

# MEETING NOTES

## 2023 IMRBPB ANNUAL MEETING

### 8<sup>TH</sup> TO 12<sup>TH</sup> MAY 2023

Time: 09:00 – 17:30 Central European Summer Time, UTC plus 2 hours

Location: Cologne, Germany, hosted by the European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA)

Meeting participants:

|                             |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| ANAC                        | Sérgio Henrique BORGES DA CRUZ  |
| CAAC                        | Xiaolei LI<br>Jin WANG  |
| CAAS                        | Aik Tio GOH   |
| CASA                        | Apologies received  |
| EASA                        | Raffaele IOVINELLA (IMRBPB Co-Chairperson)<br>Luca TOSINI (acting IMRBPB Secretary)<br>Bertrand BOURGUEIL<br>Antonino LEVANTINO<br>Angel David MANCEBO PAJARES<br>Marco MANODORI SAGREDO<br>Ralf SCHNEIDER<br>Francesca TANZI<br>Dominique DUMORTIER (OSAC) |
| FAA                         | John DUGAN<br>William (Bill) HELIKER (IMRBPB Chairperson)<br>Travis PRITCHETT   |
| GCAA                        | Apologies received  |
| HKCAD                       | Bill LAU  |
| JCAB                        | Yuhei MIYAMA<br>Masao YOSHIDA   |
| TCCA                        | Ryan HENNIGAR<br>Jeffrey PHIPPS   |
| UK CAA                      | Emma McCREESH<br>Andrew SANDERSON   |
| A4A                         | Kevin BERGER (MPIG Secretary)   |
| Aeronovo                    | Manny GDALEVITCH  |
| AeroTechna Solutions / NBAA | Leonard BEAUCHEMIN  |
| Airbus                      | Jan HUELSMANN<br>Cristiane LINDAUER<br>Oliver WEISS (MPIG Chairperson)<br>Lorenz WENK   |
| Airbus Defense & Space      | Pilar ROJAS-BARCI   |
| Airbus Helicopters          | Elodie CARMONA (RMPIG Chairperson)<br>Frederic REYNAUD  |
| American Airlines           | Avril BENSON (MPIG Co-Chairperson)  |



## International MRB Policy Board

|                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Archer                      | Armando CHIEFFI  |
| Bell Textron Mirabel        | Jeremy BURGESS   |
| Boeing                      | Jeffrey MILLER<br>Maciej (Matthew) RAZNIEWSKI<br>Kyle SMITH<br>Linh VU |
| Collins Aerospace           | Rhonda WALTHALL  |
| Delft University            | Iordanis TSEREMOGLOU   |
| Delta Airlines              | Chris IACONIS<br>David PIOTROWSKI                                      |
| Deutsche Aircraft           | Rainer SARKOEZI  |
| Embraer                     | Rodrigo Manzione CORRÊA  |
| Fokker                      | Gordon BRUCE   |
| Gulfstream Aerospace        | Jeffrey POULIOT  |
| IATA                        | Dragos BUDEANU   |
| Leonardo Helicopters        | Giacomo GIBILISCO (RMPIG Co-Chairperson)                               |
| Lufthansa Technik AG        | Joerg COELIUS  |
| SAE International (IVHM SG) | Ravi RAJAMANI  |
| Rolls-Royce                 | Nicole ELDERS  |
| Southwest Airlines          | Chris CARNUCCI<br>Javid SULEYMANOV                                     |
| United Airlines             | Robert BARNARD<br>Daniel COULTER                                       |
| Wisk                        | Alessandra BATALHA<br>Dither FLORES                                    |



**DAY 1 (8<sup>th</sup> May 2023)**

| Item | Discussion / Disposition / Action Item   |
|------|--|
| 1    | <b>Welcome and Introductions</b>   |
| i.   | Introductions by Mr Ralf Erckmann, Deputy Flight Standards Director / Head of Maintenance & Production Department.   |
| ii.  | Introductions and Welcome by Mr Bill Heliker (FAA), IMRBPB Chairman  |
| iii. | Round-the-table of Participants  |
| iv.  | Review of Agenda and Plan for the Week   |
| v.   | Review of MPIG Meetings and Introductory Remarks   |
|      | <p>Airbus / (Olivier Weiss) – The working of the MPIG this year concentrated on Condition Based Maintenance (CBM). EVTOLs are showing their interest as well. Industry has to prepare the ground for the use of the existing technologies, as well as for the ones that are coming: this is why the MSG-X working group prepared the white paper that is going to be presented. A lot of interesting topics are today on the table for consideration: it’s good to have many topics running in parallel, to prepare the future. MSG-4 represents an opportunity to set the path for the future.</p>  |
|      | <p>Kevin Berger , Co-Chair, A4A – There is no other industry group in the world which works as efficiently as this one. Other industry segments have noticed this and try to replicate our model, for example in cybersecurity are looking at us to understand our framework.</p>  |
| vi.  | Review of RMPiG Meetings and Introductory Remarks  |
|      | <p>Leonardo Helicopters / (Giacomo Gibilisco) – Some changes in the RMPiG leadership team, with Gordon Bruce (Fokker) as new RMPiG secretary. Many thanks to the former secretary Rhea Matthews for the support provided until today. Status of implementation of IP 170 “HUMS for credit”: still no use case of application with a HUMS certified for credit as of today; further complexity in future application “HUMS for credit” will be posed by the concept behind current EASA NPA 2022-03. RMPiG still considers IP 180 concept not interesting for application to MSG-3 Vol.2 mainly due to the fact that most of the components monitored on a rotorcraft are pertaining to failure causes related to FEC 5 and FEC 8 that are outside the scope of Level 3 analysis.</p> |



|   |     |   |
|---|-----|---|
| 2 |     | <b>Initial Presentation of Regulatory and Industry Candidate Issue Papers (CIPs)</b>  |
|   | A-H | Initial Presentation of Regulatory CIPs   |
|   |     | EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella) – briefly introduced all the EASA CIPs:   |
|   | A   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CIP EASA 2023-01</b> – straight forward CIP, a clean-up removing reference to “User’s Guide”. In the IMPS, only PPH or similar document are mentioned.</li> </ul>   |
|   | B   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CIP EASA 2023-02</b> – this CIP is mainly process related, impacting IMPS only. The experience of many years has shown how OEMs tend to stretch the use of assumptions. Sometimes, the design is not mature enough and still the OEM proposes to analyze it. This CIP addresses the need to properly track assumptions and to consider the maturity of the design.</li> </ul>   |
|   | C   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CIP EASA 2023-03</b> – cleanup of glossary.</li> </ul>  |
|   | D   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CIP EASA 2023-04</b> – applicable to Vol 1 and 2. Provisions regarding consolidation of tasks. CIP goal is to add clarifications and to introduce the definition of overhaul in the MSG-3.</li> </ul>   |
|   | E   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CIP EASA 2023-05</b> – as consequence of the review performed by EASA in creating the IP index, some issues with the IPs emerged. For the IP 65, the implementation was not done according to the recommendation for implementation approved by the Policy Board. We would like to rectify this mistake.</li> </ul>   |
|   | F   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CIP EASA 2023-06</b> – the current standard is not to use letter checks. Our goal is to remove such a possibility for new programs.</li> </ul>  |
|   | G   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CIP EASA 2023-07</b> – linked to CIP 2023-03. There are two different definitions of “SSI” in Vol.1 and Vol.2. We discussed internally and we believe there is room for alignment of SSI definition.</li> </ul>   |
|   | H   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CIP EASA 2023-08</b> – MSG-3 analysis can be considered completed at Step 15 of the L/HIRF analysis flowchart. The proposal is to remove all the following steps that refer to a process that seems to be not MRB related.</li> </ul>   |
|   |     |   |
|   |     |   |
|   | I-O | Initial Presentation of Industry CIPs   |
|   |     | Airbus / (Jan Huelsmann) – briefly introduced the CIPs developed by the MPIIG Structural Working Group:   |
|   | I   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CIP IND 2018-03</b> – the flowchart for “other structure” in the MSG-3 is very old, in the meantime GVI and Zonal definitions have changed a lot.</li> </ul>  |
|   | J   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CIP IND 2018-04</b> – This has a long history. Many comments have been raised at the first presentation in 2019 in Ottawa with the recommendation to develop a Rev.1. In 2021 (virtual IMRBPB Annual Meeting) it was presented again with the implementation of the comments. Mainly because there are 2 parts (A and B) it generated other comments, EASA committed to support a new revision. A rev.2 has been presented in 2022 (virtual), generating again a series of comments (e.g. SSI selection instead of categorization, WG should be involved in the SSI selection process). EASA supported again, driving a Rev.3 to be discussed this week.</li> </ul> |
|   |     |   |



