPORTI) appointed yet
19. No members from IFATCA appointed yet

Recently stepped down from the CAS.COM - replacement not yet appointed

20. Mauro Mari (ETF (UILTRASPORTI)
21. Gus Garcia, ASD Thales (retired)
22. Stephen Richardson, EIMG
23. Stephan Schliske (ASD Rolls Royce alternate)
24. Richard Williamson (ASD Rolls Royce)

AGENDA

- Welcome, Introduction and Minutes of Last Meeting
- Status of CAS.COM priority list items
 - Impact of climate change on safety
 - CAT CAG work program 2022
- Safety Promotion campaigns
- Status of Current EPAS cycle by EASA
- Presentation of the SIPI (Safety Issue Priority Index)
- D4S Status
- Key learning and safety threats + CAS.COM next steps for support of SRM process (EPAS)
- AOB

Related Links/ Documents:

- Minutes CAS.COM #08 - 2021 – [here](#)
- Meeting documents CAS.COM #09 - 2022 – [here](#) (access meeting #9)

1. Welcome, Introduction and Minutes of Last Meeting

- **Y. Malinge:** Highlighted the significance of resuming our meetings in Cologne following the COVID pandemic, albeit in a hybrid format. It is an important time as well for the CAS.COM given the imminent D4S new development phase and its reinforced link with the Safety Risk Management (SRM) process.
- The last MoM of the #8 CAS.COM meeting were approved without comments ([here](#)).

Renewed CAS.COM membership

- A review of the CAS.COM membership was made ([here](#) - Page 2). After the last meeting in 2021 some members have stepped down from the CAS.COM, left their companies or moved jobs.

Action:

A. Gonzalez-Gomez to:



- Map out the current active membership and the industry domains the CAS.COM represents and that have or need nomination.
- Email their respective associations asking for new members to come forward and formalize their nomination through the SAB.

2. Status of CAS.COM priority list items

- The CAS.COM priorities have fed into the EPAS with a few updates to its list over the last three years (latest list of priorities based on new EPAS actions – [here](#)).
- This CAS.COM list of priorities will be reviewed. It will include a few additional ones stemming from the experience with the pandemic. A tour de table is planned for this purpose during this meeting.
- The CAS.COM also benefits from the work of the CAGs and Safety Promotion, hence providing key strategic input during the EPAS programming.
- **Y. Malinge:** A gap analysis (“close the loop”) review of the CAS.COM list of priorities with last year’s EPAS correlated well with the EPAS. A review of the original CAS.COM list will be made, but certainly with COVID, more areas of strategic safety significance will result.
- **J. Franklin:** Safety promotion is now fully in the implementation phase in many of the domains. Discussions in some TeBs are ongoing to have more nominations for the T4S CAN promotion collaborative group, in addition to the few since last year.
- **T. Leoff:** The SAB is still in the process of proposing an organisation of its TeBs and COMs. More details to be provided when they are available.

3. Impact of climate change on safety

G. Aigoin provided a presentation ([here](#)). This topic was one of the strategic safety issues listed by the CAS.COM in 2018. This presentation was a progress update. The IPCC assessment report predicts an increase of global air temperature whatever the scenarios, of 1.5° C before 2040 and beyond in the subsequent years.

Weather scientists have also established a clear link between climate change and the increasing impact of extreme weather events of concern to all aviation domains. Surveys of aviation stakeholders performed by ICAO, WMO and ECTL and several studies are available which show worrying conclusions.

Climate adaptation is also a priority for the EU. The European Climate Law was adopted in 2021 requires Institutions and Member States to strengthen their resilience and address vulnerabilities. This issue was endorsed by EASA Sustainable Aviation Committee (SAC), which decided that it should be part of the EPAS and determined that EASA should focus on increasing knowledge and data on the impact of climate change on aviation safety.

to start with, EASA will try to better understand the trends in weather-related hazards (current and future) and focus on large airplanes. EASA has tasked its new Scientific Committee to come up with an overview of the state of knowledge regarding all these trends. EASA could also leverage on D4S programme to monitor the current exposure to hazards and ensure that current environmental conditions are protective enough, as illustrated by a recent study on wind gust intensity performed during D4S Proof-of-concept. Further to that, EASA may sponsor some targeted research projects.

Safety issues, that EASA handles within the SRM process, and for which weather-related hazards have a significant contribution, will be increased with the knowledge gathered on weather-related hazard trends.

