

2014 IMRBPB Meeting Minutes

(Rev 0 – 25 Aug 14)

Meeting Location: The John G. Diefenbaker Building
111 Sussex Drive
Ottawa, ON Canada

Conference Room: Bytown

Monday April 28th IMRBPB Meeting – convened at 0830.

- 1) Welcome and Logistics
 - a) Welcome by IMRBPB Chairman, Jeffrey Phipps
 - b) Logistical discussion of room etc.
 - c) Discussions of dinner Tuesday night.
- 2) Introduction of All Participants.
 - i) *(See attached attendance list)*
- 3) Welcome by Mr. David Turnbull, the Director of the National Aircraft Certification Branch, TCCA.
 - a) Mr Turnbull - Welcome to Ottawa. Impressed by the numbers and the energy. Looking forward to the collaborative effort. Proud to carry on tradition of being an active member.
 - b) Two main themes – harmonization and governance.
 - c) Harmonization: Overall objective is to see MRB report development, including associated ICA, as more integrated into the certification effort. The benefits of working together (OEM and regulatory) can be seen in a single set of ways of doing things. We need to increase the concept of validation. We note that there is a big difference between “jointly” and “concurrently”. TCCA feels that the level of involvement is increasingly difficult to sustain. The ability of a validating authority to make good decisions requires time to develop trust and understanding of other’s processes
 - d) Governance: The IMRBPB has not been brought into the context of the existing bilaterals. Those bilaterals influence direction and provide resources/support.
- 4) Review of Agenda.
 - a) Opening remarks from MPIG as to the full agenda this week.
 - b) Question from Airbus (Harbottle) about closed CIP (TCCA 2012-01)(on agenda for Thursday). Chair stated that it was closed in Hong Kong as it appeared that no action had been taken. After Hong Kong meeting, discovered that there was work had been accomplished, so on agenda to discuss and reopen. Will discuss as per the agenda.
- 5) Update Master List of Attendees.
 - a) Mr. Jouvard announced changes to the EASA website as well as to EASA structure. Goal is to make a world class website, then transfer data over. Over the last three weeks, it was impossible to make changes. Now, please send me comments/suggestions for the website. Will combine and then submit to web master.
- 6) Review of contacts for policy board.
 - a) Regulatory : Mr. Leung now primary for HKCAD. Mr. Guan added for Singapore CAAS.

- b) Industry – add Mark Lopez for A4A. Add Jim Staggs and Sebastian Rousseau for Bell. Cessna – add Steve Taylor. COMAC – delete Ms. Wong. Eurocopter has changed its name to Airbus Helicopter. Gulfstream – delete Mr. Maroni. AVIC – delete Mr. Kai.
- 7) General Discussion Regarding the Management Teleconference, MPIG and IMRBPB Working Group meetings. “What went well?”
 - a) Chair – confirmed that the policy board pre-meeting in December is very important. Telecon starts planning phase, then meetings of both groups. Plan to continue with current structure. Seems right people are on the telecon.
 - b) Working group in Hong Kong was very successful. 4 day meeting – after MPIG review, went through harmonization discussion. Main accomplishment was to form basis for TCCA CIP on harmonization, which lead to the CIP presented today. Will continue on. CASA to host this coming year.
- 8) Upcoming Meetings
 - a) Main Board Meetings:
 - i) FAA will host next year (2015) in Washington DC, USA.
 - ii) ANAC will host in 2016 (tentatively) – location TBD.
 - iii) EASA will host in 2017, Cologne, GER.
 - b) Regulatory working group meetings
 - i) CASA will host in 2014 in Canberra, AUS.
 - ii) JCAB will host in 2015 – location TBD.
 - iii) CAAC will host in 2016 in Guangzhou, China.
 - c) Mr Jouvard to update master spreadsheet and email/web.
- 9) MPIG Update (Jose Gomez-Eligido) - Not much more to say than what has already been stated.
- 10) Initial presentation of new Regulatory CIPs to MPIG.
 - a) **CIP TCCA 2014-01**, Standardization of the MRB Process and Harmonization of the IMRBPB recommendations.
 - i) New template and procedure. This applies to both volumes.
 - ii) CIP read by Chair.
 - iii) Although submitter is TC, joint support of development of CIP was obtained in Hong Kong (draft not circulated).
 - iv) Regulatory documents describe MRB process. Need to look to validation process from other regulatory orgs.
 - v) Harmonized standard would be produced by Board and considered a regulatory document. Would be available to any Regulator/OEM.
 - vi) Recommend it be based on FAA’s AC 121-22 and developed as needed for international needs.
 - vii) Formation of a working group recommended. Representation from charter MRBPB members and MPIG (need to ensure not too big.)
 - viii) Proposed schedule and agenda. Work this summer, review by MPIG/Regulatory WG at next year’s meeting. Full review in DC next year.
 - ix) Plan would allow for harmonized standard leading to validation, vs traditional regulatory participation (coordinated process).
 - x) Evolution is long term process – between authorities. This would support that process and make us more efficient.