|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
|   |   | <p>Leonardo Helicopters / (Giacomo Gibilisco) – briefly introduced the CIPs developed by the RMPIG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CIP IND 2020-02</b> – proposes to use the HUMS to set the correct interval parameters for the initial interval of a restoration task. Additional working session has been performed, following IMRBPB recommendation, supported by EASA. The CIP is now implementing 2 other topics (originally thought as dedicated CIPs, respectively CIP IND 2020-03 and CIP IND 2020-04). The new revision is going to be discussed this week, it has been deeply revised compared to the original one, that was 16 pages long.</li> </ul>                                  |
|   | K |   |
|   | M | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CIP IND 2022-03</b> – aims to clarify the agenda of the periodic review, to identify the most effective time in which the in-service experience should be considered for changes to the MRBR. ADs are there to guarantee the continued airworthiness. End of the investigation should be considered as good time for considering the impact on the MRBR and the need for an MSG-3 analyses review.</li> </ul>   |
|   |   |   |
|   | L | <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi) – briefly introduced the CIP developed by MPIG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CIP IND 2022-01</b> – aims to provide a better understanding of the "fault tolerant system/function". We believe that the concept of "fault tolerance" should not be linked to how long you can fly the aircraft with that fault.</li> </ul>  |
|   |   |   |
|   | O | <p>Boeing / (Jeff Miller) – briefly introduced the CIP developed by MPIG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CIP IND 2023-02</b> – aims to move the effectiveness check at the end when the type of task (hybrid vs alternate) is known. Deficiencies in the logic when you are going to the selection of hybrid task even if it may not be effective. E.g. you must make sure the alternative covers all the FCs. If you cannot do it, then you may go to the hybrid solution. The logic may force you to select a hybrid task even if it may be not effective (e.g. is covering only the most reliable failure cause, while the most critical failure cause still needs a standard task).</li> </ul> |
|   |   |   |
|   | N | <p>Airbus / (Lorenz Wenk) – briefly introduced the CIP developed by MPIG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CIP IND 2023-01</b> – aims to revise the GVI definition to formally introduce the use of remote visual tools. When the requirement is to be used, the OEM has to demonstrate the equivalence of the outputs between the standard GVI and the remote inspection. The technologies must be further developed, for the time being we would like to give this option to the operator introducing the concept in the MSG-3 analysis.</li> </ul>  |
|   |   |   |
| 3 |   | <p><b>An AI-based decision support tool for Condition-Based Maintenance (CBM) scheduling of an aircraft fleet</b></p>   |
|   |   | <p>Delft University / (Iordanis Tseremoglou) – introduced the topic supported by a presentation.</p>  |
|   |   | <p>A4A / (Kevin Berger): You mention that you are using the Condition Based Maintenance (CBM) aircraft model. Which aircraft are you using?</p>   |



Delft University / (Iordanis Tseremoglou): I am modelling the reality, which allows to understand what happen if an Artificial Intelligence (AI) is used instead of human.

A4A / (Kevin Berger): There is great potential in what you are doing. Maybe you should cooperate with this group (MPIG/RMPIG), there is a lot to share. What is the next step in your project?

Delft University / (Iordanis Tseremoglou): The idea is to have a simulator and create same maintenance scenarios.

EASA / (Ralf Schneider): You aim to have the “remaining time to failure”, do I understand well?

Delft University / (Iordanis Tseremoglou): Yes, but as distribution.

EASA / (Ralf Schneider): Do you connect the maintenance schedule with operational schedule?

Delft University / (Iordanis Tseremoglou): Not directly. However, one of the goals is to try to minimize all the changes to the maintenance schedule which happen in the next three days. The next step will include a direct link to the operations schedule.

Delta Airlines / (David Piotrowski): is this an EASA initiative?

EASA / (Luca Tosini): this is an EU project. EASA is facilitating it. This presentation is an attempt to initiate a cooperation with the IMRBPB. This project is giving a real taste of how an AI may be used, so EASA decided to invite Iordanis here, to introduce him to the International MRB Policy Board and propose a cooperation.

Delft University / (Iordanis Tseremoglou): condition-based maintenance conference to share ideas regarding this booming topic is running every year and you are invited to attend.

EASA / (Ralf Schneider): Do you include assessment of findings in your analysis (for example for fatigue?)

Delft University / (Iordanis Tseremoglou): I’m using simulating data (not getting real data). The preventive and corrective actions are given by the operation. However, the CBM data is simulation because it is difficult to find reliable data.

EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): I would like to know if in your determination you consider combined failure, multiple failure. If yes, where are you taking your data?

Delft University / (Iordanis Tseremoglou): In my model I’m using independent component at the moment. The output is the remaining useful life.

IATA / (Dragos Budeanu): you are mentioning the training data used by the algorithm. Did you investigate how the training of the algorithm has an impact on the quality of the results?

Delft University / (Iordanis Tseremoglou): the impact is not generated from the data used for the training of the machine; it is more linked to the operator’s schedule objectives. The problem we expect is that it is not possible to use the same data for different objectives.

Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): we are in the learning process to understand if/how there is a benefit to be taken from the entire AHM discussion. Thank you for this presentation.



|   |      |  |
|---|------|--|
|   |      | <p>FAA / (Bill Heliker): Thank you very much for this presentation. If this tool will be developed, it will come to this group for sure. We would like to invite you for the next meetings. What you are doing is so relevant to what we are doing.</p> <p>Delft University / (Iordanis Tseremoglou): I would like to highlight once again the importance of data availability. Any new development will be communicated to Luca. Thank you all.</p>   |
|   |      |  |
| 4 |      | <b>Feedback from Active Working Groups</b>   |
|   | ii.  | L/HIRF Working Group updates   |
|   |      | Archer / (Armando Chieffi) – introduced the topic supported by a presentation.   |
|   |      | <p>A4A / (Kevin Berger): this group has been initiated on requested by the IMRBPB. Does the PB see the need to keep active the L/HIRF group?</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): it really depends on the results of this meeting, we have quite a number of CIPs related to L/HIRF that may require further support from the group.</p>   |
|   |      |  |
|   | iii. | AHM Working Group updates  |
|   |      | Boeing / (Jeff Miller) – introduced the topic supported by a presentation.   |
|   |      | We have the need to create a common ground, to reach the same understanding and to use the same terminology. We spent a big amount of time discussing the FAA AC during the kick-off of this working group. Discussing about topics like <i>“what is criticality? What is an approved document?”</i>   |
|   |      | <p>A4A / (Kevin Berger): Do you think it could be a good idea to invite Iordanis to join the group?</p> <p>Boeing / (Jeff Miller): we are very happy and open to invite anybody who can contribute to the discussion.</p>  |
|   |      |  |
|   |      | Collins / (Rhonda Walthall) – introduced the “terminology subgroup” topic supported by a presentation.   |
|   |      | <p>A4A / (Kevin Berger): any interested individuals apart from the very closed AHM group?</p> <p>Collins / (Rhonda Walthall): we are looking forward for additional members, especially regulators.</p> <p>AeroTechna / (Leonard Beauchemin): has the industry any preference between the use of “monitoring” vs. “management”?</p> <p>Collins / (Rhonda Walthall): definitely “management” is the preferred option, it has been discussed and made somehow clear a decade ago. From SAE</p> |



|  |    |  |
|--|----|--|
|  |    | <p>perspective, management is the whole process while Monitoring is more the diagnostic part.</p> <p>Aeronovo / (Manny Gdalevitch): are regulators ok to go in this direction?</p> <p>Collins / (Rhonda Walthall): we need to discuss it obviously.</p> <p>EASA / (Ralf Schneider): End to end is of course management, but MSG-3 does not take into account the process end-to-end, it considers just a part of it. That's why we should have different scopes.</p> <p>Collins / (Rhonda Walthall): that's totally fine, we need to find the boundaries.</p> <p>FAA / (Bill Heliker): when drafting the document, FAA wanted to use AHM but it was copyrighted; then tried to use IVHM but FAA did not want to go that way. So the "management" has been picked up more for legal reasons rather than technical. "M" as "Management" was dictated by FAA legal because monitoring was considered passive.</p> <p>Collins / (Rhonda Walthall): we need to discuss and find the proper way to move forward that is also good for industry. An investigation was run from SAE. The objective of this investigation was to evaluate which SAE documents are relevant for MSG-3, in the frame of AHM development.</p> <p>EASA / (Francesca Tanzi): will be the relevant SAE documents available?</p> <p>Collins / (Rhonda Walthall): SAE will make it available to the individuals that will be nominated by the MPIG.</p> <p>A4A / (Kevin Berger): David Alexander (Director for standards of SAE international) is preparing the access for the identified people. During the tomorrow caucus will discuss the communication channel to be used to check the documents.</p> <p>Collins / (Rhonda Walthall): SAE is working on health monitoring since early 90's. SAE are standards which are recognized in the aeronautic world, including ARP.</p> <p>Aeronovo / (Manny Gdalevitch): the term ARP is not a standard, it stands for "Aerospace Recommended Practice".</p> <p>Collins / (Rhonda Walthall): right, it is not a standard but it is the most followed set of recommendations used by the industry.</p> <p>EASA / (Ralf Schneider): EU regulation makes reference to "recognized standards", so we may have a problem with this.</p> <p>A4A / (Kevin Berger): we see the need to strengthen the cooperation with MPIG/RMPIG and SAE.</p> <p>FAA / (Bill Heliker): regulators are involved as advisors, right?</p> <p>Collins / (Rhonda Walthall): sure they are from FAA side.</p> |
|  |    |  |
|  |    |  |
|  | i. | MSG-X Working Group updates  |
|  |    |  |
|  |    | American Airlines / (Avril Benson) – introduced the “MSG-X white paper” topic supported by a presentation. The white paper creation has been supported by a number of different papers. It is still in a draft state, nearly completed.  |
|  |    |  |
|  |    | Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): we recognized that technology is in continuing evolution and different new types of inspections become available(mainly   |





SDI per MSG-3 definition); we want them to be taken into account in MSG-4 to give more opportunities than typical SDI tasks for operators to choose.

