

MEETING NOTES

2025 IMRBPB ANNUAL MEETING

05TH TO 09TH MAY 2025

Time: 09:00 – 17:30 UAE Standard Time, UTC plus 4 hours

Location: Dubai, UAE, hosted by the General Civil Aviation Authority (GCAA)

Meeting participants:

AACM	Johnson CHEONG Tammy LAI
ANAC	Sergio Henrique BORGES DA CRUZ
CAAC	Jin WANG Xiaolei LI
CAAS	Gerald Poh HOCK GUAN Olivia KOH
CASA	David PUNSHON
EASA	Raffaele IOVINELLA (IMRBPB Chairperson) Luca TOSINI (IMRBPB Secretary) Dominique DUMORTIER (OSAC)
FAA	Rocky JOHNSON (remotely connected)
GCAA	Abdulla ALJANAHI Omar BUMELHA Marwan KHUB Badr AL ALI Saidulkhadri BIN HAMZAH Jamal AL NUUMANI Rashed AL BALOOSHI James GRAHAM Bader BASHIR Padmi JAYAWARDHANA Mohamed BEN GUEBILA Maitha ALQASIMI Mohammad AL MARZOOQI
HKCAD	Bill LAU
JCAB	Yuhei MIYAMA Aoki SHUICHI
TCCA	Jeffrey PHIPPS
UK CAA	Emma McCREESH (IMRBPB Co-Chairperson) Andrew BAYLEY
A4A	Apologies received (MPIG Secretary)
Aeronovo	Manny GDALEVITCH
Airbus	Oliver WEISS (MPIG Chairperson) Jan HUELSMANN Lorenz WENK
Airbus Defense & Space	Pilar ROJAS-BARCI



International MRB Policy Board

Airbus Canada	Hamid NOURI	
Airbus Helicopters	Frederic REYNAUD	(RMPIG Co-Chairperson)
American Airlines	Avril BENSON	(MPIG Co-Chairperson)
ANA	Daisuke YAMAZUMI	
Archer Aviation	Armando CHIEFFI	
ATR	Ana-Maria PIVNICERU	
Boeing	Jeffrey MILLER Linh VU Michael ECKELBERRY	
British Airways	Wayne THOMPSON	
COMAC	Zihan FENG Yiping WANG	
Embraer	Rodrigo Manzione CORREA	
Embraer/EVE	Eliane Cristina VIEIRA	
Fed-Ex	George WEED	
Fokker	Apologies received	(RMPIG Secretary)
Gulfstream Aerospace	Marcelo Jose FERREIRA RAMOS	
Honeywell Aerospace	Chris HICKENBOTTOM	
Leonardo Helicopters	Giacomo GIBILISCO	(RMPIG Chairperson)
Rolls-Royce	Nicole ELDERS	
United Airlines	Robert BARNARD Daniel COULTER	
Wisk	Dither FLORES Alessandra BATALHA	



DAY 1 (05th May 2025)	
Item	Discussion / Disposition / Action Item
1	Welcome and Introductions
i.	Introductions by Mr Abdulla Aljanahi, Airworthiness Senior Director of the General Civil Aviation Authority of the United Arab Emirates (GCAA), and by Mr Omar Bumelha, Senior Manager – CAMO of the GCAA.
ii.	Introductions and Welcome by Mr Raffaele Iovinella (EASA), IMRBPB Chairperson. EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella) – this will be my last IMRBPB meeting due to a new role I have been assigned at EASA. This year the IMRBPB will elect a new Chairman. Thank you all for your active involvement in this activity during the past years.
iii.	Round-the-table of Participants Mr Rocky Johnson (FAA) will attend the meeting remotely from USA.
iv.	Review of Agenda and Plan for the Week
v.	Review of MPIG Meetings and Introductory Remarks Airbus / (Olivier Weiss), MPIG Chairperson – introduced the topic supported by a presentation. Thank you to GCAA for the invitation and for having organized the event. I am glad to see a very good participation/representation from the Industry side, showing the actual interest in the MRB activities. The MPIG highlights that the IMRBPB active contribution to the ongoing SAE G-38 “Automation of Aircraft Inspection” activities would be highly appreciated.
vi.	Review of RMPiG Meetings and Introductory Remarks Leonardo Helicopters / (Giacomo Gibilisco), RMPiG Chairperson – introduced the topic supported by a presentation. Thank you to GCAA and to the IMRBPB also from the helicopter community. Experience shows that RMPiG representatives are more and more involved in the MRB activities. EASA / (Luca Tosini): could the Industry please clarify if EVTOLs’ manufacturers belong either to MPIG or to RMPiG? Wisk / (Alessandra Batalha): we consider us closer to the fixed-wing world, therefore MPIG. We would like to influence the standards from the aircraft side, we need to work on some details (e.g. definitions) in order to be able



		<p>to use the fixed wing standards such as MSG-3 Vol.1 for our EVTOL machine.</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): we are focusing on MSG-3 Vol.1, we keep monitoring the MSG-3 Vol.2 for possible applications but we have identified none so far. We have contributed to CIP development but is more about "electrification".</p> <p>Embraer/EVE / (Eliane Vieira): we agree with what has been said. MSG-3 Vol.1 is our reference. It becomes important to make the tool usable for EVTOLs as well.</p>
	vii.	Status and signing of revised IMPS/MSG-3 (as applicable)
		<p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella) – In accordance with the documents publication calendar, this year 2025 will see the new MSG-3 revision 2025.1, as well as the new IMPS revision 03.</p> <p>Based on the recent experience, we need to prevent the situation that happened during the authoring phase of the MSG-3 Rev. 2023.1. Back in 2024, the IMRBPB Leadership Team proposed to create a draft version of the MSG-3 document, to be used as a working document for approved IPs timely implementation. Same for the IMPS document.</p> <p>We need to improve the quality of the CIPs as well: when proposing amendments to MSG-3 and/or IMPS, it is fundamental to ensure that the latest current revision of this MSG-3 draft version document and/or IMPS draft version document is used as a reference.</p>
2		Initial Presentation of Regulatory and Industry Candidate Issue Papers (CIPs)
	A-E	<u>Initial Presentation of Regulatory CIPs</u>
	A	<p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella) – briefly introduced the EASA CIPs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIP EASA 2023-08_R02 – re-presented based on the IAM’24 feedback. Applicable to MSG-3 Vol. 1 and Vol. 2, as well as IMPS. MSG-3 analysis can be considered completed at Step 15 of the L/HIRF analysis flowchart. The proposal is to remove the not MSG-3 related Steps from the L/HIRF Protection Analysis Methodology and Logic Diagram. Some guidelines to be added to the IMPS to provide clarification with reference to the use of a L/HIRF assurance plan (or equivalent validation program). The CIP has been developed with the support of MPIG/RMPIG L/HIRF Working Group.
	B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIP EASA 2024-02_R01 – re-presented based on the IAM’24 feedback. Applicable to MSG-3 Vol. 1 and Vol. 2. When answering MSG-3 analysis Systems’ Level 1 Question 3. manufacturers often claim the pilot to be able to prevent an operating safety impact of the failure. The proposal is to have the information about inhibited functions clearly included in analysis, to allow correct consideration when flight crew reaction is claimed in the MSG-3 analysis Level 1.



	<p>C</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CIP EASA 2025-01 – related to IMRBPB Action Item AI 2024-01. Applicable to MSG-3 Vol.2 only. The implementation of IP 147 into MSG-3 Vol.2 created a conflict on the SSI definition between Vol.1 and Vol.2. Considerations of “serious or fatal injury to people supported by external load carrying systems” could have been addressed differently without changing the definitions of SSI for MSG-3 Vol 2. The CIP has been developed with the support of MPIG/RMPIG Structures Working Group. <p>D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CIP EASA 2025-02 – related to IMRBPB Action Item AI 2024-06. Applicable to MSG-3 Vol. 1 and Vol.2. Current MSG-3 Rev. 2023.01 2 L/HIRF Protection Logic Diagram Step 11 allows the selection of “No dedicated L/HIRF task” solely based on the assessment that the degradation of the LHSI is detectable with a Zonal inspection, without any consideration regarding the Zonal inspection program tasks interval. <p>E</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CIP EASA 2025-05 Applicable to MSG-3 Vol. 1 and Vol.2. While MSG-3 clearly states "Failure: The inability of an item to perform within previously specified limits", this aspect is not included in the definition of "Function". In a lot of currently existing analysis these limits (especially that the function may fail below and above those, or that different performance levels are required as protective function) are not assessed.
	<p>F-I</p> <p><u>Initial Presentation of Industry CIPs</u></p>
	<p>Airbus / (Oliver Weiss) – briefly introduced the CIPs developed by the MPIG:</p> <p>F</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CIP MPIG 2023-01_R03 – re-presented based on the IAM’24 feedback. Applicable to MSG-3 Vol. 1 and Vol. 2. The CIP aims to revise the GVI definition to formally introduce the use of “visual aids”. The technologies are already in place, we would like to give this option to the operator introducing the concept in the MSG-3 analysis
	<p>G</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CIP MPIG 2023-05_R01 – re-presented based on the IAM’24 feedback. Applicable to MSG-3 Vol. 1 only. The CIP aims to clarify the use of the term “overhaul” in MSG-3.
	<p>H</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CIP MPIG 2025-01 Applicable to MSG-3 Vol. 1 and Vol. 2. The current MSG-3 EZAP methodology is efficient to analyze EWIS for aircraft types where high voltage is not employed for electric propulsion and meets the intent of the regulation for transport category aircraft. Nonetheless, it may not consider the higher energy available on high voltage systems, in particular to electric propulsion systems, typical (but not limited to) for eVTOLs
	<p>Leonardo Helicopters / (Giacomo Gibilisco) – briefly introduced the CIP developed by RMPIG:</p> <p>I</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CIP RMPIG 2025-02 Applicable to IMPS. IP44 guideline is defined as not exhaustive in IMPS and shall be utilized as the basis for OEM procedure. This definition leaves a room open for interpretation of what can be used in addition to this guideline.