- xi) Airbus – do you anticipate MPIG participation? Chair – hope to confirm that this week. One or two representatives, but no more (with 9 regulators, group will get too big.)
 - xii) Boeing – what if regulators do not accept? Does that provide them leverage? Chair – not really, as regulators still have responsibility to implement IP’s into national guidance. Policy Board will stay true to MRB process, but may affect agreements outside that.
 - xiii) Aeronovo – think one step further, and think about people who would represent regulators. Ensuring that people may be fully qualified. Chair – good comment, but applies today as well. Always going to be a next generation. Transfer of knowledge is always important. Certainly the application of the document will need to be understood by everyone, but that’s the same as IP changes now. The onus for that would fall on the organization.
- b) CIP TCCA 2014-02, Analysis of Aircraft Data Networks and Associated Security Systems.**
- i) Read by chair.
 - ii) Chair - Saw references to OEM documents in MRB – possibly seen as outside of MSG-3. Discussed in Hong Kong – general consensus was that OEM’s were developing this process as technology improves.
 - iii) Key is to develop appropriate scheduled maintenance tasks. Have been generally deferred to the regional/PMI level to approve – no national guidance. Determination needs to be made if MSG-3 can be applied to these systems or a new sort of analysis needs to be developed.
 - iv) Airbus – was this paper discussed in HK? Chair – no, not at this level – just the concept. Open for general discussion. Airbus – is there a similar position from regulatory community? Before MPIG approaches, nice to get consensus. FAA – TAD papers out, would be good to step up here. We need to determine if there is a way to approach. Chair – no comments formally. Would like from MPIG general feedback on this paper and where do you see us going with this? This may depend on EUROCAE paper.
 - v) TCCA – this may be similar to ETOPS - start outside MSG-3 and then get brought in later.
 - vi) AeroTechna – What is the primary concern here? TCCA – This is mainly to do with ongoing airworthiness. Not necessarily the “pipes”(hardware), but more the in service design and the software. AeroTechna – what type(s) of failure could we anticipate here? TCCA – This also needs to be looked at on the operator’s side (COS).
- c) CIP FAA 2014-01, Discard Task Interval Incorporation by Reference.**
- i) FAA read.
 - ii) FAA – we need policy clarification on referencing safe life limits in MRBR. What happens if (when) these limits change, maintaining 1-to-1 link is difficult.
 - iii) FAA Recommendation – such changes would require MRB review to ensure remain applicable and effective.
 - iv) Showed example.
 - v) TCCA – we’re grappling with this, too. Our suggestion lately has been not publishing those limits, as those tasks in MRBR are not effective (as they are already published.)

- vi) Airbus – then you run into 5s and 8s with no task selected. TCCA – We may need to modify MSG-3.
- vii) EASA – MRB control is also an issue.
- d) **CIP FAA 2014-02**, Analysis of Highly Integrated Electronic Devices (HIED).
 - i) Read by FAA
 - ii) FAA – Concern here is functional integration. How do we address multiple functions and multiple MSI's that are handled within one component?
 - iii) Recommendation is to charter a working group.
 - iv) Chair – possible crossover with e-enabling.
 - v) Airbus – again, this is complex issue that needs regulatory coherence prior to MPIG discussion. In this case, two examples provided by MPIG members. Is it today policy board position that something needs to be done in MSG-3? Output is generally simple tasks. How many resources do industry have to accomplish this when result is simple?
 - vi) Chair – good/valid question. FAA – several OEM's have done this, can be concerning due to complexity, needs to address somehow (how slice up? Or treat as one device and move on?)
 - vii) Chair – sometimes these are long term process – this is the first step of resolving these issues (e-enabling, as well).
 - viii) Airbus – a dedicated working group, will it be chaired by Policy Board? FAA – need to discuss best route to take. Chair – would like to generally think MPIG might chair for technical subjects, Policy Board for MRB process items.
 - ix) MPIG agreed to discuss during breakout.
 - x) Chair – in Dec, we discussed amending charter to support working groups.
- e) **CIP FAA 2014-03**, MRB Process Harmonization.
 - i) Read by FAA. Discussed the three issues of standardization seen recently and FAA recommendation(s).
 - ii) Chair – At the end of this week, I expect one CIP combined with TCCA Harmonization paper. These are concrete examples of the problem. A policy board standard would avoid these issues and points out how the guidance may be interpreted differently.
 - iii) FAA – Additionally, time will be required for review by appropriate parties and discussion with technical experts in certification.
 - iv) Chair – we need in this CIP to address these three issues this week, but then position can then be associated with the harmonization effort in a longer term sense.
 - v) MPIG – we note that this is primarily about regulatory agreement. PPH guidance should be clearer. Chair – do you generally agree with the recommendations? MPIG – yes. Chair – primarily the first two. Boeing – this is the issue we were talking about earlier. If (for example) the general guidance didn't have a 30 day PPH requirement, but one regulatory does, which do we follow?
 - vi) Chair – If we agree, then an IP would say that, then the standardization document would include that guidance. But if not, then there is an expectation to include it in national guidance, but no requirement.
- f) **CIP EASA 2014-01**, Definition of Visual Check.
 - i) Read by EASA – version dated March 26th now current. Discussed generally in Hong Kong. Taking that discussion and others into consideration resulted in this draft.

- ii) EASA - Key is “does the item fulfill intended purpose”, not just “is the item present”. Propose better separating the operational check vs visual check categories. We tried to not change anything, but just clarify.
- iii) TCCA – this chart will also be affected by other CIPs and will require coordination.
- iv) Boeing – we’re concerned about examples, as they wouldn’t be transferred to zonal – may need clarification. EASA – better example might be available where transfer is possible.
- g) **CIP EASA 2014-02**, Updating of Rating Tables- Surface Protection Systems and Material Rating.
 - i) EASA read (24 Feb current). Discussed in HK, this version adds additional examples etc.
 - ii) Recommendation is to re-add wording from original revision of MSG-3. Not sure why removed.
 - iii) Airbus – can we confirm red bold text is only difference? EASA – will double check.
- h) **CIP EASA 2014-03**, Protective Functions (not safety/emergency related).
 - i) Read by EASA.
 - ii) Boeing – we have concerns around the failure being an event (which might be multiple failures of components). May lose credit for redundancy. EASA – will review and come back.
- 11) Presentation of MPIG CIPs to the IMRBPB.
 - a) **CIP IND 2013-01**, MSG-3 Logic Diagrams-Title Consistency.
 - i) Read by MPIG (Boeing).
 - ii) Noted several comments from Airbus and EASA. These will be addressed later.
 - b) **CIP IND 2013-02**, Consistency between current Zonal Analysis and 2013 L/HIF Analysis procedures.
 - i) Read by MPIG (Embraer).
 - ii) Recommendation to delete 2-5-1 (i) from MSG-3 as no longer possible.
 - c) **CIP IND 2013-06**, Clarification of MSG-3 Applicability & Effectiveness Criteria.
 - i) Read by MPIG (Airbus). Includes multiple proposals/standalone changes. Proposes various changes to the 2-3-7.1 table.
 - ii) Some comments have been previously provided by EASA, but not yet incorporated.
 - iii) Later in week can discuss specific problem statements and table arrangement.
 - iv) We will also will need to evaluate MSG-3 text as well.
 - v) TCCA – can you explain “cost effectiveness for a fleet”? Airbus – the statistical chance of double failures for larger fleets is more.
 - vi) CAAC – Different statements for second and third columns with Op/VCK but both apply to Route 9. Airbus – Will take on board and discuss. Mainly this way to reduce to one page.
 - vii) Airbus – more discussion obviously needed after the caucuses.
 - d) **CIP IND 2014-01**, L/HIRF Terminology.
 - i) Read by MPIG (Embraer).
 - ii) Embraer – two things. First, here we recommend rather than accept, and secondly we look to combine “component” with “system” to make one definition.
 - iii) No questions.
- 12) Presentation of RMPiG CIPs to the IMRBPB.
 - a) **CIP RIND 2013-01**, HUMS for Credit.