UK CAA / (Andrew Sanderson): eVTOLS are here today, next gen aircraft will be in few years instead. Maybe better to prioritize eVTOL needs in MSG-4.

American Airlines / (Avril Benson): surely there is the need to prioritize. The goal is anyway to make the new MSG-4 flexible enough to be adapted quickly to the new technology described.

TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): MSG-4 will be a standard supported by A4A. It would be applied to develop manufacturer recommendations or to develop MRBRs? In the first case you do not need the approval from the IMRBPB to proceed.

American Airlines / (Avril Benson): the idea as per today is to link it to an MRB process.

TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): from regulator's perspective, to take over many new technical projects seems overwhelming. Maybe an MSG-4 can better work as a standard to be used by industry to develop Type Certificate Holders recommendations, acceptable by multiple certifying and validating authority without seeking for formal approval. MSG-4 is very welcome, we need to better define the regulator's involvement. MRB process is labor intensive and we may not have the resources to be fully part of it.

Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): we don't want to step-off from the process ending with an MRBR approved by the regulating authorities. However, we don't want to be obliged to use the obsolete MSG-3 for the future projects that may take advantage of new technologies.

EASA / (Luca Tosini): the MSG-3 document, property of A4A, is revised through the IMRBPB with the approval of IMRBPB IPs. Does A4A currently have an alternative means to produce, control and update the standard?

A4A / (Kevin Berger): we have an acceptance process for the MSG-3 standard in place, namely the IMRBPB, that works. We would prefer to keep it as it is. We don't see how we could manage it differently.

Aeronovo / (Manny Gdalevitch): we have decades of experience demonstrating the efficiency of the process currently in place. We have to find a way to maintain the three legs-stool concept. If you leave it to OEM only, the process will be compromised. This process is extremely beneficial. There is nothing comparable.

Archer / (Armando Chieffi): I have been trying to apply the MTB process. Being a part 23 aircraft, we had difficulties to find a proper process. However, it was difficult to sell it internally because it is expensive. But at the end we could convince the company and the FAA, because it is an efficient and safety process.

EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): a process is required for sure, maybe following a different format. There are differences in the regulations, which should also be considered. e.g. in Europe we don't have PMIs, we have CAMOs

EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): the MRB is recognized means of compliance which makes the job easier for both OEMs and regulators. The objective



|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>should be to optimize it, to make it as efficient as possible. If we lose the process, we may lose a lot. Nevertheless, there are already alternatives possible.</p> <p>Delta Airlines / (David Piotrowski): the WG made reference to the ground equipment, this may start a difficult discussion. At the moment we use ground equipment but not necessarily it has to be approved. I would appreciate a discussion at that level.</p> <p>American Airlines / (Avril Benson): it's maybe too early, however we must make a difference. When it goes to collection of data on ground to be used for maintenance, probably we don't need the same assurance level.</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): the criticality of the task may make also the difference.</p> <p>IATA / (Dragos Budeanu): we should distinguish what is covered by the TC and what is not covered, more than distinguishing between ground equipment, on aircraft, etc.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): the existing regulation may also be updated in the meantime to cope with those new technologies.</p> <p>Southwest Airlines / (Chris Carnucci): did you discuss to include fatigue in MSG-4? The reason is that we see the need for a three legs process to support the development of the structure program.</p> <p>American Airlines / (Avril Benson): not really.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): the MSG-4 white paper as presented seems to be very system centric. Indeed, you should think about progresses in zonal, structure, EWIS, LHIRF.</p> <p>American Airlines / (Avril Benson): The group has discussed but no changes have been envisaged for somethings like CPCP, etc...</p> <p>Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): this is a white paper; we are just on step number one of the journey. We would like to have feedback from the IMRBPB, to understand if we are moving in the right direction.</p> <p>EASA / (Luca Tosini): it is a good starting point. We should think about a time schedule, when do we want to have the document ready? Make sure that priorities are properly set.</p> |
|  |   |
|  |   |
|  | Meeting adjourned.  |



| <b>DAY 2 (9<sup>th</sup> May 2023)</b> |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Item</b>                            | <b>Discussion / Disposition / Action Item</b> |
| 5                                      | <b>IMRBPB Regulatory Caucus</b>               |
|  | IMRBPB Leadership Team elections              |
| 6                                      | <b>MPIG/RMPIG Industry Caucus</b>             |
|  |   |
|  |   |
|  | No meeting minutes produced for Day 2         |



| <b>DAY 3 (10<sup>th</sup> May 2023)</b> |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Item</b>                             | <b>Discussion / Disposition / Action Item</b>  |
| <b>7</b>                                | <b>Results of IMRBPB Leadership Team elections</b>   |
|   | <p>The result of yesterday IMRBPB Regulatory caucus has been presented:</p> <p>IMRBPB Leadership Team elections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ IMRBPB Chairman: EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella)</li> <li>▪ IMRBPB Co-chairman: UK CAA / (Emma McCreesh)</li> <li>▪ IMRBPB Secretary: EASA / (Luca Tosini)</li> </ul> <p>The positions will be covered for the next 3 years cycle.</p>   |
|   | The IMRBPB welcome UK CAA as new voting member of the policy board.  |
| <b>8</b>                                | <b>In Depth Review of Regulatory CIPs</b>  |
| <b>A</b>                                | <b>CIP EASA 2023-01 – Removal of the reference to “User’s Guide”</b>   |
|   | EASA / (Francesca Tanzi) briefed the meeting on CIP EASA 2023-01.  |
|   | <p>A4A / (Kevin Berger): MPIG accept it with no comments.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): Regulators asked during the yesterday caucus if there is really the need to add "equivalent document". For sure we never saw a "user guide". For MTBs we saw "procedure guidelines" in legacy projects.</p> <p>A4A / (Kevin Berger): this substantiates the “equivalent document” proposal.</p> <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): we really want the possibility to open the door to other documents? Being the CIP proposed not retroactive, maybe better to keep PPH only, therefore to remove “users guide” instead.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): Agree. The amended CIP will be presented before the end of the meeting.</p> |
| <b>B</b>                                | <b>CIP EASA 2023-02 – Analysis/approval only for mature/frozen design</b>  |
|   | EASA / (Ralf Schneider) briefed the meeting on CIP EASA 2023-02.   |
|   | <p>A4A / (Kevin Berger): the intent is fully supported. We agreed that the analyses should reflect the intended design but it seems we need some more flexibility. The reference to “frozen” should be removed from the second bullet.</p> <p>Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): last bullet, for an initial MRBR the "next revision" will come after the type certification. Maybe a door can be open for a TR to the MRBR to accommodate the request. We need some flexibility.</p>  |



|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  |   | <p>EASA / (Ralf Schneider): the problem is that too many revisions are usually required prior to solve the issue, this should be stopped.</p> <p>Airbus / (Jan Huelsmann): example last minute change of materials due to last-minute input from supplier. Important to better specify the level of the change, sometimes the level of change is very low, it can be difficult to be tracked.</p> <p>EASA / (Ralf Schneider): major change in the material, with (e.g. metal to composite) to be added.</p> <p>A4A / (Kevin Berger): the CIP needs to be reworked. We will see the modifications implemented by Friday?</p> <p>EASA / (Ralf Schneider): we received comments just on the "problem" section, so everybody is ok with the "implementation" proposed?</p> <p>A4A / (Kevin Berger): the proposal is to remove the first bullet in its entirety from the recommendation.</p> <p>EASA / (Ralf Schneider): this is not going to change MSG-3, it is just an introduction to the proposed modification.</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): bullet 4, we expect that the intent is the harmonization of the approach among all the regulators.</p> <p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): sure that the proposed changes are in line with the original intent of the paragraph? Replacing "final" with "frozen" seems not properly correct. "Frozen design" is used by the industry in a different way.</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): "frozen design" means after CVR.</p> <p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): major step prior to the tracking of modifications and/or major changes. This requires the need to introduce definitions in the CIP.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): we will work on it, represent before the end of the meeting.</p> <p>FAA / (Bill Heliker): IMRBPB vote kept on-hold. CIP to be reworked with the implementations of the comments and represented before the end of the meeting.</p> |
|  |   |  |
|  |   |  |
|  | C | <b>CIP EASA 2023-03 - IMPS Appendix 4 [List of Abbreviations and Glossary of Terms] Clean-up</b>   |
|  |   | EASA / (Antonino Levantino) briefed the meeting on CIP EASA 2023-03.   |
|  |   | <p>A4A / (Kevin Berger): we fully support the CIP, with one only comment: AEG should be changed into AED.</p> <p>EASA / (Antonino Levantino): the abbreviations used are the one currently in IMPS Iss.2. When IMPS will be updated then it will be corrected.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): we can open an action item to follow-up the issue.</p>  |
|  |   | <p><b>Action Item 2023-05: at the next IMPS revision opportunity, to change "AEG" in "AED" (FAA) in the acronyms list.</b></p> <p><b>Action Owner: IMRBPB Leadership Team</b></p> <p><b>Due Date: IMPS Issue3 publication</b></p>  |