3	Discussion Topics - Part 1
1	<u>MSG-3 clean-up & standardizations</u>
	American Airlines / (Avril Benson) – introduced the topic supported by a presentation.
	<p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): how the Industry aims to implement all the amendments identified in the presentation? We have to consider that this year we have a new MSG-3 revision cycle to be completed.</p> <p>American Airlines / (Avril Benson): our idea is to implement all the modifications through a single MPIG CIP.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): we will discuss during the caucus. I do not feel we need a dedicated CIP for these cosmetic changes.</p> <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): there will be a consolidated editorial list of changes? It would be good to have better visibility on the MSG-3 changes driven by IP vs. purely cosmetic changes not necessarily driven by an approved IP.</p> <p>American Airlines / (Avril Benson): this is the plan.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): with the editing of new MSG-3 Rev. 2025.1 we will implement all the IPs approved since 2023, so there will be many changes happening already. We need to prevent as much as possible to face the same situation that happened during the authoring phase of the MSG-3 Rev. 2023 when a lot of issues popped out during the editing phase due to the big number of changes to be implemented and potential conflicts between some of the modifications not envisaged/identified at the time of the IP approval.</p> <p>EASA / (Luca Tosini): I am not in favor to introduce color codes in the MSG-3 flowcharts, with particular reference to the SYS MSG-3 analysis. We can talk tomorrow during the Regulators ‘caucus.</p> <p>GCAA / (Marwan Khub): changing the step numbers has to be taken very carefully. We need to check one by one those changes before agreeing with the implementation. Such a modification cannot be considered a “cosmetic” change.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): I fully agree, some changes look pretty straight forward, some others require a double-check instead.</p> <p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): are the changes proposed applicable to both MSG-3 Vol.1 and Vol.2?</p> <p>American Airlines / (Avril Benson): yes indeed. We have to validate the potential impact on Vol.2 , none identified as per today.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): we need to keep in mind the potential implications and proceed carefully.</p> <p>Leonardo Helicopters / (Giacomo Gibilisco): there are some proposed changes that may have an impact on Vol.2 users (e.g. In the image presented as new figure 2-2.1, the horizontal line dividing Vol.01 and Vol.02 content in respect to IP180 from Vol.01 and 02 should be moved above before all the questions asking about "Was a classic task identified?").</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): I see quite a number of inputs; tomorrow we will try to consolidate all the comments during the caucus.</p>



2	<p><u>Activities and Communications Procedure – Sub-group guidelines</u></p>
	<p>Leonardo Helicopters / (Giacomo Gibilisco) – introduced the topic supported by a presentation.</p>
	<p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): we at EASA still struggle in understanding the issue. Can you please elaborate? Leonardo Helicopters / (Giacomo Gibilisco): the main intent is to formally describe what is currently happening during the normal way of working as part of the MRB activities; some of the common procedures are not mentioned in the IMRBPB related documents. Some recent activities (e.g. SSI definition review, L/HIRF related CIPs) show the need to expand the description of the process. EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): what does the acronym “SME” in the presentation stand for? Leonardo Helicopters / (Giacomo Gibilisco): Subject Matter Expert. EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): my personal opinion is that it would be better to keep the communication procedure as simple as possible, I feel some proposals are applicable to original CIP development as well. CAAC / (Jin Wang): to achieve consensus is an important point in the group activity. Leonardo Helicopters / (Giacomo Gibilisco): the need for a consensus is an important point, together with the definition of the scope and record of the performed activities. EASA / (Luca Tosini): I think the Communication procedure maybe too low level document, maybe the Charter is a better place. There is as well the possibility to present technical topics for discussion during the IMRBPB Annual Meeting, not necessarily CIPs. To be discussed during the tomorrow caucus. EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): it is important to identify whether we are facing a practical issue here. Leonardo Helicopters / (Giacomo Gibilisco): this is a process already followed by the industry, as such needs to be described to provide the proper guidelines. Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): 4 out of 9 CIPs that are going to be discussed during the next days are indeed revisions of CIPs presented in previous IAMs, this makes the topic under discussion relevant. EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): in the past there was not the same level of cooperation between IMRBPB and Industry. As long as we are not asking for pre-approval of a CIP, we can talk about it. Let’s continue the discussion during the tomorrow Regulators’ caucus.</p>
3	<p><u>Lubrication & Servicing Interval Optimization</u></p>
	<p>Aeronovo / (Manny Gdalevitch) – introduced the topic supported by a presentation.</p>



	<p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): IP44 has been developed for the benefit of the industry. If Industry does not share data, then becomes difficult for the IMRBPB to provide guidance.</p> <p>Aeronovo / (Manny Gdalevitch): appreciate the comment. We as Industry are sure that there are experienced authorities around the table that can provide guidelines.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): in a nutshell, MPIG is looking for an amendment to IP44 to provide guidelines on the way forward.</p> <p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): many of the issues pointed by the presentation are actually more related to MSG-3 rather than IP44. E.g., slide 3 shows that the MSG-3 analysis should have been revised to consider the design change. Engineering judgement has to be used, but statistics cannot be applicable per definition.</p> <p>Aeronovo / (Manny Gdalevitch): at least the Failure Effect Category can be considered, why not allow the exercise to run for non-safety related FEC?</p> <p>Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): indeed this is an MPIG agreed presentation. We believe IP44 does not provide enough guidelines.</p> <p>EASA / (Luca Tosini): the first sentence in IP44 para 7.6 is the main issue from my point of view.</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): we need to understand why the lubricant is there in a first place. Design changes have to be considered at MSG-3 analysis level anytime. Change in lubricant requires the capability to segregate data between task performed pre- and post- the lubricant type being changed.</p> <p>Aeronovo / (Manny Gdalevitch): still would like to debate the issue related to the FEC and the possibility to move forward for non-safety related FECs.</p> <p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): in IP44 we are pointing to the effectivity criteria, therefore there are already considerations in place with reference to the FEC linked to an MRBR task.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): let's continue the discussion during the tomorrow Regulators' caucus.</p>
4	<p><u>Operational and Functional Check Clarification</u></p>
	<p>Boeing / (Jeff Miller) – introduced the topic supported by a presentation.</p>
	<p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): I think we need to be careful here. The two proposed solutions may not effectively address the questions raised in the previous slides. We need to stay in line with MSG-3 logic: failure finding vs. degradation finding.</p> <p>Gulfstream / (Marcelo Ramos): I have to agree with Dominique. I don't think either of the proposed solutions can really solve the problem.</p> <p>Boeing / (Jeff Miller): I understand where you're both coming from, but I think we need to consider the options. Personally, I prefer the second proposal, to modify the OPC definition.</p> <p>Wisk / (Alessandra Batalha): I agree with Jeff. If we open the door for a FNC failure finding, then what about the FNC applicability for evident FEC?</p> <p>Embraer / (Rodrigo Correa): I think we should be careful about changing definitions. We need to consider the implications, as mentioned in IP 217.</p>



GCAA / (Marwan Khub): I think we're getting bogged down in definitions. Rather than trying to limit the definition, why not concentrate on the objective? The means can be different to achieve the same objective.

Boeing / (Jeff Miller): I understand what you're saying, but at Boeing, we've experienced different ISC decisions because there's still room for different understanding.

GCAA / (Marwan Khub): That's exactly my point. We could make the task type objective clearer in the task definition.

Boeing / (Jeff Miller): I think the objective is already represented by the applicability criteria.

Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): I feel that to allow measurement in OPC will require a definition of the measurement. Therefore, I'm more keen on option 2.

Boeing / (Jeff Miller): We're looking for an IMRBPB recommendation on which of the two proposals is the preferred one.

EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): Before we go any further, can someone tell me what's the size of the problem? What's the impact?

EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): Based on my experience, this issue is very common for every manufacturer in the world. Different positions, even within the same manufacturer... it's a big problem. For a given aircraft, it can easily be 15-20 tasks, so worldwide, we're talking about a big number of tasks.

Boeing / (Jeff Miller): I concur with Dominique. It's a significant issue.

EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): I would prefer not to be too prescriptive, as this will reduce the effectiveness of running WGs and ISCs.

EASA / (Luca Tosini): are tolerances and measurements synonymous in your presentation?

Boeing / (Jeff Miller): I would mention only measurements in the OPC definition and remove the reference to "quantitative tolerances" from the FNC definition.

CAAC / (Jin Wang): I understand where you're coming from, Jeff, but we need to be careful. Having a definition doesn't per se resolve any problem. We need to be sure that we're not introducing additional confusion when touching a definition, especially when it's been in place for a long time.

Boeing / (Jeff Miller): I understand and fully concur. But in this specific case, we have evidence that the current definition doesn't work.

Archer / (Armando Chieffi): It's a bit more complicated than choosing one or the other solution. We need to understand that we have to write an AMM instruction. For example, voltage drop of 2V... we need to ensure the availability of the function within the next accomplishment time.

EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): With reference to the leak example in the presentation, we won't be able to determine the P-to-F curve, therefore the FNC is not a viable option. The driver should always be the actual purpose of the task.

Embraer/EVE (Eliane Vieira): VCK and GVI may have a similar problem.

Leonardo Helicopters / (Giacomo Gibilisco): Today, MSG-3 doesn't prevent selecting a FNC for failure finding.

EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): Many thanks for the presentation. We'll try to fit the discussion of this item into tomorrow's caucus agenda.



4		Feedback from Active Working Groups
	I.	<u>AHM Working Group updates</u>
		Boeing / (Jeff Miller) – We will be reconvening the Aircraft Health Management Working Group, or AHM WG, later this year. However, at this point in time, it's still premature to present any findings at the IMRBPB level. We need to allow the process to unfold and gather more data before we can make any meaningful assessments.
		<p>Aeronovo / (Manny Gdalevitch): I think it's worth noting that both Boeing and Airbus have made significant progress in implementing health monitoring systems. Perhaps we can share some updates on the progress we've made so far?</p> <p>Boeing / (Jeff Miller): From Boeing's side, we've already approved MRBRs with AHM. However, we're still in the deployment phase, and it's too early to perform a thorough assessment of the system's effectiveness. We need to give it more time to mature before we can draw any conclusions.</p> <p>Aeronovo / (Manny Gdalevitch): What about Airbus? Do you have any updates to share?</p> <p>Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): At Airbus, we've been working hard to implement AHM, and we've made some significant progress. We've managed to reach agreements with the MRB chairs, and we've also secured buy-in from our customers. Currently, we're undergoing a GPPH review, which is a critical step in the process. By the end of this year, we're expecting to see the initial applications of AHM, but it's been a challenging journey so far. We need to keep in mind that this is still a trial phase, and we're likely to focus on next-generation aircrafts.</p> <p>Aeronovo / (Manny Gdalevitch): As a member of the AHM WG, I still have some questions about the scope of the project. Are we talking about scheduled maintenance versus unscheduled maintenance, or is it something entirely different?</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): I think AHM is a new animal, to be honest. It's not going to fit neatly into either scheduled or unscheduled maintenance categories. Instead, it's going to be a process that requires continuous oversight and monitoring. We need to think about it as a dynamic system that adapts to the changing needs of the aircraft, rather than trying to fit it into traditional maintenance frameworks.</p> <p>GCAA / (Marwan Khub): I think AHM can be thought of as a scheduled task with a continuous interval. In other words, we'll be performing routine checks and maintenance tasks at regular intervals, but with the added benefit of continuous monitoring and real-time data analysis. This will allow us to anticipate and prevent potential issues before they become major problems.</p>