- i) Presentation for information only – plan to officially present for next year’s cycle.
- ii) Read by RMPIG (Airbus Helicopters).
- iii) Chair – delivering CIP day of the meeting is difficult. Does this apply to Vol 2 or both? P Conn – MPIG will discuss.
- iv) Chair – will look at tomorrow. Even without a position this week, can address next year and still get in next revision of MSG-3.
- v) Airbus Helicopters – not planning for 2015.1 – we have time.

13) Additional Matters

- a) Discussion of **CIP TCCA 2012-01** version of 21 Feb 14
 - i) Chair – who has redrafted this? Airbus – AI was for Airbus (Tony Harbottle) and TCCA (Cliff Neudorf). MPIG was not in agreement. We worked together to generate this draft.
 - ii) Chair – AI 13/08 was to jointly develop. We discussed during the Hong Kong RWG meeting. Because the CIP was several years old, we closed the action item.
 - iii) Tony Harbottle – Cliff worked it, then turned over to Bruce Hawes upon his retirement. Was discussed in Seattle and then included Brent Bringle.
 - iv) Chair – for our purposes today, Mr. Harbottle will take us through it.
 - v) Airbus (Harbottle) read paper.
 - vi) Harbottle – There seems to be a misunderstanding of the term “combination” – vs “consolidated.” Process may currently combine tasks in an inappropriate way. Also, paper discusses off-aircraft tasks and how to combine them properly into one task.
 - vii) During Cologne, discussion highlighted interaction with IP 77. Need to take in to account the decisions taken at that time. This IP would supercede IP 77, which allowed for task consolidation with a system to control it. We propose that existing consolidated tasks are kept, but no further consolidation would be allowed.
 - viii) Propose adding new 2-3-7.8 on consolidation and other related changes.
 - ix) Additional changes proposed by MPIG will be addressed later (when presented by regulatory later in the week.)
 - x) FAA – generally agree, but perhaps need tighter controls.
 - xi) Chair – agree that consolidation needs better guidance.
 - xii) EASA – you said this would be applicable to on-aircraft tasks. What about IP 106 (consolidating tasks at the LRU level.) Chair – we need to be sure we don’t contradict that. EASA – when creating Level 2, if you reach restoration, there may be different requirements.
 - xiii) Chair – thank you for the discussion.

Meeting Adjourned at 1500 – moved to regulatory/MPIG breakout for rest of afternoon.

Tuesday April 29th

IMRBPB Regulatory Working Group and MPIG breakout meetings all day.

Wednesday April 30th IMRBPB Meeting – Convened at 0830

- 14) Introduction by Chair & logistics for tomorrow’s pictures.
- 15) Review 2014 Revision to the IMRBPB Charter.

- a) Made change to paragraph on regulatory working group (now plural. TOR Clause 1, paragraph 2).
 - b) Changes to names in signatories section. Will be posted on the website.
- 16) Action Item Review:
- a) **AI 13/01**, IMRBPB Charter to include IMRBPB WG and CIP management.
 - i) In reference to industry/MPIG technical working groups. (see Cologne minutes Page 5). Amendment should follow regulatory WG paragraph. Remains **open**.
 - b) **AI 13/02**, Amend IP Template and Procedure.
 - i) IP template and procedures revision complete. Added additional statement about retroactivity as per previous agreement. **Closed**.
 - c) **AI 13/03**, NAA Implementation Reference.
 - i) Chair – will remain **open** until can confirm direction of PB on harmonization.
 - ii) Vice Chair – update to this list made by Mr. Harbottle to include MSG-3 revision. Also, FAA input received and will be incorporated.
 - d) **AI 13/04**, CIP Distribution and 60 day Submission Requirement.
 - i) Looking to provide more detail on CIP submission. Current plan to post CIP's on receipt by chair to website seems to help.
 - ii) Paul Conn – 60 days for the agenda is helpful for MPIG meetings.
 - iii) Made addition to IP management procedure to reflect current procedure (posting upon receipt). Created Rev 5 - acceptable to PB. **AI Closed**.
 - e) **AI 13/05**, RMIG Assessment of CIPs from 2011 onwards.
 - i) RMPIG –all IP's found to be acceptable by RMPIG. C Chazot to send to chair. **AI closed**.
 - ii) Discussion of applicability of items to Volume 1 and/or 2. Added a column to IP index table to address.
 - iii) Discussion of ATA revision to Volume 1 and 2. PC stated ATA's plan was to retain both volumes on the same 2 year cycle, and that it was highly improbable that one volume would be revised without the other.
 - f) **AI 13/06**, Coordination of CIP IND 2008-04 with Certification.
 - i) Action was for PB members to coordinate approach with various certification branches. CIP 2008-03 is still **open**.
 - ii) MPIG – we are awaiting PB collective response.
 - iii) Chair asked that all signatories obtain comments and send to chair.
 - iv) Action remains open. **Now due 1 July for Chair to provide comments back to MPIG chair/co-chair**.
 - g) **AI 13/07**, IP 127 and Letter of Confirmation.
 - i) Seen as complete. Discussed this year at MPIG and RWG. Letters of confirmation provided in package.
 - ii) TH confirmed that MPIG comments have been incorporated.
 - iii) **AI Closed**.
 - h) **AI 13/10**, Revise IP 44 as per IP 134 recommendation.
 - i) **Chair to add a new paragraph to move IP 44 to rev 4 and sent out to members/MPIG. Not yet complete. Will remain open. Due 1 June**.
 - i) **AI 13/11**, Further develop CIP EASA-2013-01. "Tolerances/Windows" in MRBR's.
 - i) Update from EASA - takes into account the comments raised in Cologne (last year). Not proposing to close right away. Is a good starting point, but discussion not yet