|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  |   | FAA / (Bill Heliker): the IMRBPB can now vote for the approval of the CIP EASA 2023-03.  |
|  |   | <b>CIP accepted, as presented, as IP 207</b>   |
|  |   |  |
|  | D | <b>CIP EASA 2023-04 - Clarifications on the policy of “off-wing”, overhaul and restoration tasks</b>   |
|  |   | EASA / (Ralf Schneider) briefed the meeting on CIP EASA 2023-04.   |
|  |   | <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): the intent of this CIP has a value. It is a topic discussed for many years. “Overhaul” is not defined in MSG-3 and TCCA does not support the inclusion of it into MSG-3. In the examples provided, if a part has an authorized release to service, it is good to be installed. We must make sure that we pick the effective tasks, and we should not consolidate task if this changes the intent of the applicable and effective task. We agree that RST must be a true RST. And we should define the intent, or we should not consolidate at all. The Note is ok, and we need maybe more guidance on consolidations (perhaps in IMPS).</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): agreed on the statement sometime for non-safety task. We need more research on the regulations and definitions in the regulations (the release to service document are commercial document. When we use the release to service documents as a record and validate compliance with AMP /ICA, it starts the problem. The box in the documents is only for commercial purpose to manage the components in the pool.</p> <p>A4A / (Kevin Berger): great CIP. We have a WG dealing with this issue. Some parts of the problem may be solved using ATA MSG-3, but not all of them. The text added in 2-3-2 for us it is implied, therefore not needed. The content in the Note maybe better in the IMPS, maybe needs to be simplified. Overhaul definition is not accepted: it seems more a philosophic approach rather than a definition. The MPIG has prepared a presentation to summarize the feedback: the presentation has been prepared by a group of 9 MPIG participants, who have reviewed the CIP in detail. We did not reach consensus on what is in the presentation. It can be used as reference. We may need to work in teams to address all the points mentioned there.</p> <p>AeroTechna / (Leonard Beauchemin) introduced the presentation to the meeting participants.</p> <p>Aeronovo / (Manny Gdalevitch): we may need a dedicated task-force to work on it.</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): it is not an MRB WG’s duty to review and validate the maintenance procedure.</p> <p>Boeing / (Jeff Miller): the problem has been already addressed and solved with the IMRBPB IP 176 “Task Data as part of the MSG-3 Dossiers”.</p> |



|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>UK CAA / (Andrew Sanderson): respectfully disagree with the presentation from MPIG, CMMs are fundamental in the system to perform and release the components.</p> <p>EASA / (Francesca Tanzi): we need to carefully consider the latest update of the regulation in EU (CMM or part of it as ICA), with many links between Part-145 organizations, CAMOs, TCHs. It is an issue to have an ICA in disagreement with a CMM content. In the CMM there is written "what to do" and "how to do it", in the WGs we may not have the expertise to define "how to do it", when it comes to maintenance to be performed on components. The CMM should contain all the possible maintenance on the component, scheduled and unscheduled.</p> <p>EASA / (Ralf Schneider): in the CMM is written "what to do" and "how to do it", unfortunately also "when to do it" and this is a mistake. We have similar other documents around that provide clear scheduled maintenance information and they shouldn't.</p> <p>AeroTechna / (Leonard Beauchemin): we cannot disregard the multiple commercial implications in sharing of CMMs.</p>   |
|   | <p><b>CIP EASA 2023-04 returned to submitter for re-work. Represent in 2024.</b></p>  |
|   |   |
| E | <p><b>CIP EASA 2023-05 – Wrong incorporation of IMRBPB IP 65 in MSG-3</b></p>   |
|   | <p>EASA / (Luca Tosini) briefed the meeting on CIP EASA 2023-05.</p>  |
|   | <p>EASA / (Luca Tosini): Reason for retroactivity is provided. EWIS is deliverable for Certification of the aircraft. Now the PPHs have copied and pasted the content of this version, inclusion the mistake. We don't know the repercussions of this. We want to open a door for a review (possibly internal without involvement) to verify if this mistake has driven to incorrect evaluations. We are confident that the implications should be going in a conservative direction.</p> <p>A4A / (Kevin Berger): MPIG doesn't have any comment. We would like to know the expectations for the implementation.</p> <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): retroactivity may lead to a big amount of work which may or may not lead to a change in the MRBR. I question the value of it? Especially in the American system where the operators are not obliged to implement any change except if mandated by an AD. We disagree with the retroactivity.</p> <p>Airbus / (Oliver Weiss): we may need to review the AMC which seems not in line with the wording in the CIP.</p> <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): the mistake is in the example, not in the procedure. I don't expect any massive impact of it in the procedure. And again, TCCA disagree to make it retroactive.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): from experience, there was no detrimental effect coming from this mistake. Nothing is lost in the procedures and flowcharts. I propose to reopen the IP 65, update it with an explanation in the notes, making</p> |



|  |          |   |
|--|----------|---|
|  |          | reference to the MoM 2023. We can present the IMRBPB IP 65 Rev.1 proposal before the end of this meeting.   |
|  |          | <b>EASA would like to withdraw this CIP EASA 2023-05.</b>   |
|  |          |   |
|  | <b>F</b> | <b>CIP EASA 2023-06 – Remove reference to “Letter Checks” in MSG-3</b>  |
|  |          | EASA / (David Mancebo) briefed the meeting on CIP EASA 2023-06.   |
|  |          | A4A / (Kevin Berger): MPIG doesn’t have any comment.<br>FAA / (Bill Heliker): the IMRBPB can now vote for the approval of the CIP EASA 2023-06.   |
|  |          | <b>CIP accepted, as presented, as IP 208</b>  |
|  |          |   |
|  | <b>H</b> | <b>CIP EASA 2023-08 - Removal of not MSG-3 related Steps from the L/HIRF Protection Analysis Methodology and Logic Diagram</b>  |
|  |          | EASA / (Luca Tosini) briefed the meeting on CIP EASA 2023-08.   |
|  |          | Archer / (Armando Chieffi) provided a presentation on behalf of the L/HIRF WG: we may live with the removal of the assurance plan out of MSG-3 but it’s not the preference. It looks like we are going back to when there was no guidance. We disagree that IMPS is enough as guidelines. The fear is to lose guidance on an harmonized approach on how to use the assurance plan in the MSG-3 analyses. The old 18 box should not be deleted, it should become the new 16 box.<br>EASA / (Luca Tosini): the scope of the CIP is not to remove the reference to validation program, it is more to stop the process to the steps which pertain to the MSG-3 (creation of the MSG-3 task). The publication of the task into the MRBR is not an MSG-3 related issue.<br>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): the assurance program is meant to validate the maintenance program, but also to validate that the visual inspection is effective. So, the assurance program affects the decision on which task to be selected.<br>EASA / (Luca Tosini): the difference is that the task applicable and effective is selected but, because of the presence of assurance plans, the WG decide not to publish such a task. We lose the control. The Assurance program is not a required document for certification. The assurance program appears in the ARPs. It is not required, it is suggested. If a TCH has no assurance plan, then the maintenance program would be much more expensive (no visual inspection accepted).<br>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): back in 1997 we had the same conversation. In the meantime, the process has been changing so much and we have cut so many steps. I was part of the group that defined the guidelines since the beginning. An assurance plan is not a maintenance program at all. The role |





|  |          |   |
|--|----------|---|
|  |          | <p>is to validate the maintenance program on an aircraft which has LHIRF protection features. How do you know if a LHIRF protection system is working during the life of the aircraft, if you check it only visually? Now, the flowchart is misused.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): there is agreement that we need to do something. The CIP is therefore returned for re-work. The LHIRF working group will reconvene to set the objectives and to support EASA on the CIP, with the target for presentation in 2024. TCCA (Jeff Phipps) will join the activity.</p>  |
|  |          |   |
|  |          | <p><b>CIP EASA 2023-08 returned to submitter for re-work with the support of the Industry L/HIRF WG. Represent in 2024.</b></p>   |
|  |          |   |
|  | <b>G</b> | <p><b>CIP EASA 2023-07 - SSI definition update in MSG-3</b></p>   |
|  |          | <p>EASA / (Antonino Levantino) briefed the meeting on CIP EASA 2023-07.</p>   |
|  |          | <p>A4A / (Kevin Berger): the MPIG considered that the proposal was expanding the scope of the SSI for fixed wings. The fundamental question: is the rationale applied for changing the definition in MSG-3 Vol.2 for rotorcrafts applicable to fix wings as well?</p> <p>EASA / (Antonino Levantino): why the serious or fatal injury to occupants is considered for systems, not for structure?</p> <p>A4A / (Kevin Berger): the MPIG is against the expansion of the scope of the SSI definition. We can consider to open the discussion at the level of the Structures WG, starting with a better definition of the issue.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): the proposal has to be reworked for implementation. A better definition of the Issue and the Problem is the primary need. EASA welcome the Structures WG to support the assessment and the final proposal.</p> <p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): let's use this opportunity to try to address structure departing from the aircraft.</p> |
|  |          | <p><b>CIP EASA 2023-07 returned to submitter for re-work with the support of the Industry Structures WG. Represent in 2024.</b></p>   |
|  |          |   |
|  |          | <p>Meeting adjourned.</p>   |
|  |          |   |
|  |          |   |
|  |          |   |