J. Pegram: severe icing and blown sand reaching Europe from sandstorms in northern Africa, are events lately that he has never seen to this extent in his career and is starting to have an impact on operations.

Conclusion:

- The CAS.COM supported the plan and highlighted the need to see climate change from many domains’ perspectives. They stressed the importance of including aircraft operators as the latter have concrete experience regarding weather-related hazards.
- The CAS.COM recommended to look at faster levers than rulemaking to be more reactive (e.g. safety promotion) and support the industry with climate change.



4. CAT CAG work program 2022

A. Krastins provided a presentation. An overview of the programme can be seen in slide 3 ([here](#)).

SM1.1 reminded that this CAG action is first the refine the SI which is broad and identify what are those exact scenarios or issues that need to undergo a full safety analysis. The CAG action is pushed by the SIPI prioritization and because there are still high risk occurrences and SR spotting these issues.

The CAS.COM discussed that implementation of mitigations to small operators is key here.

Y. Malinge: enquired on the relevance of assessment of SI-0010 "inappropriate flight control inputs". This has been discussed for a long time. Literature and trainings on these matters is already available. The key aspect is carefully defining the scope of the safety issue and what are the lessons learnt so to focus on the solution.

J. Pegram confirmed that these are clearly part of the new approach to Evidence Based Training (EBT).

Y. Malinge: perceived a duplication in the airworthiness portfolios and advocated for more insight into this.

N. Ben Mami: explained that airworthiness was currently spread in various portfolios. There is a need to strengthen collaboration internally with design, maintenance, and production teams. This is also true for external stakeholders. A more focused discussion on airworthiness is needed to better analyze and mitigate the issues. This should also a better link the related airworthiness action in the Volume II of the EPAS.

T. Leoff: it is crucial to get data quicker to training development and rather on an ad hoc basis.

5. Safety Promotion - Presentation of main on-going and upcoming campaigns by EASA.

J. Franklin provided a presentation on the latest developments in Safety Promotion ([here](#)).

Y. Malinge: On the SMS campaign, it is vital to convey the message to safety practitioners that SMS is not exclusively about a "tick in the box". Instead, is mostly about having the right safety culture in all levels of the organisation and the right climate to make reporting safe and properly identify and mitigate the risks that ensure safe and effective operations. It is vital, especially in the recovery after COVID to make speaking about safety a normal practice. Promotion should also support organisations internally with their SMS reporting.

J. Glantz: For small operators' feedback is vital. They don't have the resources and data other larger organisation enjoy. And due to regulations 376/214 they can't ask for feedback on reports. An effort needs to be placed to explain it in a more pragmatic and less ambiguous way.

J. Pegram: an easy and uncompromising way needs to be found on how to share information on safety issues for everyone, across domains, to know and learn from. Without

T. Leoff: It is a good idea to get the direct people dealing with safety, on certain concerned situations, to promote and be portrayed in any divulgative safety initiative. This would reinforce the message.

6. Status of Current EPAS cycle by EASA

R. Hamelijncx provided a presentation on the latest status of the EPAS, structure in 3 Volumes, Key Priorities and the main actions ([here](#)).

Timing of the EPAS consultation

The EPAS consultation has already begun. The deadline for comments on the 22nd of June 2022. The timing is very tight and the CAS.COM did not received the request to input on EPAS this year. Providing advice is one of the main roles of the group. The CAS.COM discussed their key priorities both strategically and in terms of the Safety Key Risk Areas. The more strategic priorities include:

- Having enough skilled, trained, and qualified people who are operationally ready and fit for duty.
- Effective management system implementation.
- Reporting and culture of aviation organizations.
- The ability to get meaningful feedback from occurrence reporting sent into the aviation system and relate it to day-to-day operations.
- Promotion of positive learning.



Action:

- **CAS.COM Members** to review the strategic and safety key risk area priorities. a very short review by the group with a consolidated CAS.COM priority list combining: a review of the strategic key risks' areas and the key learnings and safety threats from COVID. The new version of the list will be the formal CAS.COM input to EPAS.
- **T. Leoff and J. Glantz** would then take these topics up to the SAB during its meeting in early June for further consideration.
- To send the draft EPAS Volume I to the CAS.COM chairman and vice-chairman.

7. Presentation of the SIPI (Safety Issue Priority Index)

N. Ben Mami: presented ([here](#)) the new method used by the Agency as part of its SRM process for Safety issue prioritisation: the Safety Issue Priority Index (SIPI).