- complete. FAA Policy Memo now in place. Determined that the need was specific to business aircraft and rotorcraft.
- ii) FAA – Will Dassault try to start a “MSG-3 Vol 3” for business aircraft? Paul Conn – not officially discussed yet. MPIG Chair – will discuss within MPIG and open to CIP on this subject. EASA – can confirm that Dassault had specific concerns about business jet operations. AeroTechna - NBAA not aware of this yet but will work as well. EASA – also in receipt of request to remove FAA policy memo.
 - iii) Chair – who is supporting CIP? Francis Jouvard – EASA is. The development of a “Vol 3” is a separate issue that grew out of this discussion.
 - iv) Chair – concern that this goes back in time. From a philosophical point of view, tolerances/windows doesn’t really extend to that point. If MPIG wants to develop a CIP on that, regulators should not be involved.
 - v) AeroTechna – application of tolerances is typically at the MPD level . We don’t need to move back. FAA – after Cologne, these appeared to be available at the local regulatory level. AeroTechna – there were PPH’s that had them, but need(ed) to move to the MPD. We need to be very cautious about this.
 - vi) Gulfstream – the FAA Memo was retroactive, and this was a problem for our operators. Was a tremendous amount of work. EASA – we want to avoid current situation where we are not harmonized.
 - vii) Chair – never going to resolve this at the policy board, as national authorities have differing opinion. For today, leave action item **open**.
 - viii) Airbus – there is support for this paper, but there are still some improvements to be made. EASA – agreed.
 - ix) TCCA – see biggest concern as people confusing MRBR with maintenance schedule. We need to differentiate this.
 - x) FAA – have reviewed, agree needs more work. AeroTechna – would be interested in that, but still see education as biggest concern.
 - xi) Chair – AI to be to MRBPB/MPIG to provide comments to review CIP and represent next year. Airbus – European OEM have reviewed, MPIG has not. Our proposal is to withdraw for moment and represent. Chair – will expect **CIP to be revised by EASA and represented for consultation. AI will remain open pending that. Due 1 November for presentation at RWG.**
 - j) **AI 13/12**, IP 115 comments to be incorporated in IP 129.
 - i) MPIG action. Close out letter sent. **Chair to check and look to close this item (possibly this week)**
- 17) Review CIP TCCA 2014-01 and CIP FAA 2014-03.
- a) **CIP TCCA 2014-01**, Standardization of the MRB Process and Harmonization of the IMRBPB recommendations.
 - i) Restated by Chair. Rev 1 now in effect – changes recommendations/next steps. Discussed that Dec meeting may need to be extended to accommodate that and MPIG involvement in that process. Will finalize in October.
 - ii) Discussion of logo development.
 - iii) Objective remains to create a joint policy document that can be used by regulatory bodies to develop MRB guidance.
 - iv) A4A – we have made comments to AC 121-22C, what is FAA’s path forward given those?

- v) FAA – Have draft “D” that includes integration of newer IP’s and your comments. If we adopt this (as a joint document) we would start from there for the AC and for bilateral/TIP changes.
- vi) Chair – MPIG will have the ability to provide further comment(s) in Dec.
- vii) Paul Conn – What is your expectation of the review in Dec? Representation that we would need might not be the same for this process as for the normal presentations made in Dec.
- viii) Chair – will need to discuss – our invitation will identify needs. Hard to judge until the analysis is complete.
- ix) A4A – No TOR? Chair – decided this process was better (PB WG following charter vs sub working group.)
- x) Airbus – could you clarify what you mean by “common document.”
- xi) Chair – in the CIP, we didn’t get specific. Plan to take 121-22 Draft D and start from there.
- xii) A4A – please specify MPIG representation? Chair – maximum of three. (Agreed.)
- xiii) MPIG – concerns about timeline being too aggressive. Conn – it appears that representatives will need to make decisions in December without a chance to get back.
- xiv) Chair – we can’t direct MPIG process, you’ll have as much time to review as everyone else.
- xv) Chair – **Close as IP 136, Rev 0 Dated 30APR14. Agreed.**
- b) **CIP FAA 2014-03, MRB Process Harmonization.**
 - i) FAA – will address these as part of the harmonization discussion (see above). Added note.
 - ii) Will remain open, MRBPB will formally respond after later discussion under IP 136 in December 2015.
 - iii) Boeing –
 - (1) First item – PPH completeness (areas, vs total.)
 - (2) Second item – hard number of days not so relevant with electronic collaboration. More interested in “timely fashion”.
 - (a) Chair – discussion was that reality numerous times packages were at the last minute. TP 13850 / AC 121-22 is starting point. Up to discretion of the chairperson, but we need a standard, and the most reasonable seemed to be 30 days.
 - (b) FAA – at the same time, we understand that updates when the meeting starts happen as well – we need to find an equilibrium.
 - (c) Chair – we need to have MPIG to come to the meeting to an open mind – looking for an open mind to create harmonized standard.
 - (3) Third Item – MPIG discussed internally and decided that setting a number is difficult (sometimes may only have 1 or even no customers), recommend being vague here.
 - (a) FAA– it is important to recognize that MSG-3 is developed to be used when operator representation is present. Without, should reconsider use.
 - (b) Airbus – perhaps consideration of an MTB in that case would be appropriate.
 - (c) EASA – in at least one case, operators were invited, but never showed.
 - (d) FAA– if you have a document that says a number, it may help.