| <b>DAY 4 (11<sup>th</sup> May 2023)</b> |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Item</b>                             | <b>Discussion / Disposition / Action Item</b>   |
| 8                                       | <b>In Depth Review of Regulatory CIPs (continued)</b>   |
|   | EASA re-presented to the meeting the CIPs that have been re-worked following the yesterday comments.  |
| B                                       | <b>CIP EASA 2023-02 – Analysis/approval only for mature/frozen design</b>   |
|   | EASA / (Ralf Schneider) briefed the meeting on CIP EASA 2023-02 Rev.1   |
|   | <p>Airbus / (Jan Huelsmann): the example for the structures material from “Metallic to Composites” doesn’t really work because there are always last-minute changes from “Metallics to Composites” (e.g. clips that are still PSE). Definitions should be included in the Appendix 4 of the IMPS (definitions).</p> <p>UK CAA / (Andrew Sanderson): for initial MRBR it is normal that tests are performed and can drive design changes. So I consider that including (e.g. tests) is not appropriate for initial MRBR.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): this CIP is mainly for sustaining MRBR activity with MODS; for Initial MRBR it is understood that there will be several tests completed later in the process.</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): we should change “certification process steps” with “development process steps”.</p> |
|   | The changes proposed have been introduced in real-time in CIP EASA 2023-02 Rev.2.   |
|   | FAA / (Bill Heliker): the IMRBPB can now vote for the approval of the CIP EASA 2023-02 Rev.2.   |
|   | <b>CIP accepted, as amended, as IP 206</b>  |
| A                                       | <b>CIP EASA 2023-01 – Removal of the reference to “User’s Guide”</b>  |
|   | EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella) briefed the meeting on CIP EASA 2023-01 Rev.1.  |
|   | FAA / (Bill Heliker): the IMRBPB can now vote for the approval of the CIP EASA 2023-01 Rev.1.   |
|   | <b>CIP accepted, as amended, as IP 205</b>  |



|   |          |   |
|---|----------|---|
|   | <b>E</b> | <b>CIP EASA 2023-05 – Wrong incorporation of IMRBPB IP 65 in MSG-3</b>  |
|   |          | EASA confirmed the withdrawal of CIP EASA 2023-05. The IP 65 Rev.1 is presented instead to the meeting.   |
|   |          | FAA / (Bill Heliker): the IMRBPB can now vote for the approval of the IP 65 Rev.1.  |
|   |          | <b>IP 65 Rev.1 accepted, as presented</b>   |
|   |          |   |
| 9 |          | <b>In Depth Review of Industry CIPs</b>   |
|   | <b>I</b> | <b>CIP IND 2018-03 - “Other Structure” procedure update</b>   |
|   |          | Airbus / (Jan Huelsmann) briefed the meeting on CIP IND 2018-03 Rev.1.  |
|   |          | This CIP has been discussed the first time in IAM 2021 (virtual) and it has been returned to submitter for re-work. Not discussed in IAM 2022 (virtual).  |
|   |          | UK CAA / (Andrew Sanderson): not only experiences with similar items should be considered but also hook to the WG should be considered; the removal of new material and design concepts takes away the hook to substantiate "...the WG can initiate...", better to retain it.<br>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): that part is in P5, I struggle to connect P5 now here. The flow chart should have been changed as well in order to reflect the changes<br>FAA / (Bill Heliker): Not clear the link between the problem statement and the recommended proposal. The problem statement should be better clarified to align the practice with the flow-chart.<br>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): the Structure WG must look as well at “other structures” per MSG-3.<br>EASA / (Antonino Levantino): we should focus the attention to “other structures” that cannot be covered by the zonal program (e.g. not possible to perform a GVI for accessibility reasons) and that are transferred to the Structures WG for evaluation (e.g. to select an SDI). We should also look at the NOTE added to the Zonal program in MSG-3 2022.1 (IP 196) for interface between Structures WG & Zonal WG. |
|   |          | <b>CIP IND 2018-03 Rev.1 returned to submitter for re-work with the support of the Industry Structures WG. Represent in 2024.</b>   |
|   |          |   |
|   | <b>J</b> | <b>CIP IND 2018-04 - SSI selection and analysis organization guideline</b>  |
|   |          | Airbus / (Jan Huelsmann) briefed the meeting on CIP IND 2018-04 Rev.3.  |



|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | <p>This CIP has been discussed the first time in IAM 2021 (virtual) and it has been returned to submitter for re-work. Then it has been re-presented during IAM 2022 (virtual) with the same result.</p>  |
|  |  | <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): there is still the issue highlighted during IAM 2022 related to Part B, where to put it? IMPS has the possibility to provide guidance (4.8, related to structure), maybe a possibility. As well IMPS comes with appendices.</p> <p>EASA / (Ralf Schneider): MPIG creates documents named “MPIG Agreed Position”, maybe this can be another option to be used.</p> <p>Airbus / (Jan Huelsmann): not all the TC holders have access to those documents.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): the information reported in Part B is valuable, we should find a place where to record it and make it available.</p> <p>Boeing / (Jeff Miller): let’s not forget that we have the CIP EASA 2023-07 related to the SSI definition that needs to be reworded.</p> <p>EASA / (Luca Tosini): we are not changing the SSI definition. We analyze “other structures” as an SSI. There were no changes to the SSI definition in the glossary following IMRBPB approval of IP 192. This aspect needs to be clarified (SSI selection vs items – Other Structures - added to the SSI list). This CIP generates confusion because looks like there is a change in the SSI definition that was not agreed by the IMRBPB. IP 192 was not supposed to change the SSI definition.</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): the CIP EASA 2023-07 proposes to change the definition of the SSI (consideration of “Human Occupants”) and here we say we do not change the SSI definition. Could we align the two approaches? Do we need really to change the SSI definition, or could we simply add additional steps for Other Structures to be “treated” as SSI?</p> |
|  |  | <p>Some changes proposed have been introduced in real-time in CIP IND 2018-04 Rev.4.</p>  |
|  |  | <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): what about the part B? We propose to add this info in the IMPS (in specific consideration on Structures paragraph or in a dedicated appendix, like IP44).</p> <p>FAA / (Bill Heliker): the IMRBPB can now vote for the preferred option between IMPS paragraph 4.8. “Specific Considerations for Structures” and IMPS appendix.</p>   |
|  |  | <p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): if we go for a new appendix we need to agree on the name as well, something like “<i>Organizing the SSI analyses</i>”.</p>   |
|  |  | <p>The IMRBPB voted to add the information reported in the CIP Part B to the existing IMPS Appendix 3, renaming the appendix accordingly. An Action Item has been opened.</p>   |
|  |  | <p><b>Action Item 2023-06: at the next IMPS revision opportunity, to rework IMPS Appendix 3, to make it a repository of additional supporting information/general practices. The Appendix has to be structured in sub-appendices (3.1, 3.2). The title of Appendix 3 has to be properly defined.</b></p>  |



|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  |   | <p><b>Action Owner:</b> IMRBPB Leadership Team</p> <p><b>Due Date:</b> IMPS Issue3 publication</p>   |
|  |   | <p><b>CIP IND 2018-04 Rev.3 returned to submitter for re-work with the support of the Industry Structures WG. Represent in 2024.</b></p>   |
|  |   |  |
|  |   |  |
|  | N | <p><b>CIP IND 2023-01 - Include the use of Remote Visual Inspection</b></p>  |
|  |   | <p>Airbus / (Lorenz Wenk) briefed the meeting on CIP IND 2023-01.</p>  |
|  |   | <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): there are already different means of compliance to tasks, with NAAs involved in the approval of it. The proposed CIP is too simple. We expected more than just a new term added to the glossary. If the goal is to open door to alternatives, there is no added value in putting it into MSG-3. What EASA expected was an assessment of the impact of a remote visual inspection within the analysis logic.</p> <p>Airbus / (Lorenz Wenk): we do not see the need to complicate the analysis approach.</p> <p>EASA / (Luca Tosini): how is going to be used in the MSG-3 practically? Is it a new task type, to be selected instead of the current existing ones (e.g. GVI, DET, SDI)?</p> <p>Airbus / (Lorenz Wenk): it is not a new task type, it is just an alternative inspection method.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): how do we select this alternative method to the GVI? There is no recommendation for implementation proposed for the MSG-3 in the CIP.</p>  |
|  |   | <p>Operators highlighted the difficulties they are experiencing with local authorities to have approved alternative methods, such as to perform a GVI using drones, if those methods are not mentioned somewhere in any regulation, user guides, etc.</p>  |
|  |   | <p>FAA / (Bill Heliker): FAA can confirm those difficulties are currently in place. We are in favor to open the door to a new definition, we want to take credit of new technologies. We do not want to limit application.</p> <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): the use of a drone is an inspection aid, we do not directly regulate inspection. Just adding the definition without specifying in the document how to use is not a good approach and will not help the operators in front of the local Authority. The “<i>what</i>”, “<i>why</i>” and “<i>when</i>” are managed by the MRB process, surely not the “<i>how</i>”. However, taking the CIP back and explaining “<i>how</i>” the technology can be used in the MSG-3 analysis seems to be the proper way to go.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): we have already alternative tasks defined in MSG-3 (e.g. AHM), and their selection and use is well defined in the MSG-3 logic. We suggested to update the MSG-3 with the possibility to select a new task type (not only an alternative inspection method) and we do not agree to just adding a new definition in the glossary.</p> |