	II.	<u>MSG-4 Working Group updates</u>
		Rolls-Royce / (Nicole Elders) – introduced the topic supported by a presentation.
		<p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): I've been reviewing the current framework, and I couldn't help but notice that there doesn't seem to be a solid link between zonal and systems methodologies. I'm having trouble understanding why this connection wasn't established, as it seems crucial for a comprehensive approach.</p> <p>Rolls-Royce / (Nicole Elders): To be honest, when we were developing the framework, we didn't see the need to create such a link between the two. We focused on establishing a robust zonal methodology and a separate systems approach, but we didn't prioritize integrating them.</p> <p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): I understand the reasoning, but I would strongly recommend reviewing the theoretical approach to reconsider this link between zonal and systems methodologies. By not having a clear connection, we might be missing out on valuable insights and synergies that could enhance our overall understanding and decision-making.</p> <p>Rolls-Royce / (Nicole Elders): That's a valid point, Dominique. Many thanks for the comment. We will definitely take it into consideration and revisit our approach.</p> <p>Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): The PB feedback that will concur on the approach would be very much appreciated. In fact, I think it's essential that we get their buy-in and input on any changes we make to the framework.</p>
	III.	<u>L/HIRF Working Group updates</u>
		Archer / (Armando Chieffi) – introduced the topic supported by a presentation.
		<p>EASA / (Luca Tosini): I'd like to thank the L/HIRF Working Group for their support throughout this process. As we move forward, I'm looking for any feedback from the group regarding our cooperation. Were there any challenges or areas where we could improve our collaboration?</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): Indeed, I think it's been a challenge for everybody involved. One suggestion I'd like to propose is to have a better alignment between regulators and industry representatives before a CIP is officially distributed to the IMRBPB. In my experience, this would help to ensure that all parties are on the same page and that the CIP is more effective in addressing the needs of both the regulators and the industry.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): I think the trend we've been following over the past couple of years might be the right way forward. By increasing the number of technical topics presentations to be discussed, we're allowing for more open and collaborative dialogue between regulators, industry representatives, and other stakeholders. This approach might be more effective than having a large number of CIPs that are eventually rejected or returned for rework.</p>



IV.	<u>STR Working Group updates</u>
	Airbus / (Jan Huelsmann) – introduced the topic supported by a presentation.
	EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): I'd like to request some clarification on the MPIG Agreed Position, or MAP, related to CPCP reporting of corrosion Level 2 findings. Can you provide some details on this topic, such as the specific requirements and guidelines outlined in the MAP? Airbus / (Jan Huelsmann): The MAP provides guidance on the harmonization of corrosion Level 2 findings at the industry level. By harmonizing the approach at the IND level, we can ensure that the reporting and management of corrosion findings are consistent and effective, regardless of the specific national authority involved. EASA / (Luca Tosini): I'd like to thank the STR Working Group for their support throughout this process. As I made before with the L/HIRF WG, have we received any feedback from the group regarding our collaboration and the effectiveness of our working processes? Airbus / (Jan Huelsmann): we've received good feedback on that respect. The group has been positively impressed with the level of cooperation and communication among the different stakeholders, and they appreciate the efforts we've made to ensure a smooth and efficient process. Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): On a related note, I was wondering if it would be possible to post the MAPs on the EASA website. This would provide a central location for stakeholders to access and review the MAPs, and could help to promote transparency and consistency in the application of the guidelines. EASA / (Luca Tosini): Unfortunately, that's not possible. The MAPs are not documents that are directly supported, validated, or approved by EASA, and therefore they cannot be made publicly available through the official EASA website.
	EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): We can call the meeting for today. Many thanks to all for the fruitful discussions of this first day. Tomorrow the 2 groups will split for Regulatory and Industry caucuses respectively.
	Meeting adjourned.



DAY 2 (6th May 2025)	
Item	Discussion / Disposition / Action Item
5	IMRBPB Regulatory Caucus
6	MPIG/RMPIG Industry Caucus
	No meeting minutes produced for Day 2



DAY 3 (07th May 2025)	
Item	Discussion / Disposition / Action Item
7	Feedback from IMRBPB Regulatory Caucus
i.	<u>IMRBPB calendar of activities</u>
	<p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): We need to finalize the calendar as soon as possible. We are facing some difficulties in finalizing the calendar of the next year activities, mainly because the IMRBPB Members are facing the 2 main issues of time required to organize the event, as well the budget restrictions. We kindly remind the Industry that the Charter has been recently revised, opening the door for the Industry to host the IAM.</p> <p>Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): we will consider this option in our upcoming discussions. It will be included in the agenda of the next MPIG annual meeting.</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): in this case we may face management questions related to potential for conflict of interest. Is it possible to have an official letter from the IMRBPB providing some details on the expected activity?</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): being the option now included in the IMRBPB Charter, it can be used as supporting document for the industry in such a context.</p>
ii.	<u>IMRBPB Chair succession Plan</u>
	<p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): as anticipated at the beginning of our IAM'25, this will be my last IMRBPB meeting due to a new role I have been assigned at EASA, therefore as from Saturday I will not cover the chair position anymore. This could be the right opportunity to align the 3 years revision cycle of MSG-3 and IMPS with the election of a new IMRBPB Leadership Team. There are few options on the table, we will update you before the end of this week on the preferred way on how to move forward.</p>
iii.	<u>FDR/CVR – TCCA CIP Status</u>
	<p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps) – updated the Industry representatives providing the details presented yesterday during the Regulators' caucus.</p> <p>Last year during IAM'24 TCCA provided a presentation summarizing the issue. For FDR/CVR, ICAO requires correlation data analysis, but operators are just downloading data. The internal investigation performed by TCCA generated an unexpected increase of the workload, then the impossibility to work on a draft CIP for the next 1 year and half. The MRB must ensure that the tasks published in the MRBR are applicable and effective, therefore it seems we have an issue and is on an important subject. Therefore the target closure date of the AI 2024-02 is confirmed for the next IAM'26.</p>



	iv. <u>Review of the discussion topics presented on Monday (Part 1)</u>
	1. MSG-3 clean-up & standardizations
	<p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): Upon closer examination, it's clear that there's more to the proposed changes to MSG-3 document than just editorial tweaks. With that in mind, the Policy Board would like to propose the following approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly, we suggest that the MPIG focus on addressing the purely grammatical errors, typos, and cosmetic issues that have been identified. These changes are relatively straightforward and can be implemented directly in the next MSG-3 revision. • Then, there are other changes that have been proposed, such as the consolidation of the flowchart for SYS MSG-3 analysis, which require a more substantial overhaul. In these cases, we believe it would be more appropriate to address them through a CIP. This will allow for a more thorough evaluation and implementation of the changes, ensuring that they align with the overall goals and objectives of the project. <p>Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): Thanks to the PB for considering our input and for outlining a clear proposal. I'll make sure to inform Mr. Berger about the suggestions. Based on our discussion, it seems that we can anticipate a unique CIP that encompasses all the necessary changes, rather than trying to apply for them bit by bit. This approach will likely streamline the process and reduce the administrative burden.</p>
	2. Activities and Communications Procedure – Sub-group guidelines
	<p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): the PB think the MPIG proposal for the new bullet 9 is too much detailed. We have worked on a new proposal that aims to keep the most important information. We believe the proposal represents the current practice, in line with the original idea on the level of the details that characterize the Communication Procedure.</p> <p>Leonardo Helicopters / (Giacomo Gibilisco): The MPIG has worked during the caucus on an alternative/compact text following the early feedback of the first day. Anyway, the proposal coming from Authorities is much appreciated and fits the original needs.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): we may use the extended definition for SME, now reading Subject Matter Expert, to prevent the need to introduce an acronym list.</p> <p>Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): ok, no objection on the proposal presented.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): the IMRBPB Leadership Team takes the action to implement it in the Communication Procedure as soon as possible, following the meeting closure.</p>
	<p>Action Item 2025-01: To revise the Activities and Communication Procedure to reflect the modifications as presented during IAM'25 DAY2.</p> <p>Action Owner: IMRBPB Leadership Team</p>



		Due Date: Activities and Communication Procedure document rev. 03
		3. Lubrication & Servicing Interval Optimization
		<p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): I'd like to bring up a concern regarding the LUB and SVC procedures. By their very nature, they don't generate findings reports, which means we lack concrete data to support an IP44 exercise. The PB believes that the current IP44 guidelines provide sufficient flexibility to optimize LUB and SVC intervals, e.g. revisiting the original MSG-3 analysis.</p> <p>Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): In our experience, IP44, as it's written today, gives too much freedom, which can lead to inconsistencies. It would be beneficial to have clearer guidelines to ensure everyone is on the same page. This would help us streamline our processes and make more informed decisions.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): The key to resolving this issue lies in having a thorough discussion at the ISC level, followed by an agreement at the MRB level. By involving all relevant stakeholders, we can work together to find a solution that suits everyone's needs.</p> <p>Aeronovo / (Manny Gdalevitch): I've noticed that sometimes the MRB doesn't fully grasp the nuances of IP44, which can lead to misunderstandings and misapplications. This is why it's essential to have a clear understanding of the guidelines and their implications.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): Trying to solve IP44 issues originating from local NAAs through the IMRBPB is not the most effective approach. We should focus on addressing these issues through the established channels, such as the ISC and MRB, to ensure consistency and clarity.</p> <p>Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): We'll definitely take the IMRBPB recommendations into consideration and review them at MPIG/RMPIG level.</p>
		4. Operational and Functional Check Clarification
		<p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): the PB believes that this topic can be discussed during the presentation of CIP EASA 2025-05 related to qualitative vs quantitative functions.</p> <p>Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): agree.</p>
8		In Depth Review of Regulatory CIPs
	A	CIP EASA 2023-08_R02 – Removal of not MSG-3 related Steps from the L/HIRF Protection Analysis Methodology and Logic Diagram
		EASA / (Luca Tosini) briefed the meeting on CIP EASA 2023-08_R02.
		Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): The CIP as presented is the result of coordination between EASA and the LHIRF Working Group on the Industry side. The Action Item (AI) 2024-04 has been opened last year to address some



concerns related to the Lightning High-Intensity Radiated Field (LHIRF) Assurance Plan and its use in the MRB context.

EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): Yes, we've prepared a presentation that consolidates the results from the National Aviation Authority (NAA) level.

Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): Does the conclusion of the presentation suggest that we should completely remove the L/HIRF Assurance Program (AP) from the MSG-3 document?

EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): the presentation highlights some inconsistencies in the current approach, but it doesn't necessarily conclude that the AP should be removed entirely.

FAA / (Rocky Johnson): I think it's essential to keep the reference to the AP in the IMPS.

EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): The AP, or any equivalent validation plan, can confirm whether there's a need for a specific task, and if not, it won't be published in the MRBR.

TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): Before we proceed, I'd like to ask: does the Industry agree with the original concept of the EASA CIP?

Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): I can confirm from MPIG side.

TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): I'd like to highlight that there's a direct parallel between this LHIRF issue and the CCMR/CMCC issue that we solved at the MRB level some time ago. We completely removed any reference to CCMR from the MSG-3 document. The Electromagnetic Effects WG introduced long time ago the concept of the L/HIRF AP, which was meant to be prepared as part of the certification process to validate the protection initial maintenance program. However, at that time, we didn't have an MSG-3 analysis on L/HIRF. Following this, a dedicated MSG-3 analysis was developed, and the AP was retained to validate the MSG-3-derived tasks. That being said, following the AI 2024-04 results, an AP should not be used to say that an applicable and effective task is not required. The intent of the AP is extremely clear from FAA AC and EASA AMC: an AP requires to radiate an aircraft to verify that the protection still provides its function, and this activity is not maintenance related. The NOTES in step 12 and 13 should be removed as well. To be responsible, we need a NOTE in the IMPS to ensure that ISC, MRB and TCH have a coordination process in place, keeping in mind that different certifying authorities may have slightly different implementation of the AP. On top, there is the need for the IMRBPB to report to the Certification Maintenance Team (CMT), as we did for the CCMR/CMCC issue following the removal of any reference from the MSG-3 and the MRB process.

Archer / (Armando Chieffi): The LHIRF WG has now a better understanding of the original intent of the EASA CIP. We agree that the use of an AP is optional in the certification activity, therefore we agree with the intent. The main Industry concern was that the original paper was focusing on the misuse of the AP to prevent MSG-3 to identify applicable and effective tasks. The MPIG proposed to modify the CIP based on the EASA recommendation to proceed step by step. Therefore the MPIG has an additional CIP in the work pipe to propose a way forward.

TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): it could be good to save time, please share the CIP proposed verbiage so we can work tomorrow on a consolidated proposal.



	<p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): it can be possible also to proceed step by step. EASA wanted to solve the issue that the current L/HIRF analysis does not follow the common MSG-3 analysis logic.</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): the proposed modifications are acceptable as presented. The L/HIRF WG will propose an enhancement through a new CIP next year.</p> <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): the problem is that, if we remove the 2 NOTES from MSG-3 step 12 and 13, the proposed verbiage for the IMPS has to be revised. If we can reach an agreement within this week, I can update the CMT at the next opportunity.</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): the proposed step 16 has an issue, because this verbiage may conflict with some PPH.</p> <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): The AP may not be available at the time the MSG-3 analysis is performed.</p> <p>Embraer / (Rodrigo Correa): We've been using the AP as a reference document in the L/HIRF WG since 2021.</p> <p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): IP162 can be used as well as reference.</p> <p>GCAA / (Marwan Khub): I have two points: first, an AP is a certification requirement, so it's wise to use the AP results. The note can be helpful if kept. Second, the flowchart in step 13 should be split into two parts.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): GCAA can propose a CIP.</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): The Industry supports the CIP as it is, with the NOTE kept in steps 12 and 13.</p> <p>Airbus / (Lorenz Wenk): the AP can be used to drive changes to the aircraft design as well, correct?</p> <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): the intent was never to link the AP to drive design changes, as the design is certified via the design standard.</p> <p>Airbus / (Lorenz Wenk): maybe an "improvement" of the protection from a design point of view.</p> <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): I see what you mean, but that's not the primary purpose of the AP.</p> <p>Airbus / (Lorenz Wenk): Does the AP need to be completed or closed in order to proceed with an optimization of the LHIRF MSG-3 task?</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): IP 44 is the reference for any MRBR task optimization.</p>
	<p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): the IMRBPB can now vote for the approval of the CIP EASA 2023-08_R02.</p>
	<p>CIP accepted, as presented.</p>
	<p>The IMRBPB decided not to assign an IP number yet, waiting for the presentation of the CIP EASA 2025-02, as well related to the L/HIRF MSG-3 analysis modifications.</p>



	<p>D CIP EASA 2025-02 – L/HIRF workflow review - tasks covered by Zonal</p>
	<p>EASA / (Luca Tosini) briefed the meeting on CIP EASA 2025-02.</p>
	<p>Gulfstream / (Marcelo Ramos): Can someone walk me through the concerns with the current proposal? GCAA / (Marwan Khub): I think deleting Step 11 might not be the best approach. Airbus / (Lorenz Wenk): we can use different verbiage in Step 15 to make it clearer? Wisk / (Alessandra Batalha): I propose removing the reference to interval from Step 15. EASA / (Luca Tosini): Yes, I think that's a good idea. Archer / (Armando Chieffi): I think it would be better to refer to consolidated policies in Step 16. This would ensure that we're following established guidelines. Gulfstream / (Marcelo Ramos): Okay, let's summarize the proposed changes.</p>
	<p>CIP EASA 2025-02 is reworked live in R01.</p>
	<p>Gulfstream / (Marcelo Ramos): I'd like to discuss tasks related to critical systems. Can these tasks be transferred to zonal inspections? Archer / (Armando Chieffi): If a zonal inspection is covering the related maintenance of a critical system through transfer, do we need to raise awareness at any level? Can we ensure that it's properly tracked in the Minutes of the Meeting (MoM)? EASA / (Luca Tosini): Absolutely. Furthermore, the proposed change is a step in the right direction, as it creates a dedicated LHIRF task to be transferred. EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): As of today, there's no reference to critical protections in MSG-3. We should keep that in mind. Archer / (Armando Chieffi): Only critical items are sent for LHSI candidate selection, and we want to make it clear. Leonardo Helicopters / (Giacomo Gibilisco): The proposed note deletion, specifically step 7, explains how the zonal process works. I think we should retain it for clarity. EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): I disagree. The note itself is not entirely accurate. You may have zones with no inspections at all, so it's better to delete it. EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): Transferring tasks ensures that the inspection level is appropriate. That's the key point here. Archer / (Armando Chieffi): A zonal analysis is not required only if there's only a structure in the zone. We need to consider that exception.</p>
	<p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): the IMRBPB can now vote for the approval of the CIP EASA 2025-05_R01.</p>
	<p>CIP accepted, as amended.</p>



		EASA / (Luca Tosini): Now that we've approved this CIP, I'd like to explain the need to revise the previous one based on the modifications introduced by this second CIP approved on LHIRF. The changes we've made will have a ripple effect, and we need to ensure that the previous CIP is updated accordingly. I'll present the new revision as soon as possible.
		Being both CIPs recommending different modifications to the same L/HIRF methodology and logic diagram, the IMRBPB decided to consolidate the results in one Issue Paper only.
		CIP EASA 2023-08_R02 accepted, as presented. CIP EASA 2025-02_R01 accepted, as amended. Consolidated CIP accepted as IP 220 .
	B	CIP EASA 2024-02_R01 – System analysis and relation with inhibited functions
		EASA / (Luca Tosini) briefed the meeting on CIP EASA 2024-02_R01.
		<p>Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): I think we all understand and support the intent of the CIP, and the MPIG is on board with it. However, we're struggling with the second example provided. It seems to us that it doesn't quite fit the content of the CIP. Specifically, the functional failure of an inhibited function may be evident under some circumstances, but not always. We see the need to re-examine this example and potentially revise it to better align with the CIP's goals.</p> <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): I agree with Oliver. The examples provided are a bit misleading and generate confusion. I think we can come up with better examples that would help to clarify the need for improvement.</p> <p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): I recognize that there's a need to have a systematic approach to this problem. Whenever a function is identified, we should analyze not just the complete loss of the function, but also the degradation of the function, as well as the generation of information. This would give us a more comprehensive understanding of the potential risks and help us develop more effective mitigation strategies.</p> <p>Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): It seems to me that this is more of a certification issue, to ensure that the functions we're dealing with are properly validated and verified.</p> <p>Embraer/EVE / (Eliane Vieira): I'd like to add that if something goes wrong during an inhibited function, it could potentially become active during other flight phases, which could have serious consequences. We need to make sure that we're considering all possible scenarios and developing strategies to mitigate those risks.</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): it seems to me that the CIP doesn't quite tackle the problem properly.</p> <p>EASA / (Luca Tosini): If the examples are the main issue here, we can certainly rework them. Perhaps we can develop some new examples that would better illustrate the problems we're trying to solve.</p>



		<p>Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): That would be highly appreciated. If it's possible to revise the examples and move in the direction we've highlighted, I think that would be a big step forward. It's all about monitoring capabilities.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): I think we can implement some of the requested changes. We can work on revising the examples and developing new ones that would better illustrate the issues we're trying to address.</p> <p>Airbus / (Lorenz Wenk): we could have an applied example that describes how we go through the process and shows that the issue is actually in place.</p> <p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): I think the proposed resolution is acceptable, but what's missing is a better example that shows that a function may change from evident to hidden during the same flight.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): thank you all for the valuable comments. EASA has indeed to re-work the CIP to make use of better examples.</p>
		CIP EASA 2024-02_R01 returned to submitter for re-work. Represent in 2026.
	C	CIP EASA 2025-01 – Realignment of SSI definitions in MSG-3 Vol 1 & Vol 2
		<p>EASA / (Luca Tosini) briefed the meeting on CIP EASA 2025-01. The original CIP has been revised overnight in Rev 01, to implement some comments following the yesterday Regulators caucus.</p>
		<p>Leonardo Helicopters / (Giacomo Gibilisco): I have no objection to the proposed modification. I appreciate the flexibility that's been introduced with this modification. It's a step in the right direction.</p> <p>Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): What about HEC? Does anyone have any thoughts on that?</p> <p>Airbus / (Jan Huelsmann): Actually, we've already made a decision on that point, following the recommendation of the EASA rotorcraft expert. HEC doesn't necessarily include human occupants. It's a broader term that encompasses any external cargo that's carried by the aircraft.</p> <p>Leonardo Helicopters / (Giacomo Gibilisco): That's interesting. I noticed that in the MPIG presentation on MSG-3 clean-up from Monday, the term "Human External Cargo" was written with capital letters. Is that a typo, or is it intentional?</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): that's because of the acronym. We're using HEC as an acronym, so it's written in capital letters to distinguish it from regular text. It's not a typo, just a stylistic choice to make the acronym stand out.</p>
		<p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): the IMRBPB can now vote for the approval of the CIP EASA 2025-05_R01.</p>
		CIP EASA 2025-01_R01 accepted, as amended, as IP 221.