(e) Boeing – that’s why we recommend that it be dealt with in the PPH.

iv) **Remains open pending IP 136 discussions in December 2014.**

18) MPIG CIP Review:

- a) **CIP IND 2013-01**, MSG-3 Logic Diagrams - Title Consistency.
- i) Restated by MPIG
 - ii) MRBPB comments
 - (1) The current titles no longer match 2013.1 and should be rewritten.
 - (2) Add “protection” to L/HIRF in bottom row.
 - (3) EASA comment that logic diagram may not be the same as flow chart. Chair – call all the same thing, either logic diagram or flow chart.
 - (4) MPIG decided to use “logic diagram” – consistent through MSG-3.
 - iii) Will accept revised paper and probably close tomorrow.
- b) **CIP IND 2013-02**, Consistency between current Zonal Analysis and 2013 L/HIRF Analysis procedures.
- i) Chair – when examining the logic diagram, the concern becomes traceability – are we losing traceability of the critical components here?
 - ii) Greg – this calls out for creation of specific tasks (stand-alone GVI) or determination that the zonal is adequate. Bombardier – the sheer numbers of transfers would be a burden.
 - iii) EASA – there could still be areas where zonal could not generate an inspection. This still may be a concern. Bombardier – flowchart assumes that a zonal exists, if a zonal inspection does not, the answer to that question will be no. This may also be covered in EZAP. EASA – perhaps wording in step 11 could be improved. TCCA – perhaps “existing” used before zonal. Agreement that this was a different topic obtained.
 - iv) Chair – we can move forward, as there are no longer GVI’s that can be transferred to zonals under the current wording and that’s the focus of the CIP.
 - v) **Closed as IP 137 R0, 30APR14, Implement into next revision of MSG-3.**

19) Logistics etc. for Mr. Eley’s visit on Friday.

20) MPIG CIP Review continued.

- a) **CIP IND 2013-06**, Clarification of MSG-3 Applicability & Effectiveness Criteria.
- i) Airbus – we see 5 distinct issues. The table needs work – both from comments and EASA issue paper, but would like to see comments from PB on specific areas stated.
 - ii) The most significant comment was possibly moving to a new route. This was proposed in the past (2000 – 2001 or so?) – and completely rejected at the time. Wish to just clarify criteria under Route 9.
 - iii) If impact on the infrastructure is eliminated, this CIP might need to be eliminated. It was our (Airbus) understanding that there was pressure on FAA AEG to determine that, but we will work with your recommendation.
 - iv) TCCA – if you affect the airport, you obviously have affected the aircraft as well. FAA – it appears that this would take a huge investment in time and effort to determine. How could a WG come up with a figure? Chair – how many variables do you consider?
 - v) Airbus – concern for operators can be wider as well. Chair – this is part of operator’s program.
 - vi) FAA – again, not bad idea, but still very hard to determine.

- vii) TCCA – this seems to be on the right track, as some automatically assume “no task” for all route 9’s. EASA – seems to be a little bit too far. Chair – agreed. Too far. Mainly concerned with incidents on the aircraft that could be prevented.
 - viii) Airbus – understood. MPIG will discuss. First point is effectively withdrawn.
 - ix) Airbus – “effect” - came out of propulsion working group due to discussion of seal failure (low cost of failure, high cost of failure effect.)
 - x) EASA – the same discussion here – just different level.
 - xi) FAA and Boeing – where do you determine the correct level? Boeing – seems that this would tend to create more scheduled tasks.
 - xii) Airbus – this text obviously doesn’t give enough guidance. What level is correct/sense of the Board? Trying to make this a robust discussion that clarifies what we mean (in MSG-3). Prepared to limit as needed, but prefer to go further than the cost of the part/repair.
 - xiii) FAA– what about environmental impact? Airbus – hard to judge/specific to various countries and operators. FAA – similar discussion of airport availability. Airbus – this is part of the working group process.
 - xiv) EASA – to add, a discussion of special operational aspects of business jet concerns might complain here.
 - xv) EASA – we can support change to failure effect now.
 - xvi) FAA – the glossary doesn’t match (economic effect/operational effect.)
 - xvii) Airbus – the operational impact is limited (as of now) the effect is on the mission of the aircraft. Quite often now, it is cheaper to let the part fail than maintain/inspect.
 - xviii) Paul Conn – will need to look at glossary definitions as well.
 - xix) Chair – already some work to rewrite and change columns. Board agrees with “effect”. Please redraft and represent.
 - xx) FAA/EASA - Final discussion of repetitive task performances over time. Clear guidance on meaning of “cost effectiveness” will be needed here.
 - xxi) Airbus – **Will revise given these comments and represent next year.**
- b) **CIP IND 2014-01, L/HIRF Terminology**
- i) FAA - Removed “protection systems” (was added in 2007). Why add then and remove now?
 - ii) Chair – noted relationship to CIP IND-2013-01 – will discuss on Friday. Weren’t sure here if this was impacted. Boeing – it is not impacted, now all references are “components”.
 - iii) EASA – what was the result of the EASA proposal (Rafale) 8 April to avoid, eliminate consequences. Boeing – Rafale agreed, and we will discuss in the working group.
 - iv) MPIG – in review yesterday, reviewed EASA comments. What we documented was the addition of “avoid, eliminate...” after “to” In L/HIRF Protection Components. Has not been added yet. (Meeting was within the 60 day window.)
 - v) Chair – prefer original definition as per submission. Cleaner. Board agreed.
 - vi) **Closed as IP 138 R0 30APR14. Applies to both Vol 1 and 2.**
- 21) Continuation of TCCA CIP Review
- a) **CIP TCCA 2014-02, Analysis of Aircraft Data Networks and Associated Security Systems.**