|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  |   | <p>Delta Airlines / (David Piotrowski): if the proposed remote visual inspection is just an alternate to a GVI, we can approve it by ourselves.</p> <p>FAA / (Bill Heliker): AFS300, field inspector asks the references on where the policy is.</p> <p>Southwest Airlines / (Chris Carnucci): my first interpretation was that the CIP intended to add a new task type. In MSG-3 the effectiveness criteria is fundamental, GVI specifies "<i>within touching distance</i>", adding new method requires an assessment of the effectiveness of the new method. We are "assuming" that we find the failure in the same effective way. Some criteria have to meet specific requirements.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): open the door in MSG-3 to alternative tasks implies the need for having the proper guidelines in the analysis.</p> <p>UK CAA / (Andrew Sanderson): we as regulators need to understand the proper documents in order to provide the validation to the task.</p> <p>Airbus / (Lorenz Wenk): the IMRBPB position is well understood, we as industry need to understand the added value in going in that direction.</p> <p>FAA / (Bill Heliker): ICAs definition gives the bases; for an MRB aircraft FAA asks for the supporting MSG-3 analysis or an emulation of it. So the proposal in the CIP will be valid only if the MSG-3 provides the proper guidance.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): in the EASA world the bases can be found in Part-M. Maybe the today's discussion can be a good input for the MSG-4 working group.</p> <p>A4A / (Kevin Berger): we propose to withdraw the CIP and to re-think it based on all the valuable comments received.</p> |
|  |   | <p><b>MPIG would like to withdraw this CIP IND 2023-01.</b></p>  |
|  |   |  |
|  |   |  |
|  | K | <p><b>CIP IND 2020-02 - HUMS Usage Data to Optimize Restoration (Overhaul) &amp; Discard Intervals</b></p>   |
|  |   | <p>Airbus Helicopters/ (Elodie Carmona) briefed the meeting on CIP IND 2020-02 Rev.5.</p>  |
|  |   | <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): what does it mean "regulator approved data" mentioned in the CIP?</p> <p>Airbus Helicopters/ (Elodie Carmona): data part of the certification process but not used by the operators (e.g. the PPH).</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): what is the meaning of "initial"?</p> <p>Airbus Helicopters/ (Elodie Carmona): initial MRBR</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): proposal in 2.3.8, seems that paragraph 3. is more appropriate. If PPH define different parameters this is more than ok, already today we do it, there is no need to specify it at MSG-3 document level. The request to use the data acquired as an additional input for the WG to select the best interval for the task, it makes sense.</p>   |



|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>Leonardo Helicopters (Giacomo Gibilisco): it is not just related to selection of interval parameter, but data monitoring based on specific usage of the machine.</p> <p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): the WG cannot validated different mission profiles. In addition, you will monitor the actual usage to "convert" the interval. How the WG can validate the parameter using the new interval?</p> <p>UK CAA / (Andrew Sanderson): HUMS is not a science; it seems complex to be considered at WG level. Is certification accepting this parameter?</p> <p>EASA / (Francesca Tanzi): "control service introduction" (certification), "Flight data monitoring program"... are those input valid?</p> <p>Airbus Helicopters/ (Elodie Carmona): HUMS can be certified for credit. We can demonstrate it, with the support of design office representative that can show the curves.</p> <p>Leonardo Helicopters (Giacomo Gibilisco): the identification of the limit parameter is fundamental, "power usage hour" is the name. We suggest that looking in the spirit of section 2.3.8 this would be an useful addition.</p> <p>FAA / (Bill Heliker): there is currently an FAA AC in DRAFT on this topic and we would like not to create any conflict at this point in time changing something in the MRB process. FAA therefore does not support the approval of the presented CIP.</p> <p>EASA / (Francesca Tanzi): why the proposal to add verbiage to the "customer data" bullet? We propose to have a dedicated bullet point per the added blue text and not to combine it with customer requests.</p> |
|   | <p>The IMRBPB agrees that some changes to the CIP are needed. The RMPiG reworked promptly the CIP implementing the modifications in its Rev.6.</p>   |
|   | <p>FAA / (Bill Heliker): the IMRBPB can now vote for the approval of the CIP IND 2020-02 Rev.6.</p>  |
|   | <p><b>CIP accepted, as amended, as IP 209</b></p>  |
|   |  |
|   |  |
| M | <p><b>CIP IND 2022-03 - Periodic review: in-service issues timely assessment</b></p>   |
|   | <p>Leonardo Helicopters / (Giacomo Gibilisco) briefed the meeting on CIP IND 2022-03</p>   |
|   | <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): the issue is understood. Periodic review per se doesn't intend to mandate any action at a certain time. This needs to be agreed during the periodic review. We propose to simply add in the same paragraph "timing" in addition to "need" and "scope".</p> <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): "timing" refers to?</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): timing of the related MRBR revision. There is a reference in the last sentence that the periodic review is taking place during the ISC but it is not always valid (there are stand-alone periodic reviews). Timing depends on case-by-case basis, we cannot address and cover all cases. This needs to be agreed during the periodic review.</p>   |







|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): EASA supports the concept, however we reject the CIP; only changing the definition in the glossary seems not enough, there is a specific paragraph in the MSG-3 that has not been changed and still include the changed definition.</p> <p>CAAC / (Xiaolei Li): do we really need the definition in the glossary?</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): there could be the possibility that clarifying the current fault-tolerance system paragraph in the MSG-3 paragraph generates no need for having a definition in the glossary.</p> <p>EASA / (Ralf Schneider): why not merging step n.1 and n. 2? In addition, it seems not clear in the definition the verbiage "<i>the design of systems or functions</i>".</p> <p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): despite the need for re-work, the CIP is very well made. The concept of "fault tolerance" is at the functional failure level.</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): the CIP will be re-worked to take into consideration the comments received, and to update of the specific paragraph in the MSG-3 related to fault-tolerance system that has not been changed (it includes the changed definition).</p> |
|  |  |
|  | <b>CIP IND 2022-01 returned to submitter for re-work. Represent in 2024.</b>   |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | Meeting adjourned.   |



| <b>DAY 5 (12<sup>th</sup> May 2023)</b> |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Item</b>                             | <b>Discussion / Disposition / Action Item</b>   |
| 9                                       | <b>In Depth Review of Industry CIPs (continued)</b>   |
|   | Industry re-presented to the meeting the CIPs that have been re-worked following the yesterday comments.  |
| O                                       | <b>CIP IND 2023-02 - Level 3 Analysis - AHM Effectiveness Determination</b>   |
|   | Boeing / (Jeff Miller) briefed the meeting on CIP IND 2023-02 Rev.1.  |
|   | FAA / (Bill Heliker): the IMRBPB can now vote for the approval of the CIP IND 2023-02 Rev.1.  |
|   | <b>CIP accepted, as amended, as IP 211</b>  |
| 10                                      | <b>Discussion Topics</b>  |
| 3                                       | <b>Relation between MSG-3 and other standards (e.g., SAE etc.) in AHM or other topics - How to harmonize all standards or specifications</b>  |
|   | CAAC / (Xiaolei Li and Jin Wang) – introduced the topic supported by a presentation. There is the need to understand cross area logic and implications (e.g., if other standards take some new concepts and terms, should we follow them?)  |
|   | A4A / (Kevin Berger): we definitely support the idea, already some initiatives are going on (e.g. record keeping process works with IPs).<br>FAA / (Bill Heliker): if I am not wrong as today there are 6 dedicated working groups running (and 81 related standard docs) that potentially consider areas of activities pertinent to what we are doing at MRB level. The topic is being around for a while, IATA spoke about it years ago. Not easy to identify the proper way to move forward.<br>Delta Airlines / (David Piotrowski): ready to have meetings with CAAC and other regulators to support; many CIPs will come in the next years about AHM and its implementation. |
| 6                                       | <b>AMOC/AD with applied SHM</b>   |
|   | Delta Airlines / (David Piotrowski) – introduced the topic supported by a presentation.<br>The EASA Senior Expert – Materials Mr Simon Waite joined the meeting.  |



|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  |   | <p>EASA / (Ralf Schneider): CPCP is already a sort of SHM, it is not just task-based anymore. Some isolated examples existing today show that the direction set is the one described (e.g. automated transmission and data collection).</p> <p>Delta Airlines / (David Piotrowski): that's right but we need to get there soon; this is not only a Delta Airlines concern, next week will take place a large event in Tokyo to discuss the topic and we need clear definitions from regulator's side. We can be in a "hybrid mode" soon, with task-based and process-based approach running side by side.</p> <p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): are there already available technologies to monitor corrosion?</p> <p>Delta Airlines / (David Piotrowski): some, but moisture sensors are easier to start with. We can put sensors where we expect corrosion will happen, therefore thanks to monitoring we could go for opening and cleaning before corroding.</p> <p>EASA / (Ralf Schneider): this can be a topic for consideration for the MSG-4 Working Group.</p> <p>EASA / (Simon Waite): the key point is to ensure the TCH is directly involved with any projects impacting PSE baseline structure or large PDA threats. We should not initially allow STCs without TCH input, even if only for the reason that the TCH may lose in feedback (and will not align with intent of Part 26, e.g. 26.305). For the short term, we need to ensure that any STC's using SHM without TCH support impacting TCH baseline structure does not limit feedback to the TCH related to structure performance.</p> |
|  |   |  |
|  |   |  |
|  | 1 | <b>Placards &amp; Markings</b>   |
|  |   |  |
|  |   | EASA / (Bertrand Bourgueil) – introduced the topic supported by a presentation.  |
|  |   |  |
|  |   | <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): Originally EASA was considering developing a CIP about it, then we decided to prepare a short presentation instead. Recently, issues relative to Placards and Markings have been reported to EASA (e.g. leading to the recent issuance of EASA Airworthiness Directive 2023-0012). We would like to get the opinion and feedback from the PB regarding that topic. In case it is recognized being an issue, then a CIP could be proposed.</p> <p>EASA / (Francesca Tanzi): We believe it is better if this discussion is managed by Industry/ MPIG rather than authorities. Placards &amp; Markings are part of the aircraft definition and supporting ICA are developed by TCH/DAH. In addition, it needs to be workable for the Industry.</p> <p>UK CAA / (Andrew Sanderson): it is something not evident to a CAMO; an increased level of attention from operators' side can be an improvement. Maybe the design is sufficient.</p> <p>EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): placards are very customized, as such it is really an issue (non-availability of reference material).</p>  |