	<p>E CIP EASA 2025-05 – Clarification of “previously specified limits” in the MSG-3 Failure definition</p>
	<p>EASA / (Luca Tosini) briefed the meeting on CIP EASA 2025-05.</p>
	<p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): I'm having trouble understanding how we can effectively analyze both quantitative and qualitative functional failures under the same functional failure umbrella.</p> <p>Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): doesn't the definition of Functional Failure already account for this? It refers to "previously specified limits".</p> <p>Wisk / (Alessandra Batalha): the requirement is well-defined at the level of functional failure, so perhaps instead of amending the definition of function, we should expand the definition of functional failure.</p> <p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): I agree with the proposed change, but I think we need to consider the current limitations of MSG-3. As it stands, MSG-3 doesn't provide much guidance on managing Functional Failure. If we remove the blue portion in the Level 1 analysis, it could simplify things without losing any essential information. That section doesn't seem to add much value to the analysis.</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): I think we need to ensure that our top-down analysis is comprehensive. We should provide guidance to guarantee that all failure modes are considered in the analysis. Sometimes, the degradation of a function isn't properly addressed, and this can lead to incomplete or inaccurate analyses. By referencing FMEA and/or FMECA, we can make sure that all failure modes are taken into account.</p> <p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): the CIP could be accepted if we simply remove the blue portion and don't alter the definition of Function. Instead, we could provide more details at the functional failure level. Additionally, I noticed that page 6 mentions "activation", which is a new term in MSG-3. This could be a point of contention, as it introduces a concept that hasn't been previously discussed.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): considering the nature of comments received by the IMRBPB, EASA recognizes that the CIP is not mature enough; we need to work on a better formalization of the Recommendations.</p>
	<p>CIP EASA 2025-05 returned to submitter for re-work. Represent in 2026.</p>
	<p>iv. <u>Review of the discussion topics presented on Monday (Part 2)</u></p>
	<p>4. Operational and Functional Check Clarification</p>
	<p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): as agreed earlier today, the PB believes that this topic can be discussed now, following the presentation of CIP EASA 2025-05 related to qualitative vs quantitative functions.</p> <p>Boeing / (Jeff Miller): based on the Industry's caucus feedback, it seems we prefer the direction to work on a CIP to amend the OPC definition; this means to allow measurements as part of the task procedure.</p>



		<p>FAA / (Rocky Johnson): can you please quantify the time such an issue appeared at WG level? Boeing / (Jeff Miller): it happens quite a number of times. EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): I recommend focusing the CIP on the change of the OPC definition.</p>
		<p>Action Item 2025-02: To draft a new Industry CIP, on the bases of the MPIG presentation and IMRBPB discussion (ref. to dedicated presentation on IAM '25 DAY 1, agenda item #4).</p> <p>Action Owner: MPIG Due Date: IAM 2026</p>
9		In Depth Review of Industry CIPs
	F	CIP MPIG 2023-01_R03 – Use of other applicable and effective tools for visual inspections
		<p>Boeing / (Michael Eckelberry) briefed the meeting on the. This CIP has been discussed the first time in IAM’23 and it has been returned to submitter for re-work. It has been then re-discussed in IAM’24 and it has been once again returned to submitter for re-work, with the recommendation to take in better consideration the input received from the IMRBPB.</p>
		<p>GCAA / (Marwan Khub): I'd like to discuss how we can comply with the GVI requirement of "within touching distance" when using tools that can be applied beyond this distance limitation. Perhaps we can add a clause to the definition that requires the inspector to confirm the validity of the tool application. Additionally, we should provide guidelines for inspectors to verify that their findings are genuine and not just a result of shadows or dirt. Aeronovo / (Manny Gdalevitch): I recall that the first definition of GVI in MSG-3 took three days to agree upon. The "within touching distance" phrase doesn't necessarily imply physical contact; it's more of a guideline to differentiate between GVI and DET. EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): What prevents the IND from considering these devices as part of the SDI definition? Boeing / (Michael Eckelberry): We're looking to update the GVI definition based on our current experience, which includes cases of approved GVIs using borescope inspections. Archer / (Armando Chieffi): I think we should focus on the task intent rather than the tool itself. It's possible to use a borescope for GVI. Boeing / (Michael Eckelberry): I agree, and we should consider the zonal program and focus on the GVI task type. GCAA / (Marwan Khub): Why not introduce a new inspection type instead of amending the GVI definition?</p>



Boeing / (Michael Eckelberry): We've tried that approach in the past, but it didn't work out. We need to focus on the task intent and ensure that the tool used is suitable for the task.

EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): If training is required, then it's not a GVI. We need to be careful not to blur the lines between different inspection types.

EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): The original request from the IMRBPB was to incorporate the use of these tools into MSG-3, not just at the definition level. EASA has provided comments on the CIP itself. Are there industry-standard tools related to these visual aids?

Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): Yes, there are manuals and ICAs that provide guidance on the use of these tools.

Airbus / (Lorenz Wenk): It's common practice to use video aids, such as mobile phones, during maintenance.

EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): using a mobile phone for maintenance is not in accordance with the EASA Part-145 regulation.

GCAA / (Marwan Khub): It's time to regulate the use of new technology tools. But that's a separate issue. The GVI definition is well-established, so let's define a new task type instead of amending the existing one.

EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): When we tasked the Industry to consider this issue, the intention was to revise MSG-3 as a whole, not just the definition. We've been trying to find an easy fix for three years now.

Archer / (Armando Chieffi): The Industry task force has considered all these aspects, including the FAA AC 43.13-1B. We've trained line mechanics to assess the proper tool to use based on the task intent. A GVI is a GVI, regardless of the tool used.

EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): The generic approach of changing the GVI definition is not consistent with the need for the working group to assess the applicability of the tool. The GVI definition is widely used, and we have AIs relying on GVIs.

Boeing / (Michael Eckelberry): The proposal is based on the fact that this is an equivalent inspection.

Airbus / (Lorenz Wenk): This forum is relevant to the MRB process, and we want to allow the PPH to open up to the use of these applications on a case-by-case basis.

EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): The specifications of the tool should be provided by the manufacturer. If we change the definition, what about existing tasks? The IP will be implemented on a voluntary basis.

Airbus / (Lorenz Wenk): Can we clarify the regulatory issues, please?

GCAA / (Marwan Khub): Based on the proposed GVI amendment, we have all the elements for a new definition.

Airbus / (Lorenz Wenk): Can we at least agree on some of the details provided in the CIP?

EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): The IMPS proposed change on 3.7 is task validation, so 3.7.1 seems not appropriate.

TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): What about operators who don't want to buy a camera? This is a déjà vu of the IAM'24 discussion. We need to provide applicability and effectiveness criteria. The MoM of IAM'24 captured the discussion well. MSG-3 doesn't mention remote inspection tooling. No PMI in Canada will



		<p>challenge the use of a tool just because it's not mentioned in MSG-3. This has nothing to do with the initial maintenance schedule requirement. We have the analysis, we have GVI, and then in the task procedure, the tool will be specified. If optional tooling is used to perform traditional maintenance, I want to see the technical documentation from the TCH that supports the use of such a tool. Therefore, I don't think this issue will be solved through MRB and MSG-3. The proposed 3.7.1 doesn't provide enough details and explanation to guide the MRB process.</p> <p>HK CAD / (Bill Lau): The reference to tooling and optional tools is not pertinent to the IMPS content.</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): The task procedure that the OEM writes, regardless of the tool used, has to be considered an effective means.</p> <p>EASA / (Luca Tosini): I struggle to identify the equivalence of the inspections. There have been clear indications from the policy board in the past 2 years.</p> <p>FAA / (Rocky Johnson): in this specific case FAA disagree with the IMRBPB position.</p> <p>Aeronovo / (Manny Gdalevitch): We have the right direction from TCCA, and we will proceed to include the tool in the manual.</p> <p>Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): We'll take back the CIP and come back with the original intent for drone external GVI. The second option could be to withdraw the CIP and proceed outside the MRB perimeter.</p> <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): The directions the IMBPB considers valuable have been provided in IAM'24. The WG should have the ability to discuss the intent of the inspection and the means to perform the task. The equivalency to a traditional task should be assessed by the WG. We're not there yet. Technology is evolving, and domestic authorities may have different opinions on this. We're missing the assessment of equivalency, so the Industry should come back with a proposal and not give up.</p> <p>Boeing / (Michael Eckelberry): We're experiencing pushback from authorities because it's not mentioned in the MSG-3 definition.</p> <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): We need to find a way forward together.</p>
		CIP EASA 2023-01_R03 returned to submitter for re-work. Represent in 2026.
	I	CIP RMPIG 2025-02 – Clarification of IP44 definition in IMPS
		Airbus Helicopters / (Frederic Reynaud) briefed the meeting on the CIP.
		<p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): The IP44, as implemented in IMPS Section 3, talks about data and confidence level. Perhaps we could add another line to the IP44 paragraph on page 42, stating that "<i>sufficient data should be collected</i>". I also propose rewording the sentence to: "<i>However, additional data may be required and provided by the OEM to support the substantiation</i>".</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): I think it's essential to keep the reference to the use of PPH in the text.</p>



	<p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): If you look at page 47 of the PDF, at the top of the page, there might be a better place to introduce the concept of "additional data".</p> <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): Where would these "additional data" come from?</p> <p>Leonardo Helicopters / (Giacomo Gibilisco): They would come from the TCH, but not statistical data. Rather, it would be another type of data that provides more confidence in the evaluation.</p> <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): In that case, I suggest rephrasing it to: <i>"Additional data from the TCH may be used to support the evaluation, provided the use of this data is described in the PPH to complement the analysis"</i>.</p>
	<p>The CIP is reworked live, then showed to the IMRBPB, to implement the comments discussed.</p>
	<p>COMAC / (Zihan Feng): I think the reference to the PPH is not proper in this context. Not all possible types of engineering judgment should be mentioned in the PPH.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): I understand the point, nevertheless I think it's essential to describe how to use the data in the PPH. It appears that the group has made progress in discussing and refining the language of the CIP, so please show us an updated version of the CIP tomorrow for final approval from the PB.</p>
	<p>Meeting adjourned.</p>



DAY 4 (8th May 2025)	
Item	Discussion / Disposition / Action Item
7b	Feedback from IMRBPB Regulatory Caucus - Part 2
ii.	<u>IMRBPB Chair succession Plan</u>
	EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): as anticipated yesterday, let me update you on the preferred way on how to move forward. The IMRBPB decided to keep the election of the new Leadership Team as part of the IAM'26 agenda; meanwhile, Jeff Phipps from TCCA will cover the position of IMRBPB Chairman.
9	In Depth Review of Industry CIPs (continue)
G	CIP MPIG 2023-05_R01 – Latent use of the term "Overhaul"
	FedEx / (George Weed) briefed the meeting on this CIP.
	TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): I think there's a misconception that because overhaul is mentioned in the RST definition, MSG-3 automatically produces a hard time maintenance program. Obviously, that's not the case. FedEx / (George Weed): I think the misunderstanding stems from the fact that the term "overhaul" implies any type of RST MSG-3 derived task. We need to clarify this. TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): IP 213 and 217 are crucial milestones that help the Working Group (WG) choose the proper task and provide sufficient details. However, the correlation between task procedures and the intent of the MSG-3 task doesn't always follow the component in the shop environment. Back to the significant point 5 of the presentation: an FAA example has been used, but FAA 8130.21H provides the definition of overhaul (OVH). There is an international standard to identify 4 types of "work" to be recorded on the forms: <i>overhauled, repaired, inspected, modified</i> . So OVH is just one of the 4 types of work. The term <i>restoration</i> (RST) is not used, therefore will never be internationally recognized. In addition, with reference to significant point 7: it is not really clear to me; off-wing task performed by operator is just "remove-replace". What happens to the component once off-aircraft is an OEM responsibility. So OVH does not mean "hard time maintenance", it is only a type of work. I have as well a question to the new proposed definition for RST: what does it mean " <i>to return the item to a specific standard of failure resistance</i> "? Archer / (Armando Chieffi): That comes from the MSG-3 applicability and effectiveness criteria. EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): I still don't understand the need to remove the term "overhaul" from the RST definition. MRBR and shops are two different types of environments.