- i) MPIG response – is not clear what the maintenance aspects of A/C data networks and systems are. Request further examples.
 - ii) Additionally – there are other organizations working on specific standards. Recommend holding this paper until the publication of those documents by the end of the year.
 - iii) Chair – it appears that you need better definition of what we’re trying to analyse before you determine if it can be analysed.
 - iv) **Chair – we will take the CIP back and monitor the EUROCAE document and examine the operation and design aspects, then rewrite accordingly (or if needed) with better examples.**
 - v) FAA – the only concern is what checks really need to be done – how does that get into MSG-3? Airbus – may need to work together with airworthiness certification offices on this (where do these checks fall?)
- 22) Continuation of FAA CIP Review
- i) **CIP FAA 2014-01**, Discard Task Interval Incorporation by Reference
 - (1) **FAA to withdraw and rewrite.**
 - (2) MPIG will send comments directly to the FAA (Kersner and Perry).
- 23) Admin/logistics – adjourn for day at 1545.

Thursday May 1st, IMRBPB Meeting – Convened at 0830

24) Pictures Taken

25) Continuation of FAA CIP Review

- a) **CIP FAA 2014-02**, Analysis of Highly Integrated Electronic Devices (HIED)
 - i) Restated by FAA (Problem statement and recommendation). Recommending MPIG charter a subgroup.
 - ii) Chair – also, this subgroup might consider other similar topics (for example, e-enabling/data security, CIP TCCA-2014-02)
 - iii) MPIG – we feel that we have been dealing with the subject successfully using current analysis, don’t see a huge need for group.
 - iv) FAA – This was mainly a concern brought to us by industry.
 - v) Chair – last paragraph – consistency.
 - vi) Boeing – we found that trying to treat the software as a replaceable component, it works. Perhaps best practices are appropriate here.
 - vii) Bombardier – our discussion here appears that the approach is relatively common – existing MSG-3 analysis procedure has been applied with adequate methodology.
 - viii) Boeing – didn’t come up on 787. Greg – had to clarify transfers a bit but otherwise OK.
 - ix) Bombardier – not sure presenting examples would make sense.
 - x) EASA – Then perhaps what you’re saying is that there are different approaches. WG’s appears to be looking for an adaptation.
 - xi) FAA – These are external stakeholder concerns, we can dismiss if there’s not a problem.
 - xii) MPIG – appears that the paper is more about creating a standard way to deal with these issues.
 - xiii) Chair – that is the role of the board, standardization.

- xiv) Airbus – Are you confirming that this is not an FAA concern. FAA- As of yet, we have not had rejections in this area. Airbus – previously understood this would be chaired by a regulatory. In this case, there would need to be a neutral party. With MPIG, this is not realistic.
- xv) FAA – We see this as a growing issue now and in the future, the question is do we want to “get our arms around it” now.
- xvi) A4A – perhaps this is something for the common process document
- xvii) Chair – no – that would be more about technical analysis.
- xviii) Chair – just not there yet – may have to readdress this at a future time. **FAA withdraws the CIP.**

26) EASA CIP Review:

- a) **CIP EASA 2014-01**, Definition of Visual Check.
 - i) Restated by EASA – new draft sent on Monday.
 - ii) MPIG – we reviewed the March version.
 - iii) MPIG – we generally support this CIP. A few comments/recommendations.
 - iv) In 2.1 “Identification must be possible” – The original copy had a statement saying ID of failure must be possible. Are you indenting to delete this?
 - v) EASA – the intent is to replace that phrase with the two new phrases.
 - vi) Airbus – wanted to make sure we were tracing the deleted text.
 - vii) EASA – yes. Similarly in the table. We will add strike outs to make clear.
 - viii) MPIG – Similarly, the “Note” box – should it be retained?
 - ix) EASA – yes.
 - x) MPIG – also, in the glossary entry, needs to strike “an” before “obvious”. Also in text (section 2). EASA – agreed.
 - xi) MPIG – section 2.1 – change to “visual identification of pass/fail state” . EASA - Agreed.
 - xii) MPIG– typo in 2.2 – change reduce to reduces. EASA – agreed.
 - xiii) MPIG– 2.3 ,detection of one hidden failure to “the” hidden failure.
 - xiv) MPIG/EASA – not quite ready to give feedback on the table due to the overlapping issue papers. Will have to revisit and revise. Can’t say if we can accept the exact wording until then. We will take this into account. Otherwise agreed.
 - xv) Agreement in principle on the change.
 - xvi) **Chair – FJ to add text and represent tomorrow. Plan to close then.**
 - xvii) EASA – practical question – if a CIP affects MSG-3, can we get word versions of MSG-3 to support that? A4A – that seems reasonable, will supply.
 - xviii) Airbus – will note that this CIP means that there might be changes to the templates/forms used in analysis. We will be looking for a bit of flexibility from MRB chairs to address this.
 - xix) EASA– As long as the interpretation is clear, we would not have a concern.
 - xx) EASA – Are you talking about new or existing programs? Airbus – new programs would address, but existing would not. EASA – understand this is not proposed to be retroactive, but for ongoing programs should be ok.
 - xxi) EASA – faced similar questions in the past as well.
 - xxii) Airbus – understood what the concern is. Difficult before, but we managed to get through it. Using the same software for “derivative models” is preferred.

