



**Agenda No. – 1**

**Title – Call to Order**

The Chairman, Mr. David Nigri, called the meeting to order at 8:00 AM and conducted a roll call of the members. The Chair also recognized a number of observers in attendance. It was noted that the meeting was scheduled to begin an hour earlier than the traditional start time due to the request to accomplish a large agenda and the need to conclude the meeting by 3:00 PM. The Chair thanked the ISBAO team for all of its efforts in preparation of this annual meeting.

**Members**

David Nigri- Textron	Chair	Present
Juergen Wiese-BMW	Vice-Chair	Present
Len Beauchemin – AeroTechna Solutions, LLC	Member	Present
Rodrigo Duarte	Member	Absent
Pat Dunn - AsisCorporateJet	Member	Present
Kurt Edwards – IBAC DG	Member	Present
Carl Evans – FedEx Corporate	Member	Present
Jens Hennig – GAMA	Member	Present
Merlin Preuss – CBAA*	Member	Absent
Bill Stine – NBAA**	Member	Present
Dave Stohr - Air Training Intl.	Member	Present
Keith Washington – Nike	Member	Present
Matt Zuccaro – HAI	Member	Present

**Observers/Support Staff**

Rudy Toering – President of CBAA for Merlin Preuss\*  
Doug Carr – NBAA assuming Bill Stine’s position as of January 1, 2014\*\*  
Bob Bauer – Former Chair Audit Advisory Group  
Don Spurston – Former IBAC Director General

Jim Cannon – ISBAO Program Director/Secretary to Standards Board  
Peter Ingleton – Director, ICAO Liaison  
John Sheehan – ISBAO Audit Manager  
Sonnie Bates – ISBAO Operations Manager  
Larry Fletcher – ISBAO Assistant Audit Manager  
Ben Walsh – ISBAO Workshop Presenter



**Agenda No. – 2**

**Title – Adoption of Agenda**

The proposed agenda was unanimously adopted.

<b>AGENDA</b>		
1.	Call to Order	Chair
2.	Adoption of Agenda	Chair
3.	Review of Decision Record of October 9, 2011	Chair
4.	Action Items From Last Meeting	Chair
5.	Action Items From Conference Call August 7, 2012	Chair
6.	Standards Board Membership	Chair
	Terms expiring in 2012	
	New members in 2012	
7.	IS-BAO Activity Summary	Cannon
8.	Workshop Schedule	Bates
9.	Amendments to IS-BAO Standard and Audit Procedures Manual	Bates
10.	Other Business	
	The Future of IS-BAO	Cannon
	Data Base	Sheehan
	Auditor Update/Monitoring Program	Sheehan
	Operator Update	Cannon
11.	Next Meeting	Chair
12.	Adjournment	Chair



**Agenda No. – 3**

**Title – Review of Decision Record of October 29, 2012**

**Decision**

The Decision Record of the Standards Board/13 meeting held on October 29, 2012, was reviewed and a motion was made and seconded for the approval of Decision Record/12.

**Agenda No. – 4 – Action Items From Last Meeting**

The Chair reviewed the following action items generated from the 2012 IS-BAO Standards Board meeting.

**Attachment to Agenda Item 4 – Action Items Report – 2012 Standards Meeting**

<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Status</b>
Data Base update requested by Standards Board members:	Fully operational and historic data entered. ISADORA in process.
Additional administrative support appears to be needed for growing ISBAO activity.	Position has been supported on a temporary basis to accomplish Database updating only.
Chair proposed a WebEx to be conducted in the Spring of 2013.	Conference Call held on July 8, 2013.
Consider changing the name of the AMC to Guidance Material (GM).	Name changed in the 2013 ISBAO Standard.
APM 8.1 to be inserted within APM 8.4 to place emphasis upon the evaluation of the operators SMS in the Audit Report.	Insert completed with the 2013 APM. Workshop simulations have received enthusiastic support from Auditors.
The workshop programs need to be more actively promoted going forward.	Coordination of workshop marketing and promotion has been actively managed by the ISBAO Operations Manger. Member Associations have been actively promoting workshops during 2013. Note: See workshop activity in 2012; Agenda item 8.



**Agenda No. – 5 – Action Items From Conference Call, July 8, 2013**

The Chair reviewed the following action items generated from the 2013 IS-BAO Standards Board conference Call in July..