British Airways / (Wayne Thompson): The problem lies in what's done at the maintenance shop level.

Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): We think the CIP is improving the situation, but we need to clarify the issue.

EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): The situation shows that the TCHs are not producing the proper set of ICAs. It's not an MSG-3 issue. When the TCH completes the exercise to achieve the link between MRBR and ICA instructions, the problem will be solved. We're running in circles.

GCAA / (Marwan Khub): Maybe we can redefine RST to include overhaul, or define overhaul separately instead.

EASA / (Luca Tosini): We shouldn't confuse the type of task with the type of work. The same issue arises with cleaning type of work.

TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): If we send a part out for RST, it will come back 'repaired.' So, it's a similar issue as overhaul. MSG-3 is in place to produce an on-wing maintenance program. We haven't been proactive in following up on what happens when the part is off-wing. We recognize the issue.

Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): The word 'complete' from overhaul has to be removed. Do we agree?

EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): Referring to 'i.e. LRU' may not cover the landing gear case.

EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): The WG in the MRB process has no issues; they know what RST means. Removing the word 'complete' from OVH in RST definition does not solve the issue.

CAAC / (Jin Wang): The issue referred to by the industry is the interface between MRBR tasks and CMM. The supplier doesn't want to modify their documents, which is where the issue arises. CAAC thinks there's no issue at the MSG-3 level.

FedEx / (George Weed): So, why do we want to keep the OVH concept reference in MSG-3?

TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): Because it's one of the different possible types of work related to a RST task type.

Wisk / (Alessandra Batalha): All three related CIPs addressed a common issue, challenging one point at a time. I don't think this specific CIP, if not approved, will put the results of the others under discussion. It's just a matter of completeness.

TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): I'm not against including a standardized/harmonized OVH definition. But I would be concerned if a WG member doesn't understand the definition of the different types of work.

EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): It seems the IMRBPB disagrees with changing the current RST definition, except for removing 'complete.' But we understand that's not the issue.

FedEx / (George Weed): The goal is to remove MSG-2 related terminology from MSG-3.

EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): When you select RST, you have to determine the scope, in other words the type of work, and OVH is a type of work. If you remove OVH, what do you do then?

TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): Maybe we're missing some verbiage in MSG-3 to explain the difference between MSG-3 task criteria and internationally standardized



		<p>types of work that will be performed. That might be the way to address the concern that these three CIPs are trying to address, instead of reworking a definition that's well-used and well-understood in the MRB world.</p> <p>FedEx / (George Weed): We understand that none of the arguments presented by the Industry are considered valuable by the IMRBPB to change the definition of RST.</p> <p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): We recognize the issue, but we don't concur on the problem description (e.g. the reference to MSG-2) and on the recommendation proposal.</p> <p>Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): Many thanks for the valuable input. The MPIG will take care of all the comments and rediscuss the issue internally.</p>
		<p>CIP IND 2023-05_R01 returned to submitter for re-work. Represent in 2026.</p>
	H	CIP MPIG 2025-01 – Assessment of electric propulsion High Voltage wiring
		<p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi) briefed the meeting on CIP MPIG 2025-01.</p>
		<p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): EASA fully support the CIP, with few comments. Why limiting only to propulsion? The concept seems applicable to other types of aircraft systems.</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): The initial CIP proposal to MPIG was more generic. The MPIG decision has been to narrow it down due to the current design and protections in place. We need to consider the specific requirements and challenges of electric propulsion.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): EASA likes the concept; we support a broader scope. We believe that the principles of the CIP can be applied to other areas of the aircraft, not just propulsion.</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): I understand EASA's position, but we need to be cautious. The usage and duty cycles in conventional aircraft are very different from those in electric propulsion systems (e.g. EVTOLs). We don't want to compromise the safety of conventional aircraft by applying a one-size-fits-all approach.</p> <p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): I agree with Armando. The standards for certification are very unclear to me as per today. The scope of MRBR is to maintain what has been certified, hence the concern. We need to ensure that any changes to the CIP do not compromise the certification process.</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): I understand Dominique's concern. Electric propulsion is a different animal, and we need to approach it with caution. The decision to narrow the scope of the CIP was well understood, and we need to focus on the specific challenges of electric propulsion.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): I still think that we can learn from other areas of the aircraft. Why not add a third independent branch for electric propulsion to the ZNL/EZAP flowchart? This could help us to better understand the unique challenges of electric propulsion and develop more effective maintenance strategies.</p>



Archer / (Armando Chieffi): That's an interesting idea. However, we need to be sure that the same wiring goes back to the EZAP flowchart following the electric propulsion assessment. We don't want to create a separate process that doesn't integrate with the existing maintenance procedures creating unnecessary complexity.

FAA / (Rocky Johnson): What kind of tasks do you think may come out instead of the well-known inspections? Are we talking about new maintenance procedures? Or modifications to existing ones?

Wisk / (Alessandra Batalha): Thermo-cameras (SDI) may be effective, FNC maybe effective to access complex areas... we cannot forecast now, we simply would like to keep the door open at analysis level. We need to consider all options and be open to new ideas.

Embraer/EVE / (Eliane Vieira): SDIs seem more effective than GVIs and DETs as well from an initial assessment. We need to consider the benefits and limitations of each option and choose the best approach for electric propulsion.

EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): It seems to me you are focusing on "isolation" aspects for the time being. But what about other aspects of electric propulsion, such as power generation and distribution?

Archer / (Armando Chieffi): We are working hand in hand with our engineering team to address all aspects of electric propulsion, including the "corona effect" and degradation. We need to consider the entire system and how it interacts with the rest of the aircraft.

Wisk / (Alessandra Batalha): This CIP represents the first attempt for improvement of the analysis, we have identified room for valuable work. That's why the scope is reduced, for the time being. We need to take a step back and consider the bigger picture before we proceed.

EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): EASA supports this new idea and the CIP intent. Agree with Dominique that an approach *IP180-style* may be envisioned. We need to consider all options and be open to new ideas.

HK CAD / (Bill Lau): Have the certification specialists been involved in developing this CIP? It is essential to ensure that all stakeholders are engaged and that the CIP fulfils industry needs.

Archer / (Armando Chieffi): We approached EWIS Archer engineering with reference to the current certification requirements. Certification bases published are not covering as of today the product in an harmonized/standardized way. We need to work together to develop a comprehensive and standardized approach to electric propulsion.

Embraer/EVE / (Eliane Vieira): We are trying to address an issue. We need to work together to find a solution that meets the needs of the industry.

HK CAD / (Bill Lau): The MSG-3 is a guidance document and is not part of the certification process. We do not require a formal decision before obtaining certification concurrence. Our only requirement is to ensure that all industry stakeholders agree that the Certification Implementation Plan (CIP) meets the industry's needs.

Archer / (Armando Chieffi): The decision of certification to accept as means of compliance for certification requirements can be taken later on, at least



	<p>we have a document ready. We need to be prepared to adapt and evolve as the industry changes.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): The goal of the MRB process is to cover the complete aircraft, and a "gap" is currently identified. We have done this also with AHM recently. I understand we may proceed carefully, but this is just a starting point.</p> <p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): Maybe we need complementary approaches to the EZAP only. Maybe system MSG-3 analysis can help on that respect, such it happened in the past for fuel tank safety. We need to consider all options and be open to new ideas.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): What is the goal of MPIG, maybe to have an IP to be implemented in the upcoming revision of MSG-3?</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): If not published, it will not be visible. The group EVTOLS has a limited representation in MPIG as of today, so the visibility will be limited. We need to ensure that all stakeholders are aware of the IP and its implications once, and if, approved.</p> <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): There could be Part 23 / CS 23 aircrafts as well with electric engines. We need to consider all types of aircraft and their unique needs.</p>
	<p>The IMRBPB members decided to have a caucus: eventually it has been decided to proceed with this CIP approval and its implementation in the upcoming new MSG-3 revision.</p>
	<p>EASA / (Luca Tosini): I am somehow concerned to make reference to specific technical specifications (i.e. 213V AC, 200V DC) considering that today there is not a certification recognized design standard. Therefore I personally think that we should not introduce a definition in MSG-3 but to embed the concept within the flowchart instead. Furthermore, I am personally not in favor to delete the link between the new standalone High Voltage task and the MRBR system/powerplant section. I am concerned that, if deleted, there will be the need for a task marker or tag.</p> <p>Airbus / (Lorenz Wenk): I agree that we may have some concerns as long as we do not know the result of this new analysis practically speaking. We need to ensure that the CIP is effective and efficient.</p> <p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): We need also not to change EWIS Inspection to EWIS task then, leave the box in the center as it is. We need to ensure that the CIP is consistent with existing standards and procedures.</p> <p>COMAC / (Zihan Feng): We need to be sure that designs that do not have HV EWIS are not impacted by the new analysis. We need to ensure that the CIP is fair and equitable for all stakeholders once approved.</p> <p>Wisk / (Alessandra Batalha): If no HV, the PPH will not show this new flowchart branch.</p>
	<p>The CIP is reworked live in R01, to implement all the comments presented above.</p>



		EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): the IMRBPB can now vote for the approval of the CIP IND 2025-01_R01
		CIP accepted, as amended, as IP 222.
		Following the CIP formal acceptance, some additional points has been raised.
		<p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): Introducing a decision point in the flowchart has a different meaning other than having a definition in MSG-3. We need to be careful about how we present this information.</p> <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): We want to be sure MPIG understand and concur on the Regulators concern. This analysis will be anyway subjected to validation from design certification following any application, on case by case bases. We need to ensure that we're not creating unnecessary regulatory hurdles.</p> <p>HK CAD / (Bill Lau): If someone asks about the origins of the values 213V AC and 200V DC in the future, we need to have a clear reference document to point to for this information.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): The MoM that will be published and the IP 222 itself provide the proper references to the SAE standard. We can use these documents to support our decisions.</p> <p>HK CAD / (Bill Lau): the MSG-3 document is not a certification document; therefore, we are doubtful that such a design parameter has to be mentioned in MSG-3, even in the flowchart. We need to keep the purpose of MSG-3 in mind and avoid confusing it with certification documents.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): We need to keep certification and MRB activities segregated. We can't mix up the two processes or we'll create confusion.</p> <p>HK CAD / (Bill Lau): Do we need to have a validation from certification? Shouldn't we get their input on this matter?</p> <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): I don't think this is the proper way to go. As Armando explained, this is "phase one" of a new analysis concept. As we evolve the analysis and we become more familiar with this system architecture, we may better understand how to proceed. Let's not get ahead of ourselves.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): We may open an action item. Perhaps we should formalize this discussion and assign someone to follow up on it.</p>
		<p>Action Item 2025-03: To provide update with reference to the guidance on how to select task and interval for electric propulsion High Voltage (HV) EWIS.</p> <p>Action Owner: MPIG Due Date: IAM 2026</p>
		<p>HK CAD / (Bill Lau): the IP 222 introduces "MTBR" as a word in MSG-3, where today only MRBR is mentioned. Shouldn't we be consistent with our terminology?</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): That's a good point. We should strive for consistency in our documentation.</p>