- Embraer / (Rodrigo Manzione Corrêa): back to year 2005, US operator asked the same question. Embraer prepared MSG-3 and was rejected, adducing "covered by zonal" as justification.
- EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): marking painted (or inked) might have not part numbers to be tracked. Degraded marking maybe identifiable, more difficult to say the same will always happen for the missing ones.
- EASA / (Bertrand Bourgueil): zonal cannot cover FEC 5 and FEC 8. MSG-3 shows that zonal is not enough.
- AeroTechna / (Leonard Beauchemin): zonal inspections are directed towards the condition of the zone (so including check for presence). When we are missing a placard we are not in compliance with type design. The technical level of knowledge should pick-up the non-conformity of the aircraft to the type design.
- EASA / (Dominique Dumortier): unfortunately is not 100% true that all the markings are in the IPC. Some markings have not a P/N so they are not tracked through the IPC. The painting is part of the certification exercise, so part of the certified configuration that has to be maintained.
- AeroTechna / (Leonard Beauchemin): if TCH delivers the A/C the paint is part of the type design, no doubts. Some placards get installed during STC. The expectation of the inspector is to have the set of ICAs that give enough instructions how to perform the tasks.
- EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): on that respect, zonal description cannot be considered detailed enough.
- AeroTechna / (Leonard Beauchemin): education and human performance of the maintenance crew becomes an important factor.
- Archer / (Armando Chieffi): important issue, we should focus on the reasons why we are missing that.
- EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): maybe the MSI selection is the right place where to start from.
- Southwest Airlines / (Chris Carnucci): agree to have a group to have a look to it. Nevertheless, a placard is a part of a significant system, so maybe MSG-3 is already covering it a system level.
- EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): as you may be aware of, EASA currently approves AMPs of some operators as competent authority. We have evidence of tasks to inspect marking and placards, but only as internal operator procedures.
- EASA / (Francesca Tanzi): from the findings coming from those internal operator procedures tasks the question is "what to do when we have a finding". The question has been originated from this point. When the finding is identified during a product audit or a SAFA inspection, the experience shows that the evaluation and the corrective action required is left to inspectors, in absence of indication from the TCH (no MMEL, no identification of the acceptable degradation...).
- Southwest Airlines / (Javid Suleymanov): the issue seems covered as per today, all required placard and markings are installed, airworthiness certificate requirement. Why we need to add it in MSG-3?
- EASA / (Francesca Tanzi): airworthiness review is every 3 years, instead the tasks we saw from the operators are every 6 months.



|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  |   | <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): because of the impact on the airworthiness certificate, maybe operators are trying to prevent to the maximum extent that this problem happens.</p> <p>Embraer / (Rodrigo Manzione Corrêa): we have examples of placards analyzed in MSG-3, such as the illuminated placards (ATA 33-50).</p> <p>Southwest Airlines / (Javid Suleymanov): the material of the placards/markings can impact the level of degradation, this has to be considered.</p> <p>Leonardo Helicopters / (Giacomo Gibilisco): we share the idea that we have to think about it. But since we have requirements existing (release of the airworthiness certificate) it should be considered the fact that we already have a checkpoint in time (mitigation).</p> <p>EASA / (Francesca Tanzi): the airworthiness review asks for "a check", that based on our experience is not supporting the case.</p> <p>A4A / (Kevin Berger): at MPIG/RMPIG level we will look at it, providing update at the next IMRBPB Intermediate Meeting (IIM), tracking the topic with an action item.</p>  |
|  |   | <p><b>Action Item 2023-07: to investigate the possibility/implications to cover "Placard and Markings" in the MRB process making use of MSG-3 analysis.</b></p> <p><b>Action Owner: MPIG/RMPIG</b></p> <p><b>Due Date: IIM 2023</b></p>  |
|  |   | <p>A4A / (Kevin Berger): experience from the other Regulators?</p> <p>HK CAD / (Bill Lau): operators create their tasks, and we rely on the MRO to make this detection of missing/degraded placards and markings. Saying the is "based on training" it seems not fair to the operators/MROs.</p> <p>TCCA / (Jeff Phipps): simple from a regulatory point of view. TCCA issues a type certificate and we have in the type certificate data sheet (TCDS) all the placards required per type design listed, and it is operator's responsibility to maintain them. In most of the cases, replacing a placard in TCCA world does not identify the action as "maintenance", so we do not require maintenance release. It seems not possible to identify an effective task interval in MSG-3 because of the number of variables behind. Maybe MSG-3 need a bit more attention to specify "do not forget about the placards". But operationally wise it is not a concern for TCCA.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): thank you all for the attention and understanding, as well as for the valuable inputs. We need to further discuss the topic internally at EASA.</p> |
|  |   |  |
|  | 7 | <b>Proposal to evaluate / develop plan to consolidate V1 &amp; V2 and related dependencies</b>   |
|  |   | <p>American Airlines / (Avril Benson) – introduced the topic. A comparison between the 2 documents has been performed, that shows not many differences are in place. The few differences identified are very well documented. So the proposal for MSG-4 is to go for 1 volume only.</p>  |



|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  |   | <p>A4A / (Kevin Berger): MPIG/RMPIG discussed the topic in detail. From a document management perspective, the fact MSG-3 will become MSG4 requires a transition plan.</p> <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella): MSG-3 Vol.2 was specifically created to address the peculiarities highlighted by the rotorcraft community. To blend everything together seems a bit of a challenge.</p> <p>Leonardo Helicopters / (Giacomo Gibilisco): a separated volume was created because of the needs at that point in time. It is perfectly understandable the direction proposed, and we have no objection to move that way, as far as the final text will be able to preserve the applicable differences between rotorcrafts, VTOLs and fixed wing aircrafts.</p> <p>American Airlines / (Avril Benson): we need to proceed carefully during the development phase.</p> |
|  |   | <p>The IMRBPB agrees with the proposal to consolidate Vol.1 and Vol.2 for the development of MSG-4. The 2 documents will continue to exist in the frame of MSG-3.</p>  |
|  |   |  |
|  |   |  |
|  | 8 | <b>Strengthening coordination with SAE committees involved with common topics of MPIG/RMPIG</b>  |
|  |   |  |
|  |   | <p>A4A / (Kevin Berger) – introduced the topic. Interface is already in place at industry level with SAE, we have an agreement to have access to SAE documents as presented by Rhonda during the first day of our meeting.<br/> <i>[ref. to Item 4 iii. of this MoM]</i></p>   |
|  |   | <p>No additional comments from the IMRBPB.</p>   |
|  |   |  |
|  | 4 | <b>IAHM Brief</b>  |
|  |   | <p>SAE International / (Ravi Rajamani) – introduced the topic.</p>   |
|  |   | <p>No additional comments from the IMRBPB.</p>   |
|  |   |  |
|  | 5 | <b>Highly Integrated Electronic Systems</b>  |
|  |   | <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi) – introduced the topic supported by a presentation.</p>  |
|  |   | <p>EASA / (Ralf Schneider): components failure is constant while in service but aging maybe a factor. Also, within the scope of an MSI the analysis, the function has to be identified at aircraft level. MSG-4 should consider the boundaries between functions and failure costs. Proper MSI highest manageable level, with different elements in one box. We need to consider the system final user to evaluate the need for having an MSI.</p>   |