**Attachment to Agenda Item 5 – Action Items Report – Conference Call Meeting**

Action Item	Status
The Chair asked each member whose term was expiring in 2013 to correspond with him concerning their preference to continue their service to the ISBAO Standards Board.	Each member has indicated a desire to serve an additional term on the Standards Board. Communication with the Chair has been completed.
Pat Dunn suggested that the Board consider creative means of allowing participation of a single aircraft operators that may not be able to attend the NBAA.	The point was discussed and it was agreed that consideration be given to the formation of a Single Aircraft Operators sub-committee of the Standards Board. Pat Dunn agreed to work on the issue.
Motion was passed to reach out to the FBO community for persons willing to act in an observer status with the ISBAO Standards Board. Kurt Edwards suggested a member of the NATA.	Kurt further elaborated on the working relationship between IBAC and NATA in development of the ISBAH standard. He indicated that this was a matter of timing depending upon the introduction date of the ISBAH but felt that an NATA member representative should be appointed following the introduction of ISBAH.
Motion was adopted to have the IBAC DG and the ISBAO PD review the bylaws/TOR's for the standards board specifically in the area of board selection and election.	A revision to the TOR's for the Standards Board were sent to the IBAC governing board for consideration of approval. Each association member was reminded of the need to nominate candidates for election.
The Vice Chair offered that the succession to ISBAO Standards Board Chair should not be automatic from the Vice Chair position, but should be a nomination and election at the end of the Chairman's term.	Included within the TOR's revision was a clarification of the process to select the Chair and Vice Chair of the Standards Board.
The Operations Manager was tasked with the clarification of SMS protocol 8.1 for Auditors.	Submission of a new APM protocol 8.1 was attached to the agenda. It was unanimously approved by SB 14 during the meeting.
The ISBAO Program Director asked the Board to provide the ISBAO management team with the authority to make administrative changes to the SMS toolkit, Guidance Material, GCOM, and ISBAO protocols without seeking permission of the Standards Board.	Matt Zuccaro offered that the function of the board is governance and not to manage the ISBAO standard. Matt indicated that he felt that the program is being properly managed and if the staff feels that additional guidance material and supporting documents are necessary during the course of the year, they should have the freedom to create them without oversight.
The ISBAO Operations Manager requested that the Jeppesen Book version of the GCOM be eliminated and that the "Small, European, and North American" GCOM be maintained in the future.	It was agreed that only two versions, North American and European GCOM would be included with the 2014 revisions.
Matt Zuccaro and Rogrigo Duarte offered to work on a presentation to the SB 14 on Helicopter Safety.	Matt provided a concise review of the helicopter industry and its safety initiatives.
The Chair called for a motion to reach out to the Part 91 helicopter industry for a potential Standard Board Member.	Daniel Doepker from Hillsboro Aviation was submitted as a potential board candidate for 2014. His resume was submitted



▪ **Discussion Points:**

Change Guidance Material (GM) to ISBAO Implementation Guide.

APM 8.1 is further revised to reflect ICAO SMM version 3 guidance and guidance for soundness, appropriateness and effectiveness is built into the ISBAO Audit Protocols, Chapter 3; Safety Management Systems.

Limit the number of GCOM revisions each year to the North American and European versions.

Terms of Reference have been changed to reflect an election process. These will be presented to the IBAC Governing Board for approval.

**Agenda No. – 6 – Standards Board Membership and Election**

Current ISBAO Standards Board Members and Terms

<b>Member</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Term Expires</b>
David Nigri- Textron	Chair	2014
Juergen Wiese - BMW	Vice-Chair	2015
Len Beauchemin – AeroTechna Solutions	Member	2016
Rodrigo Duarte	Member	2015
Pat Dunn – AsiaCorporateJet	Member	2015
Kurt Edwards	Member	IBAC DG
Carl Evans – FedEx Corporation	Member	2015
Jens Henning – GAMA	Member	2016
Merlin Preuss - CBAA	Member	2015
Doug Carr - NBAA	Member	2016
Dave Stohr - Air Training International	Member	2016
Keith Washington – Nike	Member	2015
Matt Zuccaro	Member	2014

**Decision**

Doug Carr was elected to replace Bill Stine, who is retiring in January 2014. Len Beauchemin, Jens Henning, and Dave Stohr were elected to terms expiring in 2016. David Nigri was elected to the position of Chairman and Juergen Wiese was elected to the position of Vice Chairman, both for an additional two years. No new candidates were offered for election at the SB 14 meeting.



**Agenda No. – 7 - ISBAO Activity Update**

**Attachment to Agenda Item 7 – ISBAO Sales**

The following are the ISBAO sales reported through 1 September 2013 with comparative data sales for the full years of 2005- 2012.

MEMBER ASSOCIATION	IS-BAO SALES									
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	1 JANUARY - 1 SEPT 2013	TOTAL TO DATE
ABAA (Australia)					1	1	2		1	5
ABAG (Brazil)	-	0	0	0						3
AsBAA (Asia)						1	4	3		8
BBGA (UK)	2	0	2	8	2	10	8	7	4	54
BAASA (S. Africa)	--	0	2	0	1					5
BAOA (India)									2	2
CBAA (Canada)	2	3	1	0	1	3	5	7	3	31
EBAA (Europe)	4	2	0	9	6	18	10			62
EBAA-F (France)	-	2	0	0						5
GBAA Germany	1	1	1	2	4	1	4	1		17
JBAA (Japan)	-	0	0	0					1	6
IBAA (Italy)					2					2
MEBAA (Middle East)					2	15	7	4	5	32
NBAA (USA)	115	60	115	105	172	400	170	110	50	1577
RUBAA (Russia)						2	2	2		6
BHA										
EHA										
HAI								18	7	25
Baldwin Aviation							8	3		11
Total	124	68	121	124	191	451	220	155	73	1852

**Discussion:**

Jim Cannon, John Sheehan, Sonnie Bates and Larry Fletcher briefed the ISBAO Standards Board as to the activities during 2013 dealing with Manual Sales, Operator registration, Auditor credentialing and Workshop attendance.