		<p>Action Item 2025-04: To introduce reference to MTB process and MTBR document in the MSG-3.</p> <p>Action Owner: MPIG Due Date: MSG-3 rev. 2028.1</p>
	I	CIP RMPiG 2025-02 – Clarification of IP44 definition in IMPS (continue)
		Leonardo Helicopters / (Giacomo Gibilisco) showed the CIP revision R01 implementing the modifications as agreed yesterday.
		EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): the IMRBPB can now vote for the approval of the CIP RMPiG 2025-02_R01
		CIP accepted, as amended, as IP 223.
	3	Discussion Topics - Part 2
	6	<u>Functions inside “smart” LRUs</u>
		EASA / (Luca Tosini) – introduced the topic supported by a presentation.
		<p>Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): I think it's very relevant to consider the context of an integrated system design when discussing this topic. It's not particularly related to LRU, but rather how the various components interact with each other.</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): I agree with Oliver. In MSG-3, we rarely discuss failure modes in depth. However, it's crucial that we consider all the failure effects related to the LRU that have an impact at the aircraft level. To support this complex phase of identification, we can utilize tools like FMEA and other relevant documents to ensure that we're not missing any critical information. By doing so, we can close any potential gaps in our analysis.</p> <p>Wisk / (Alessandra Batalha): While MSG-3 encourages a top-down approach, we always double-check our findings using a bottom-up methodology to ensure accuracy. Additionally, we review the OEM deliverables to verify that nothing has been overlooked. In some cases, we've investigated the MSI at the LRU level and found that it makes more sense to set the MSI at a higher, more manageable level. This approach allows us to better understand the system's behavior and make more informed decisions.</p> <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): it's essential to identify the functionality of an LRU as well. When it comes to this new technology, I wonder if the MSI selection in MSG-3 provides the proper level of detail. In my opinion, this seems more like an MSG-4 relevant topic.</p> <p>Rolls-Royce / (Nicole Elders): Actually, there's a section in the white paper that discusses integrated systems. In our experience with powerplant, we often find it necessary to go below the LRU level to truly understand the</p>



		<p>system's behavior. For example, a thrust reverser is considered an LRU, but we need to break it down to the functional level to appreciate its intricacies.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): Thank you all for your valuable feedback. We'll definitely take your comments into consideration and discuss the need for a CIP.</p>
	5	<p><u>Clarification of “internal” and “external” in the MSG-3 analysis and in the MRBR</u></p>
		<p>EASA / (Luca Tosini) – introduced the topic supported by a presentation.</p>
		<p>Airbus / (Lorenz Wenk): We originally introduced the internal vs. external concept simply to identify the boundaries between different zones. However, the zonal section of MSG-3 is indeed limited, and it's not surprising that we're seeing differences among TCHs. The question is, how far can the GVI of a zone cover a very specific item within that zone? To drive commonalities, we need to go down to the sources and understand the underlying principles.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): The lack of proper guidance is precisely what triggered our technical topic discussion. Perhaps there are areas beyond the zonal analysis in MSG-3 that can be improved. We're looking for ways to harmonize our approaches and ensure that we're all on the same page.</p> <p>Embraer / (Rodrigo Correa): We've actually used the internal vs. external definitions in our PPH, and we haven't encountered any issues with it. It's been a useful framework for our analysis</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): I don't see any need for a definition in MSG-3. We're using the zonal characterization from S1000D, which provides a clear framework for identifying threats and assessing their impact. The key is to understand the exposure to those threats and how to rate them accordingly.</p> <p>Leonardo Helicopters / (Giacomo Gibilisco): The focus should be on the exposure to specific threats, rather than trying to define internal vs. external zones. By rating the exposure, we can get a better sense of the potential risks and take steps to mitigate them.</p> <p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): But if we're using the same exposure considerations to rate different systems, shouldn't we be getting similar results? The slide in the presentation suggests that we're getting different ratings from the same exposure, which seems strange to me.</p> <p>Airbus / (Lorenz Wenk): The assessment really depends on the specific details of the PPH and the rating system being used. There are many factors that can influence the outcome, and it's not always easy to compare apples to apples.</p> <p>Embraer / (Rodrigo Correa): We've actually had questions from our regulatory authority, ANAC, on this topic. But we've validated our PPH based on the experience we've gained, and we're confident in our approach.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): that's precisely why we're having this tech topic discussion - to explore the room for harmonization and see if we can develop more consistent and effective guidelines. Thank you all for your valuable input.</p>



7	<u>Evacuation slide deployment</u>
	Airbus / (Oliver Weiss) – introduced the topic supported by a presentation. If we look at the applicability and effectiveness criteria outlined in MSG-3, I think it's clear that a slide deployment maintenance task doesn't really make sense in this context.
	<p>EASA / (Luca Tosini): it's worth taking the presentation back to EASA for internal discussion. We need to consider whether this task is truly necessary and whether it's aligned with the overall goals of MSG-3.</p> <p>British Airways / (Wayne Thompson): We actually think that this test has value, even if it doesn't necessarily fit within the MSG-3 framework. Maybe it doesn't pertain to MSG-3 specifically, but that doesn't mean it's not worth doing. Perhaps it should reside somewhere else, such as in a separate maintenance program or guideline.</p> <p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): to support the review of this task, it would be nice to have visibility on the in-service issues or findings that have arisen from this task activity (e.g. any notable problems that have come out of this task).</p>
8	<u>ICA availability</u>
	Airbus / (Oliver Weiss) – informed the IMRBPB members that the topic is deferred to a later opportunity for discussion.
10	Additional Topics
i.	<u>Two clouds on the horizon of MSG-4</u>
	COMAC / (Yiping Wang) – introduced the topic supported by a presentation.
	<p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): I found the presentation to be very interesting, and I appreciate the enthusiasm behind it. However, I think the reference to IP 53 is not entirely appropriate, given the context of the IP development. On the other hand, I did appreciate the comparison between certification process and MSG-3 analysis in relation to the definition of safety. As we all know, the two processes are intentionally different, and it's essential to recognize those differences. What does concern me, though, is the use of engineering analysis to produce scheduled maintenance. I'm worried about how these concepts may influence MSG-4 development, as MSG-3 has been weak in standardizing the identification of task intervals. Having a more analytical way to standardize task interval determination is an interesting aspect to be investigated, but we need to be cautious in our approach.</p> <p>COMAC / (Yiping Wang): We expect more instructions and guidelines from Authorities during the MSG-4 development phase. As we move forward, it's crucial that we receive clear direction on how to integrate these new</p>



	<p>concepts and methodologies into our maintenance practices. We can't afford to have ambiguity or confusion.</p> <p>Honeywell Aerospace / (Chris Hickenbottom): I'd like to draw your attention to ARP 5097 and ARP 7122, which focus on the mitigating measures that need to be in place for an Aircraft Health Management (AHM) system to ensure it's robust enough to perform its intended function. For example, one mitigating action could be to have a look at the AHM functionality and ensure it's properly certified.</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): The reliability of AHM will indeed play a role in hazard classification. In MSG-3, we don't recognize the need to identify the functions for which the AHM has been certified in the aircraft. However, if the intent is to provide supplemental maintenance, the hazard classification would be non-safety. The same system may have a different safety-related classification depending on the criticality of the function it's designed to perform. I think AHM should be handled in a similar way as other systems that provide CAS messages.</p> <p>Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): I think we need to take this carefully and consider all the implications. We can't rush into new methodologies or standards without thoroughly evaluating their potential impact on safety and maintenance practices.</p> <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): The story of the authority member in the presentation is actually linked to a situation I experienced back in 2018, where I requested the CMT to create a technical team to investigate the need for a dedicated certification bases for AHM. Unfortunately, the answer from CMT was negative at the time.</p>
	Meeting adjourned.



DAY 5 (9th May 2025)	
Item	Discussion / Disposition / Action Item
11	Action Items Review
i.	<u>AI 2024-05</u>
	COMAC / (Yiping Wang) – reviewed the action item supported by a presentation.
	EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): the IMRBPB can now vote for the closure of IMRBPB Action Item 2024-05.
	AI closed.
ii.	<u>AI 2024-03</u>
	American Airlines / (Avril Benson) – reviewed the action item supported by a presentation.
	<p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): Given the late distribution of the White Paper, we didn't have a lot of time to delve into the details before our meeting.</p> <p>American Airlines / (Avril Benson): As we move forward, I'd like to highlight that points 3. and 4. of the AI 2024-03 will be thoroughly investigated once MSG-4 reaches a level of maturity that we consider sufficient for a comprehensive assessment. Additionally, regarding point 5., we've received feedback from the industry that our original plan, which aimed for completion within 1-2 years, was overly ambitious. As a result, we're now working with a new tentative timeline that extends until 2029. It's likely that this revised timeline will also impact the IMPS document.</p> <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): As IMRBPB members, it's our responsibility to provide thoughtful comments on the White Paper. Considering the complexity of the document, I think it's essential that we have sufficient time to review it. Tentatively, I propose that we aim to provide our comments by the next IAM meeting in 2026. Having had a chance to review the White Paper, I must say that I feel more comfortable with the direction of MSG-4 development. I also appreciate the more realistic timeline that's been proposed. I'd like to propose an Action Item for the Policy Board to review the White Paper and provide comments.</p> <p>American Airlines / (Avril Benson): Would it be possible to get some initial feedback from the Policy Board earlier than IAM'26? Perhaps we could aim for something in the fall of 2025? I'd like to remind everyone that we have an MPIG meeting scheduled for September '25, which will focus specifically on MSG-4. It would be beneficial to have some feedback from the Policy Board before that meeting.</p> <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): I'm afraid it will be challenging to provide anything comprehensive before your September meeting. The best we can do is aim</p>