Safety issue prioritisation is a structured approach allowing safety issues to be risk-classified in a consistent manner, regardless of the operational domains they belong to, and regardless of the source of the safety intelligence (safety data, experts' inputs, etc.) through which they have been identified. Some safety issues are identified via occurrence data, others through accident and serious incident investigations, and still more through expert judgement and safety studies.

The approach creates an index that is built upon a residual risk evaluation of the safety issues. 'Residual risk evaluation' means that we consider the worst likely accident outcomes and the effectiveness of their implemented systemic barriers. In other words, a safety issue with the same potential outcome as another one but with some effective mitigations in place will have a lower 'residual risk'.

Other elements that are factored in the prioritisation index are:

- Has the safety issue already resulted in fatalities?
- If there are no fatalities, has the safety issue contributed to a high-energy accident outcome where no other barrier but providence was remaining?
- Is the safety issue an emerging/novel one?
- Is the operational exposure to the safety issue important?

Any positive replies to the above questions will imply a higher priority index.

The resulting index enables us to prioritise the safety issues for further assessment (refer to SRM process step 2) and support the Agency and its safety partners in deciding what safety assessments are to be launched in priority.

As a practical way to support the prioritisation, the safety issues are then split into two categories, an 'elevated' one and a 'normal-to-low' one. The eventual intention is to focus the collaborative resources first on safety issues within the elevated category. Indeed, based on the priority index construction, the 'elevated' category will include safety issues such as emerging ones and/or safety issues for which undesired outcomes have already realised and where the effectiveness of the current systemic barriers is not satisfactory and for those where a significant part of the flights are affected.

Then, they were questions and discussions by the CAS.COM discussed on a few cases to illustrate practically how they would be scored under the SIPI.

Summary:

Take this index into consideration in the review of the CAS.COM priorities list for this year

8. D4S Status

E. Ferrandez gave a brief explanation on where the D4S project is at present. The testing phase of proof of concept will be over in June and a new phase (called Development phase") will be launched in September. This involves the expansion to new and more members. The initial expansion will be with more operators, NAAs and we will start opening to ANSPs. The programme will later open gradually to all type of organisations with a stake in the EU aviation system (airports, rotorcraft, business aviation, Maintenance, etc...)

A fundamental change in the new phase will be to integrate D4S in the SRM process (in comparison to the current prototype/demonstrator mode). This will imply to establish connections with all stakeholders including the SAB/MAB

As part of this integration, E. Ferrandez reminded that the CAGs were initially set up with the idea to merge them into the D4S programme as it will expand. Hence the first merges will be gradually done to have the network of experts organised as part of the overall D4S governance and framework.

A reflexion on the role of the CAS.COM vis-à-vis D4S (that was set up as a group to establish strategic priorities by the SAB) will also take place.



J. Glantz: he remarked that the business aviation sector is knocking at the door of D4S to take advantage too of its benefits. Smaller operators by the nature of the small business they operate in, find hard to take advantage of data, However, they could also be a source of information relevant for the project. It will find it challenging to join the project and for sure by end of this year when new partners would join up, business aviation will not be ready.

E. Ferrandez: replied that as the program is meant to eventually welcome and onboard this type of operations, however this is not planned in the early phases of the expansion given the multiple challenges (diversity of operations and fragmentation of the data). The D4S team also acknowledges that a one-year preparatory work will be a necessity to discuss the data protection and other technical aspects of the onboarding.

9. Key learning and safety threats + CAS.COM next steps for support of SRM process (EPAS)

These two agenda points were merged during the meeting. See annex to the minutes ([here](#)).

10. AOB

- Provide a summary of the latest status concerning the proposed/discussed for the ABs groups.
- Advance this initial list CAS.COM Lessons Learnt from Pandemic input to **T. Leoff** and **J. Glantz** to be the verbal contribution of the group during the next SAB meeting/ workshop.
- **J. Pegram:** at the moment is difficult to identify issues from the D4S data lake. Logically, as the knowledge lake is developed, expert groups need to pull, analyse test the right information from it. The CAS.COM has a vital role to play in this. The discussion need to be maintained on the synergies and contributions between CAS.COM and D4S in view of the latest development with the project as well as the changes in the CAGs to adapt to the consolidation of D4S.

Next CAS.COM meeting in 2022

- The nest CAS.COM meeting is planned before end of 2022, also before the last SAB in 2022 and on time for the next EPAS programming cycle.

(Expost addition)

- The next SAB meeting is planned for the 08 & 09 June 2022
- The following SAB meeting after that is due on the 15 & 16 November 2022