- xxiii) When applying the latest revision of MSG-3 to an existing program, the OEM will not be required to change existing analysis templates to accommodate any potential changes to MSG-3. However, in order to accommodate potential changes between MSG-3 revisions, a PPH revision/appendix may be required. (or something to that effect.)
 - xxiv) Airbus – this statement seems acceptable.
 - xxv) Chair – do we need to put this statement in this CIP or address in broader sense in new CIP? Airbus – here.
 - xxvi) Chair – we will take a regulatory action item to review the implementation of this CIP in a broader sense as part of our MRB generic guidance document (**now AI 14/01**).
- b) **CIP EASA 2014-02**, Updating of Rating Tables- Surface Protection Systems and Material Rating
- i) EASA restated and explained change (“design” from “family of aircraft”)
 - ii) MPIG – SWG analysed, and we do support. Recommended change in the last sentence, to change “is customized” to “may be customized”. EASA – have we eliminated concern with “design”? Boeing – perhaps also major parts may change as well.
 - iii) Chair – perhaps remove the last sentence? Shouldn’t the system handle this?
 - iv) EASA – we consider this is needed as it was not accomplished in the past.
 - v) Airbus – I think the word “may” is important – in a later aircraft model, improved protections may allow for increased intervals, we shouldn’t be forced to upgrade the table.
 - vi) EASA – that is not in line with the MSG-3 process. Maybe we can reword.
 - vii) Chair – perhaps we should say that “each rating system is to adequately cover all different SSI.”
 - viii) Boeing expressed that they didn’t see the first no findings vs second inspection large amount of findings scenario as a risk.
 - ix) Airbus – small mistake on table. EASA – corrected.
 - x) Boeing – applicability should be added to ensure not retroactive. EASA – agreed, added.
 - xi) **Agreed to, closed as IP 139 R0, 1 May 14. Applies to both Vol 1 and Vol 2.**
 - xii) Discussion of retroactivity having been added to the IP template.
- c) **CIP EASA 2014-03**, Protective Functions (not safety/emergency related)
- i) EASA Restated
 - ii) MPIG – acceptable with change explained on Monday (4/29).
 - iii) **Agreed to, closed as IP 140 R0, 1 May 14. No retroactive, applies to both Vol 1 and 2.**
- 27) Review EASA CIPs that were not accepted during the 2013 IMRBPB Meeting.
- a) **CIP EASA 2013-03**, sensibility to relative size of damage in ED analysis
- i) Was awaiting for other organizations to discuss this.
 - ii) Airbus – lots of controversy about this issue in SWG.
 - iii) MPIG – no feedback from AAWG on this issue. Only discussed within MPIG members.

- iv) SWG had two teleconferences about this subject – last year, there was a belief that AAWG would make definitions that would help with the SWG position. Received less from AAWG than we expected.
 - v) EASA – frustrated with AAWG inaction on this issue, and perhaps we should move forward without them.
 - vi) MPIG – the MPIG position is then that they do not support this issue paper.
 - vii) Airbus – it was expected that EASA was going to be on that call.
 - viii) EASA – request that the position be forwarded to the PB and we will react.
 - ix) **Further discussion is required, MPIG to submit formal comments and position will be adjusted based on that input.**
- b) **CIP EASA 2013-04**, CPCP for safe life item.
- i) Was awaiting MPIG input.
 - ii) MPIG does support this paper. SWG requested a change in paragraph 6 - last word – “age” to “limit”.
 - iii) EASA – made small changes to support new template.
 - iv) Agreed – **Closed as IP 141 R0, 1 May 14, Not retroactive, applies to both Vol 1 and Vol 2.**
- 28) Review withdrawn **CIP TCCA 2012-01** and closed **AI 13/08**.
- a) Now been redrafted.
 - b) Airbus – History – drafted by FAA in 2012. In Cologne, significant discussion – AI was for Airbus and TCCA to redraft for this year. Redrafted in summer by MPIG, comments received from TC, redrafted again. Looked at in Seattle (MPIG) and redrafted since. Available in Feb.
 - c) Restated by Airbus. Regulatory comments requested.
 - d) FAA – the numbers quoted in the CIP now don’t line up in the 2013 revision.
 - e) Airbus – think they’re OK now.
 - f) Airbus – where we did have a significant change was to have a clause to allow. Much easier to state as a note. Chair – that addresses regulatory concern of traceability.
 - g) MPIG – MPIG official position is to support position. Disagree that it should be applied retroactively. Three recommendations:
 - i) In 2-3-7.8 propose the addition in “task of different types” “If, for technical reasons, tasks of different types...” to ensure that consolidation occurs not for planning reasons. Additionally, add “linked by a note against the tasks to this effect...” later.
 - ii) Proposed definition of combination – add “stand alone”.
 - iii) Delete paragraph 2 of the recommendation. Concern is that consolidation policy didn’t really exist and now tracking these items down would be difficult.
 - (1) FAA – want something in the PPH showing that consolidation may have been accomplished in the past, but will not occur in the future. Bombardier – MPIG was concerned that someone would have to do this work.
 - (2) Airbus – propose text change to paragraph 2 to state that task consolidation will not be carried out after this date. MPIG making change.
 - (3) Chair – we’re talking about a paragraph in the recommendation that puts into context the change in MSG-3 – this paragraph is strictly guidance. Should these recommendations go into MSG-3?
 - (4) Airbus – Implementation statement? Chair – this is a unique situation where applicability is different than the planned change to MSG-3.

- (5) Chair – So ultimately, this is a retroactive decision. FAA – how about a present amendment to existing PPH's to stop further action?
 - (6) Aeronovo – this was started because people did not understand consolidation and/or combination.
 - (7) Chair – let's take paragraph 2 as redrafted and pull out and put in recommendation for implementation section (new template).
 - (8) Airbus to take and put into new template, then can close tomorrow.
 - (9) EASA – with the consolidation definition, perhaps second sentence should be in core discussion. Also, this highlights IP 106, but didn't seem to address this aspect. Is this only applicable for on-aircraft tasks? Chair – Are these two separate issues? Airbus – will propose a sentence for that as well. EASA – will need to be careful, it may be confusing to mention here.
- 29) Logistical discussion for tomorrow. Goal tomorrow will be to finish by lunch. Meeting adjourned at 1500.

