

Virtual "Decision Committee" Meeting 4/26/2021 (0700-0806 CST)

Minutes of Meeting

Participants: IMRBPB Luca Tosini (EASA)
 Bill Heliker (FAA)
 Jeff Phipps (TCCA)
 Sergio Cruz (ANAC)
 Li Xiaolei (CAAC)

 MPIG Laurent Boyer (Dassault-Aviation)
 Armando Chieffi (Gulfstream)
 Jose Gomez-Elegido (Boeing)
 Hamid Nouri (Bell)
 Edwin Davis (AAL)

Meeting began on schedule and concluded at 0806 CST.

Agenda overviewed by Bill Heliker

- *IP Number: CIP IND 2019-15 (R0) - EZAP Definition*
- *IP Number: CIP IND 2019-19 (R0) – Freeze-Thaw cycle effect*
- *IP Number: CIP EASA 2020-01 (R0) – Identification of Failure Cause(s) - Clarification*

Ed Davis volunteered to record minutes of meeting utilizing consistent format from Virtual Meeting #1.

Discussion on CIP IND 2019-15 (R0)

EASA comment – Requested clarification of the purpose.

Dassault-Aviation response – The current definition does not represent the intent. The proposal clarifies and prevents expansion to areas with no EWIS conditions present.

FAA Comment – Proposed the CIP be accepted via Chat response.

Conclusion: CIP IND 2019-15 (R0) was accepted as written

Discussion on CIP IND 2019-19 (R0)

ANAC comment – Asked for clarification in paragraph 3 of the Problem section in regard to the correctness of the rate of temperature decrease.

Bell response – The source of the data was provided but will be validated. *Note: Post-meeting the verification was accomplished with the information to be revised in the subsequent submission (see Conclusion comments)*

FAA comments – Accepts the change but rejects the premise that roto aircraft are not subject to freeze-thaw. It was asked to clarify that the concern is the combination of water ingress and freeze-thaw, not individually. Requested that the problem statement be modified.

TCCA comments – Agreed with the FAA comment. Also asked about the use of MSI and SSI in the two c) sections in the Recommendation section. Proposed revising the Recommendation section to state ‘with water ingress in association with a freeze-thaw cycle.’

Bell response – The wording in the c) sections is from the existing text. The impact of the ‘freeze-thaw’ wording is that it introduces a Flight Cycle limit from the analysis which might not apply to roto operation.

TCCA response – The location of operation would be a factor in the presence of freeze-thaw.

EASA position – Agrees with the TCCA proposed wording revision.

Bell response – Will take action to address the questions raised and modify the Problem and Recommendation wording.

FAA comments – The Board accepts the CIP in theory but will need the two sections updated per the discussion.

EASA position – Suggested that the revised CIP be routed electronically for approval.

FAA comments – Agreed with the suggestion and asked for MPIG to provide when ready.

AAL (speaking for MPIG) response – Hamid will provide the updated wording. MPIG will process and submit to the Board as requested.

Conclusion: The CIP is agreed to in theory but MPIG will provide updated wording to the IMRBPB for electronic approval.

Discussion on CIP EASA 2020-01 (R0)

Gulfstream (speaking for MPIG) comment – (See attached files) Shared that MPIG has overall agreement with the intent of the paper. MPIG proposed some changes as follows:

- Problem section: typo 'Sometimes,'
- Recommendation section:
 - For the statement 'Failure Causes should describe specifically why a function fails [...]', MPIG proposes replacing 'why' by 'how'.
 - Addition of 'failure mode' was discussed but concerns were raised. MPIG and PB agreed to not add to the CIP recommendation.
 - MPIG proposed to delete 'allow selection of a maintenance task that is most effectively addressing it' and replace by 'aid in maintenance task and interval determination as well as for failure cause transfers among MSIs.'
 - The intent is to highlight the fact that the proper identification of the failure cause will help the task and interval determination (expanding from the 'most effective' concept initially presented).
 - The other proposal is to recognize that completeness of the analysis depend not only on the proper identification of the failure causes, but also on transfers, which are being used by some OEMs.

EASA response – Appreciated the presentation and understood the proposal. Proposed using both 'how and why'.

TCCA comment – Agreed with the intent of the CIP and the use of both 'how and why'.

CAAC comment – Agreed with the concern about the use of failure mode along with the use of 'how and why'.

Boeing comment – Provided that 'failure mode' is MSG 1 and 2 verbiage and used only once in MSG 3. Recommended it not be used.

General comment – There was discussion on how to process the proposals.

FAA comment – EASA will review the presentation and route to the Board for review and approval. The use of 'failure mode' will be removed along with the addition of 'how and why'. Additionally, it was agreed to replace the text 'allow selection [...]' by 'aid in maintenance task and interval determination as well as for failure cause transfers among MSIs.' Also asked MPIG to provide the presentation to the Board.

Conclusion: EASA will update the CIP and send to Board members for approval.

Meeting closure – Bill asked for any comments or suggestions regarding the process. Laurent suggested that the format provided efficiency and offered that it be continued into the future. Hamid recommended that at the conclusion of each topic, the action items be displayed on the screen.

The meeting was concluded at 0806 CST.

APPROVED MOM