

IP N° 107 (previously CIP 2009 EASA 2009-1)

IP title: Keeping up to date current MSG 3 MRBR

---

### **Meeting : IMRBPB 2010**

Date : 27/APR/2010

PB position:

CIP revised in rev 1 with additional text and changes.

Date 2: 28/APR/2010

MPIG comments based on the initial CIP prior to change 1

### **CIP EASA 2009-1 - “Keeping up to date current MSG 3 MRBR”**

- "normal MRBR updates" , "annual MRB meetings“
  - In order to better explain that it relates to the regular MRBR update discussed during the periodic (annual or other period) meeting
    - The word "periodic" is added in these two sentences
    - normal periodic MRBR update
    - periodic MRB meetings
- "ARM / COS meetings"
  - These are specific meeting acronyms, all OEMs do not have the same names for it
  - Replaced by a more generic wording
    - TCH / Authorities meetings
- The sentence explaining when IP44 is not required should be completed by one explaining when IP44 is required for better clarity.
  - The following new sentence is proposed by MPIG :
    - IP44 requirements are only applicable to interval escalation exercise based upon fleet data collection.
  - This clarification should be included in the next revision of IP44. An action item is therefore added :
    - Action : Revise IP44 in accordance with the above paragraph to better explain when it is applicable
- "For new tasks the interval should be justified per the dedicated Issue Paper addressing interval determination of new MRBR".
  - As this new IP is not yet released, MPIG proposes to replace this sentence with the following in order to move forward and allow closure of IP EASA 2009-1

- "For new tasks the interval should be justified per MRB agreed policy addressing interval determination for new MRBR"

Date 3: 29/APR/2010

PB comments

- a) PB: Remove "initial" issue to be addressed through a separate CIP by FAA.
- b) Regarding industry proposal to revised IP 44 to add guidance for handling specific situation, PB rejects the proposal and states that any optimization should be addressed through IP 44.  
Any other situation other than optimization should be addressed through other means.
- c) last sentence "**For new tasks the interval should be justified as per the dedicated issue Paper addressing interval determination of new MRBR**" removed.
- d) Regarding "annual meeting" PB maintains, as per regulatory material, the annual frequency.

MPIG comments:

**MPIG Position (29-APR-2010):**

**This proposal brings to light that with the exception of fault finding tasks, IP 44 does not provide sufficient guidance for evolution exercise not based on extensive data collection.**

**MPIG proposes that further action on this CIP be deferred pending a new Issue Paper from MPIG with proposed changes to the IP 44 guidelines document. This will be a discussion item at the November 2010 MPIG meeting. The proposed changes will pertain to cases where statistical analysis of fleet wide data is not feasible or appropriate.**

Date 4: 30/APR/2010

**MPIG comment:**

- a) PB: Remove "initial" issue to be addressed through a separate CIP by FAA.  
*(MPIG agrees)*
- b) Regarding industry proposal to revised IP 44 to add guidance for handling specific situation, PB rejects the proposal and states that any optimization should be addressed through IP 44.  
Any other situation other than optimization should be addressed through other means.  
*(MPIG agrees with this statement, but clarification of the term "optimization" is needed)*

c) last sentence “**For new tasks the interval should be justified as per the dedicated issue Paper addressing interval determination of new MRBR**” removed.

*(MPIG agrees)*

d) Regarding “annual meeting” PB maintains, as per regulatory material, the annual frequency.

*(No objection from MPIG)*

Based on these comments MPIG propose to close the IP  
As a result of the optimization question MPIG will develop a new CIP to address clarification within IP 44 guideline.