Friday May 2nd IMRBPB Meeting – Convened at 0900

- 30) Remarks by Martin J Eley, Director General, Civil Aviation (TCCA).
- a) Mr. Eley spoke about international cooperation to the Board and the importance of harmonized standards. How risk is managed, in an environment of reduced budgets, is critically important. He encouraged the board to both build and then maintain the consensus standard over time.
 - b) Mr. Eley took questions. Mr Gdalevitch (Aeronovo) commented that hands-on training will be important to ensure that knowledge is passed forward. Mr. Eley mentioned that training together (both regulator and industry) can be helpful as well (as it fosters a common perspective.)
 - c) Chair – Dedication of the board members is impressive. This board is a unique thing – we all want to continually improve and optimize the MSG-3 process and our moves forward have been significant.
 - d) Mr. Harbottle – thanks very much for your thoughts on the future. You mentioned 1309 concerns. You gave the impression that all was well now – but industry still feels that there is room for improvement in this area. I would continue to encourage coordination here. We tend to meet in this group with our AEG/AFS counterparts and have grown our relationship there. How do we get the same relationship with our certification/1309 regulators?
 - e) Eley – we acknowledge that there has been some unequal application in this area. Perhaps the EASA conference in June might be a good place to talk about this. Mr Howell (TCCA) – one of our IP's (evolution) has caught some interest as we were exceeding safety caps.
 - f) Eley – how are we working with the third party arena with this process? Chair – depends on the operators – some may extend the program. Always a challenge to coordinate the baseline program for all operators. Eley – true – as industry and aircraft change roles over time, it's important to adjust. Mr Howell – STC's have been a major problem (ICA acceptance.)

- g) Mr Xue (CAAC) – thanks to Mr. Eley and TC for the input and support. Budget is always a challenge – how do we plan to continue to support this meeting? Eley – there’s no easy answer, but we always look at the value of the activity.
 - h) Chair – as a closing comment on 1309, the integration of MRB tasks provides a level of confidence. Having a standardized process will help with that level of confidence, and tighter level of integration with the certification world will be on the agenda moving forward.
- 31) Review and closure of remaining CIP’s.
- a) **CIP IND 2013-01**, MSG-3 Logic Diagrams - Title Consistency
 - i) Now version dated 2 May (header 1 May).
 - ii) Reviewed markup/changes from the previous session.
 - iii) Removed proposed change to paragraph numbers (in table).
 - iv) **Accepted – Closed as IP 142 R0 2 May 14 – Applies to both volumes and is not retroactive.**
 - b) **CIP EASA 2014-01**, Definition of Visual Check.
 - i) As discussed, added note. Also added text to paragraph 2.
 - ii) Also, as discussed – moved “text to the recommendation for implementation.
 - iii) Concern about the table (due to the overlapping industry paper). Airbus - MPIG has now agreed with the paper and table. This (table) text will further be modified by the industry paper in the same area.
 - iv) More corrections were applied. New draft adds highlight to question box to note change. Adds plural to failures in 2.2 and corrected a typo in implementation.
 - v) **Accepted – Closed as IP 143 R0 2 May 14 – Applies to both volumes and is retroactive as noted in the implementation section.**
 - vi) **AI – 14/01 – IMRBPB process standard to address revision status and implementation of MSG-3, refer to IP 143 recommendation for reference.**
 - c) **CIP TCCA 2012-01**, Clarification of Policy for Consolidation of tasks.
 - i) Changes made last night –
 - (1) 2-3-7.6 Task consolidation, added sentence from definition.
 - (2) Added sentence about applicability “on aircraft tasks only”.
 - (3) Simplified definitions (see 1 above).
 - (4) Removed “2 and 3” paragraphs from recommendations into retroactivity statement.
 - (5) Included statement to show that this supersedes IP 77.
 - ii) **Accepted – Closed as IP 144 R0 2 May 14 – Applies to both volumes and is retroactive as noted in the implementation section.**
- 32) **Other items of business**
- a) **IP 44 revisions** – need to still revise the CMCC process statement. **Chair to revise over the next several weeks and will send to PB and MPIG for review, 30 day comment period, with concurrence, will create as Rev 4. Agreed.**
 - i) Airbus – email from 2 Dec 2011 – document may be missing text in one paragraph. Chair – will research and potentially incorporate as well.
 - b) **RMPIG CIP RIND 2013-01** “HUMS for credit” discussion initial comments
 - i) **Chair to send comments to MPIG/RMPIG (from Mark Trainer – TCCA Rotocraft).** Quick précis provided by the Chair. Initial feedback only. Perhaps details of HUMS could be improved.

33) Meeting summary

- a) One action item
- b) 9 IP's closed
- c) Minutes soon – will circulate for comment, plan to finalize in 30 days +/-

34) Next meeting dates and locations

- a) Leadership teleconference – October 28th. Agenda by mid-October.
- b) MPIG meeting – Nov 4-6, Hosted by Airbus in Toulouse, FR.
- c) Regulatory WG – Dec 1-5, Canberra, AUS. May be more (up to 9 Dec) depending on process standard document development (will decide in October.) Agenda
- d) Next main meeting – April 20-24, 2015 in Washington DC, USA (FAA host) May run into the end of the cherry blossom festival (book early).

35) Closing Remarks

- a) Members/MPIG – thanks for hosting this week. Also appreciate regulatory IP's (more prolific) Bombardier – thanks for making meeting so smooth.
- b) Regulatory – FAA – great meeting, agree with Bombardier – the two year cycle helps as well. The guidance document is really important and will set a high standard, look forward to that.
- c) Chair – to add to that, maintenance can take a back door at times. Everyone here understands the importance. This will solidify our existence and raise our profile, and then feed into international agreements. The value/efficiency and safety aspects of maintenance are important. Many challenges to come, but they will be overcome through common understanding and acceptance. Thanks all for coming and all the extra work that comes before and during the meeting. Look forward to the meeting in Australia. Minutes to come soon.
- d) Adjourned 1130.