|              | <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): the DO-160G (Environmental Conditions and Test Procedures for Airborne Equipment) is a standard for the environmental testing of avionics hardware but does not consider aging factors.</p> <p>EASA / (Ralf Schneider): we experience many issues with avionic equipment.</p> <p>AeroTechna / (Leonard Beauchemin): components failure can be considered as constant but we have not to forget the mortality. How can we name them “Maintenance Significant Items” if there is no maintenance practically involved?</p> <p>EASA / (Francesca Tanzi): are we sure we want to keep the current avionics analysis as it is in the scope of MSG-4 development?</p> <p>Archer / (Armando Chieffi): the goal is to have safe aviation. MSG analysis as a tool demonstrated to be effective, so we should focus in applying MSG to all aviation. Urban Air Mobility (UAM) vehicles are mainly categorized as Part-23 machines, therefore do not use MSG, they go by performance-based maintenance. The objective should be to enhance MSG tool to make it fit better the UAM needs.</p> |  |           |             |              |                                   |  |              |   |  |              |                          |  |
|--------------|---|--|-----------|-------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|--|--------------|---|--|--------------|--------------------------|--|
|              |   |  |           |             |              |                                   |  |              |   |  |              |                          |  |
| 2            | L/HIRF MSG-3 – Issues highlighted during the review of CIP EASA 2020-05   |  |           |             |              |                                   |  |              |   |  |              |                          |  |
|              | Topic withdrawn from the agenda items.  |  |           |             |              |                                   |  |              |   |  |              |                          |  |
|              |   |  |           |             |              |                                   |  |              |   |  |              |                          |  |
| 11           | <b>Review of Outstanding Items from CIP Review and Caucuses</b>   |  |           |             |              |                                   |  |              |   |  |              |                          |  |
|              | Budget availability to support the MRB related activities becomes more and more a factor for regulating authorities. To host an IMRBPB Annual Meeting, a face-to-face event as agreed by the Policy Board, it is considered a challenge for the future. During the IMRBPB Regulatory Caucus it has been discussed the possibility to open for the industry to host the IMRBPB Annual Meeting in 2025.   |  |           |             |              |                                   |  |              |   |  |              |                          |  |
|              | A4A / (Kevin Berger): the door is open from MPIG/RMPIG side, provided no conflict of interest is in place.  |  |           |             |              |                                   |  |              |   |  |              |                          |  |
|              |   |  |           |             |              |                                   |  |              |   |  |              |                          |  |
| 12           | <b>Disposition of CIPs into IPs, IMPS, requests for rework, etc.</b>  |  |           |             |              |                                   |  |              |   |  |              |                          |  |
|              | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>CIP number</th> <th>CIP title</th> <th>Disposition</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>EASA 2023-01</td> <td>MSG-3 reference to "User's Guide"</td> <td>Accepted, as amended, as <b>IP 205</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>EASA 2023-02</td> <td>Analysis/approval only for mature/frozen design</td> <td>Accepted, as amended, as <b>IP 206</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>EASA 2023-03</td> <td>IMPS Appendix 4 Clean-up</td> <td>Accepted, as presented, as <b>IP 207</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>   | CIP number                               | CIP title | Disposition | EASA 2023-01 | MSG-3 reference to "User's Guide" | Accepted, as amended, as <b>IP 205</b> | EASA 2023-02 | Analysis/approval only for mature/frozen design | Accepted, as amended, as <b>IP 206</b> | EASA 2023-03 | IMPS Appendix 4 Clean-up | Accepted, as presented, as <b>IP 207</b> |
| CIP number   | CIP title   | Disposition                              |           |             |              |                                   |  |              |   |  |              |                          |  |
| EASA 2023-01 | MSG-3 reference to "User's Guide"   | Accepted, as amended, as <b>IP 205</b>   |           |             |              |                                   |  |              |   |  |              |                          |  |
| EASA 2023-02 | Analysis/approval only for mature/frozen design   | Accepted, as amended, as <b>IP 206</b>   |           |             |              |                                   |  |              |   |  |              |                          |  |
| EASA 2023-03 | IMPS Appendix 4 Clean-up  | Accepted, as presented, as <b>IP 207</b> |           |             |              |                                   |  |              |   |  |              |                          |  |



|    |    |  |   |   |
|----|----|--|---|---|
|    |    | EASA 2023-04                           | Clarifications on the policy of consolidation of “off-wing”, overhaul and restoration tasks           | Returned to submitter for re-work. Represent in 2024  |
|    |    | EASA 2023-05                           | Wrong incorporation of IMRBPB IP 65 in MSG-3  | Withdrawn   |
|    |    | EASA 2023-06                           | Remove reference to "Letter Checks" in MSG-3  | Accepted, as presented, as <b>IP 208</b>  |
|    |    | EASA 2023-07                           | SSI definition update   | Returned to submitter for re-work with the support of the Industry Structures WG. Represent in 2024 |
|    |    | EASA 2023-08                           | Removal of not MSG-3 related Steps from the L/HIRF Protection Analysis Methodology and Logic Diagram  | Returned to submitter for re-work with the support of the Industry L/HIRF WG. Represent in 2024     |
|    |    | IND 2018-03                            | “Other Structure” procedure update  | Returned to submitter for re-work with the support of the Industry Structures WG. Represent in 2024 |
|    |    | IND 2018-04                            | SSI selection and analysis organization guideline   | Returned to submitter for re-work with the support of the Industry Structures WG. Represent in 2024 |
|    |    | IND 2020-02                            | HUMS Usage Data to Optimize Restoration (Overhaul) & Discard Intervals                                | Accepted, as amended, as <b>IP 209</b>  |
|    |    | IND 2022-01                            | Fault-Tolerant System Definition  | Returned to submitter for re-work. Represent in 2024  |
|    |    | IND 2022-03                            | Periodic review: in-service issues timely assessment  | Accepted, as amended, as <b>IP 210</b>  |
|    |    | IND 2023-01                            | Include the use of Remote Visual Inspection   | Withdrawn   |
|    |    | IND 2023-02                            | Level 3 Analysis – AHM Effectiveness Determination  | Accepted, as amended, as <b>IP 211</b>  |
|    |    | IP 65 Rev.1                            | Enhance Current EZAP Logic in MSG-3 to Incorporate Additional Aspects Now Being Considered by the FAA | Accepted, as presented  |
|    |    |  |   |   |
|    |    |  |   |   |
| 13 |    | <b>Final Provisions</b>                |   |   |
|    | i. | IMRBPB documentation status and review |   |   |



- Action Items

3 (three) new action items have been opened during the IAM 2023:

| AI number  | Raised on | AI content  | AI assigned to    |
|------------|-----------|---|-------------------|
| AI 2023-05 | May 2023  | at the next IMPS revision opportunity, to change "AEG" in "AED" (FAA) in the acronyms list  | IMRBPB Leadership |
| AI 2023-06 | May 2023  | at the next IMPS revision opportunity, to rework IMPS Appendix 3, to make it a repository of additional supporting information/general practices. The Appendix has to be structured in sub-appendices (3.1, 3.2). The title of Appendix 3 has to be properly defined. | IMRBPB Leadership |
| AI 2023-07 | May 2023  | to investigate the possibility/implications to cover "Placard and Markings" in the MRB process making use of MSG-3 analysis   | MPIG/RMPIG        |

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>

- Issue Papers Index

EASA / (Luca Tosini) – showed the Issue Paper Index (Rev. May 2023\_DRAFT) to the Policy Board. The approval of the IMRBPB is required for the following modifications proposed:

- Deletion of the IMRBPB IPs that have been erroneously considered as “approved” (13 in total). The IP number will be kept as “*Not used.*” For traceability reasons;
- Review of the “RETROACTIVE” column;
- Review of the “STATUS” columns, with particular reference to the “ACTIVE” vs. “ARCHIVED” ones;
- Inclusion of the 7 (seven) new approved IMRBPB IPs.

The IMRBPB approved the amended Issue Paper Index.

The approved Issue Paper Index will be made available on the EASA website at the following link:



|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p><a href="https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/domains/aircraft-products/international-maintenance-review-board-policy-board-IMRBPB">https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/domains/aircraft-products/international-maintenance-review-board-policy-board-IMRBPB</a></p>   |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>Focal Points List</u></li></ul>   |
|  | <p>EASA / (Luca Tosini) – showed the Focal Points List (Rev. May 2023) to the Policy Board. The approval of the IMRBPB is required for the following modifications proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Consolidation of the 2 lists under a unique document, in order to stop tracking separately each single list revision (IMRBPB focals vs. MPIG-RMPIG focals);</li><li>• Review of the focal points for both Regulators and Industry, as per the latest communications received.</li></ul> |
|  |  |
|  | <p>The IMRBPB approved the amended Focal Points List.<br/>The approved Focal Points List will be made available on the EASA website at the following link:<br/><a href="https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/domains/aircraft-products/international-maintenance-review-board-policy-board-IMRBPB">https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/domains/aircraft-products/international-maintenance-review-board-policy-board-IMRBPB</a></p>   |
|  |  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>Meetings Calendar</u></li></ul>   |
|  | <p>EASA / (Raffaele Iovinella) – showed the IMRBPB Meetings Calendar (Rev. June 2022) to the Policy Board.<br/>The IMRBPB should identify as minimum the host, tentative date and location (if applicable per the Communication Procedure) for the upcoming meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• IMRBPB Intermediate Meeting (IIM) 2023 (virtual)</li><li>• IMRBPB Annual Meeting (IAM) 2024 (face to face)</li></ul>   |
|  | <p>The IMRBPB find an agreement, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• IIM 2023 will be hosted by JCAB, tentatively the week of December 18-22;</li><li>• IAM 2024 will be hosted by CAAC, tentatively the week of May 13-17, proposed location Haikou (China), to be confirmed.</li></ul>   |
|  | <p>The IMRBPB Meetings Calendar updated will be made available on the EASA website at the following link:<br/><a href="https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/domains/aircraft-products/international-maintenance-review-board-policy-board-IMRBPB">https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/domains/aircraft-products/international-maintenance-review-board-policy-board-IMRBPB</a></p>  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | Meeting Closed   |