	to have our feedback ready by the end of November, which would be a few weeks before our IMRBPB intermediate meeting (IIM'25). This will give us sufficient time to review the White Paper and provide thoughtful comments.																								
	<p>Action Item 2025-05: The PB Members, to review in details the MSG-4 white paper and to provide comments to the IMRBPB Leadership Team.</p> <p>Action Owner: IMRBPB Due Date: October 2025</p>																								
	EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): I recommend the IMRBPB Leadership Team to proceed with the consolidation of the comments once received; this will speed-up the review process during the IIM'25.																								
	<p>Action Item 2025-06: Following AI 2025-05 closure, to prepare a presentation to provide the IMRBPB consolidated list of comments to the MSG-4 White Paper.</p> <p>Action Owner: IMRBPB Leadership Team Due Date: IIM 2025</p>																								
12	Disposition of CIPs into IPs, IMPS, requests for rework, etc.																								
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>CIP number</th> <th>CIP title</th> <th>Disposition</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>EASA 2023-08_R02</td> <td>Removal of not MSG-3 related Steps from the L/HIRF Protection Analysis Methodology and Logic Diagram</td> <td>Consolidated in one IP only. Accepted, as amended, as IP 220</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EASA 2025-02</td> <td>L/HIRF workflow review - tasks covered by Zonal</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>EASA 2024-02_R01</td> <td>System analysis and relation with inhibited functions</td> <td>Returned to submitter for re-work. Represent in 2026.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EASA 2025-01</td> <td>Realignment of SSI definitions in MSG-3 Vol 1 & Vol 2</td> <td>Accepted, as amended, as IP 221</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EASA 2025-05</td> <td>Clarification of “previously specified limits” in the MSG-3 Failure definition</td> <td>Returned to submitter for re-work. Represent in 2026.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MPIG 2023-01_R03</td> <td>Use of other applicable and effective tools for visual inspections</td> <td>Returned to submitter for re-work. Represent in 2026.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MPIG 2023-05_R01</td> <td>Latent use of the term “Overhaul”</td> <td>Returned to submitter for re-work. Represent in 2026.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	CIP number	CIP title	Disposition	EASA 2023-08_R02	Removal of not MSG-3 related Steps from the L/HIRF Protection Analysis Methodology and Logic Diagram	Consolidated in one IP only. Accepted, as amended, as IP 220	EASA 2025-02	L/HIRF workflow review - tasks covered by Zonal		EASA 2024-02_R01	System analysis and relation with inhibited functions	Returned to submitter for re-work. Represent in 2026.	EASA 2025-01	Realignment of SSI definitions in MSG-3 Vol 1 & Vol 2	Accepted, as amended, as IP 221	EASA 2025-05	Clarification of “previously specified limits” in the MSG-3 Failure definition	Returned to submitter for re-work. Represent in 2026.	MPIG 2023-01_R03	Use of other applicable and effective tools for visual inspections	Returned to submitter for re-work. Represent in 2026.	MPIG 2023-05_R01	Latent use of the term “Overhaul”	Returned to submitter for re-work. Represent in 2026.
CIP number	CIP title	Disposition																							
EASA 2023-08_R02	Removal of not MSG-3 related Steps from the L/HIRF Protection Analysis Methodology and Logic Diagram	Consolidated in one IP only. Accepted, as amended, as IP 220																							
EASA 2025-02	L/HIRF workflow review - tasks covered by Zonal																								
EASA 2024-02_R01	System analysis and relation with inhibited functions	Returned to submitter for re-work. Represent in 2026.																							
EASA 2025-01	Realignment of SSI definitions in MSG-3 Vol 1 & Vol 2	Accepted, as amended, as IP 221																							
EASA 2025-05	Clarification of “previously specified limits” in the MSG-3 Failure definition	Returned to submitter for re-work. Represent in 2026.																							
MPIG 2023-01_R03	Use of other applicable and effective tools for visual inspections	Returned to submitter for re-work. Represent in 2026.																							
MPIG 2023-05_R01	Latent use of the term “Overhaul”	Returned to submitter for re-work. Represent in 2026.																							



MPIG 2025-01	Assessment of electric propulsion High Voltage wiring in MSG-3	Accepted, as amended, as IP 222
RMPIG 2025-02	Clarification of IP44 definition in IMPS	Accepted, as amended, as IP 223

12 Final Provisions

i. IMRBPB documentation status and review

- Action Items

6 (six) new action items have been opened during the IAM 2025:

AI number	AI content	AI assigned to	Target Closure Date
AI 2025-01	To revise the Activities and Communication Procedure to reflect the modifications as presented during IAM'25 DAY2.	IMRBPB Leadership Team	Activities and Communication Procedure document rev. 03
AI 2025-02	To draft a new INDUSTRY CIP, on the bases of the MPIG presentation and IMRBPB discussion (ref. to dedicated presentation on IAM '25 DAY 1, agenda item #4)	MPIG	IAM 2026
AI 2025-03	To provide update with reference to the guidance on how to select task and interval for electric propulsion High Voltage (HV) EWIS	MPIG	IAM 2026
AI 2025-04	To introduce reference to MTB process and MTBR document in the MSG-3	MPIG	MSG-3 rev.2028.1
AI 2025-05	The PB Members, to review in detail the MSG-4 white paper and to provide comments to the IMRBPB Leadership Team.	IMRBPB	October 2025
AI 2025-06	Following AI 2025-05 closure, to prepare a presentation to provide the IMRBPB consolidated list of comments to the MSG-4 White Paper.	IMRBPB Leadership Team	IIM 2025

The complete list of action items will be made available on the EASA website at the following link:

<https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/domains/aircraft-products/international-maintenance-review-board-policy-board-IMRBPB>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Issue Papers Index</u>
	EASA / (Luca Tosini) – showed the Issue Paper Index to the Policy Board. Inclusion of the 4 (four) new approved IMRBPB IPs.
	The approved Issue Paper Index will be made available on the EASA website at the following link: https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/domains/aircraft-products/international-maintenance-review-board-policy-board-IMRBPB
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Focal Points List</u>
	The approved Focal Points List will be made available on the EASA website at the following link: https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/domains/aircraft-products/international-maintenance-review-board-policy-board-IMRBPB
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Meetings Calendar</u>
	EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella) – showed the IMRBPB Meetings Calendar (Rev.19 dated May 2025) to the Policy Board.
	The IMRBPB found an agreement, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• IIM 2025 (virtual) will be hosted by TCCA, tentatively December 16-17;• For the IAM 2026 organization, there are currently 2 options on the table:<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. hosted by UK CAA, tentatively May 18-22, location to be confirmed;2. hosted by COMAC in cooperation with CAAC, tentatively May 18-22, in Shanghai (China). <p>A final decision will be made during IIM 2025.</p>
	The IMRBPB Meetings Calendar updated will be made available on the EASA website at the following link: https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/domains/aircraft-products/international-maintenance-review-board-policy-board-IMRBPB
	EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): I wanted to bring up a concern that was discussed during the Regulatory caucus. When Industry members step-in to host an event, there's a potential risk that the independency of the IAM format could be challenged. This might lead to conflicts of interest, which could undermine the integrity of the process. To mitigate this risk, we've considered the possibility of a joint letter from the IMRBPB. I think this is a viable option that could help address any concerns that may arise. I would like to request that MPIG/RMPIG members consider this option in case of



		<p>need, to ensure that we can maintain the independence and credibility of the IAM format.</p> <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): Once we confirm the host for the event, whether it's MPIG or RMPIG, I would like to propose that Industry members formally ask for the need for such a joint letter.</p>
	ii.	Final Remarks – “How did it go?”
		<p>MPIG Chairperson - Airbus / (Oliver Weiss):</p> <p>I'd like to express my gratitude to the Policy Board members for their tireless efforts. I'd also like to thank the MPIG and RMPIG members for their attendance and active participation in our discussions. The Engine Propulsion topic has been a significant focus for us, and I believe our hard work has paid off, particularly with the milestone achievement of IP 222. Moving forward, it's essential that we remain agile and continue to leverage the AI open process to ensure proper follow-up and improvement of our concepts. However, I do want to note that the two MPIG CIPs numbered 2023 are still not mature, which is a bit frustrating. I think it's crucial that the MPIG works on more significant changes to bring a more advanced version of the proposed solution to the IIM 2025, which will help prevent similar situations in the future, such as what we experienced with GVI and the need for visual aids. MSG-4 is moving in the right direction from Industry point of view, we are glad that an action item has been opened for the PB members to provide comments on the white paper.</p>
		<p>RMPIG Chairperson – Leonardo Helicopters / (Giacomo Gibilisco):</p> <p>Thank you all. I'm happy to see that we've started working on a more effective way of addressing our challenges. I appreciate that we're discussing the MSG-3 Vol.1 issues while considering their potential impact on Vol.2 as well. I'm looking forward to continuing this approach. With IP 221 approval the IMRBPB supersedes part of IP 147, in the sense that only "half " of the issue of the IP 147 has been solved in respect to the SSI definition; the other "half" of the issue is related to the "adverse effect on safety" definition which is still different and can be solved through the creation of "Human Occupant" definition as promoted by EASA Technical Topic discussed during IAM’24 as part of the "SSI Roadmap" presentation.</p> <p>The RMPIG will begin evaluating the implications and identifying possible CIP subjects for the next year's IAM. Our goal is to ensure that the concept of “Human Occupant” is clear enough in MSG-3 Vol.2 to allow for proper execution of MSG-3.</p>
		<p>IAM 2025 Host – GCAA/ (Omar Bumelha):</p> <p>I'd like to thank everyone from the National Aviation Authorities and Industry level for their hard work and contributions. I'd also like to extend a special thank you to Rocky (FAA), who attended all the night sessions of our meeting, that's a tremendous effort. Thank you to Raffaele (EASA) for attending the last MRB meeting despite the new position covered at EASA, and I wish Jeff (TCCA)</p>



		<p>all the best for his ad-interim position as the IMRBPB Chairman. I hope you all enjoyed your time in Dubai.</p>
		<p>IAM 2025 Host – GCAA/ (Marwan Khub): It's been a pleasure being with all of you, learning from both sides, and I'd like to express my gratitude for the active participation. We hope that the efforts made by the GCAA have met your expectations.</p>
		<p>IMRBPB Secretary – EASA / (Luca Tosini): Many thanks to the GCAA for the great hospitality. Thank you very much to all the IMRBPB members, as well as to MPIG and RMPiG for the valuable discussion and for the comments/inputs provided during these 4 intensive days of working together. All the IMRBPB related documents will be revised and posted on the EASA website as soon as possible. The minutes of meeting in draft version will be made available for your comments in the upcoming weeks.</p>
		<p>IMRBPB Co-Chairperson – UK CAA / (Emma McCreesh): Thank you to the GCAA for hosting us, and thank you to everyone for your contribution.</p>
		<p>New IMRBPB Chairperson – TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): I'd like to thank the GCAA staff for their support in making this meeting a success. I appreciate the active participation from our Regulatory colleagues, as well as the MPIG and RMPiG members – it's been very collaborative, and I super appreciate it. Raffaele, I've had the pleasure of working with you since your first meeting in 2018, and I've seen you grow into a fantastic co-chair and eventually chair. You've done an excellent job as a Policy Board member, and I'm grateful for your dedication.</p>
		<p>Former IMRBPB Chairperson – EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): I think this has been a very successful Policy Board meeting from a technical standpoint. We've set some significant milestones for future development, and I couldn't imagine a better way to close my MRB career than with the exceptional hospitality and organization provided by the GCAA. I'd also like to thank all the Industry members for the years of working together, growing together, and learning from each other. To my PB colleagues, thank you for your support and collaboration – we've had some changes in membership over the years, but it's clear that we need the involvement of all National Aviation Authorities, especially with the level of technological innovation on the horizon. And to my Leadership team colleagues, thank you for having supported me in performing my duties. With that, I officially declare this meeting closed.</p>
		Meeting Closed