**Attachment to Agenda Item 7 – Accredited Auditors**

**Accredited Auditors\***

<b>State</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>
Argentina	0	0	1	1	Oman	0	1	1	1
Australia	4	5	5	9	Philippines	0	1	1	0
Austria	0	0	1	5	Russia	1	5	5	3
Belgium	0	0	1	1	Saudi Arabia	0	1	1	3
Bermuda	1	1	1	0	Singapore	0	0	1	2
Brazil	2	5	8	10	South Africa	1	1	1	0
Canada	7	11	12	15	Spain	2	2	2	2
Caymans	1	1	1	1	Switzerland	6	9	12	14
China/HK	2	2	3	7	Thailand	0	0	0	1
France	0	0	0	2	Trinidad	0	0	0	1
Germany	2	6	8	6	UAE	1	3	4	5
India	0	3	4	6	UK	18	20	18	24
Italy	1	1	3	2	USA	182	243	276	342
Japan	1	1	1	1	Venezuela	1	1	0	1
Luxembourg	2	2	2	1					
Malta	0	0	0	1					
Netherlands	0	0	0	1					
Nigeria	1	1	1	0	<b>Total</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>327</b>	<b>374</b>	<b>468</b>

\* October-September for the year indicated (currently through September 20, 2013)

**Noteworthy:**

- > 67 auditors did not renew their accreditation at the end of calendar year 2012  
This number will likely increase to above 100 at the end of 2013.
- > Auditors population increased 20% in 2013.
- > 73% of auditors are based in the US.



**Attachment to Agenda Item 7 – Registered Operators**

**Registered Operators\***

State	2010	2011	2012	2013	State	2010	2011	2012	2013
Australia	1	4	5	6	Malaysia	1	2	3	4
Austria	0	4	4	3	Malta	0	1	1	0
Bahrain	0	1	2	3	Netherlands	1	1	1	1
Belgium	0	1	1	1	Portugal	1	1	1	1
Bermuda	5	5	5	5	Qatar	0	1	1	1
Brazil	2	5	10	11	Russia	1	5	8	9
British Virgin	0	2	2	2	Saudi Arabia	2	5	6	8
Canada	3	4	8	10	Singapore	1	1	1	3
Cayman	0	4	4	4	Slovakia	0	0	1	1
China	2	6	9	8	Slovenia	1	1	1	1
Costa Rica	0	0	1	1	South Africa	2	2	2	2
Egypt	0	2	2	0	Switzerland	6	9	10	14
Germany	5	11	11	14	UAE	2	2	4	5
Greece	1	2	2	1	Ukraine	0	1	1	1
Indonesia	2	2	2	1	UK	9	10	14	15
Italy	1	3	3	3	USA	257	452	517	557
Jamaica	0	1	1	1					
Japan	1	1	1	2					
Jordan	0	1	1	1	<b>Total</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>553</b>	<b>666</b>	<b>701</b>

\*

October-September for the year indicated (currently through September 20, 2013)

**Registered Operators by Stage**

Stage	2011	2012	2013
1	397	397	338
2	104	188	254
3	52	81	109

**Noteworthy:**

- > Total registrants increased 5% compared to a year ago
- > Non-US registrants comprise 20% of the total
- > Registrants are from 35 States
- > 293 audits were conducted during the past year
- > 33 registrants either ceased/merged operations or failed to renew during the past year.





**Agenda No. – 8 - ISBAO Workshop Schedule**

The following are the results for workshops for calendar year 2007-2013.

2013 has been a tremendous year for workshop attendance. During the period 2011 thru September 2013 the workshops have averaged 10 attendees per workshop. During 2013 the numbers of workshops were increased by 65% and the average attendance per workshop remained at 10. The level of interest in the new format of the Fundamentals of ISBAO and the ISBAO Auditor workshops, active marketing by IBAC member associations, and the request by many operators to host ISBAO workshops, all attributed to the success of the 2013 ISBAO workshop program.

Year	Workshop Events	New Auditors	Renewal Auditors	Other	Total Attendees
2007	9	15	30	90	135
2008	14	19	23	106	148
2009	22	52	37	243	332
2010	42	241	52	383	676
2011	38	202	66	120	388
2012	40	135	159	125	419
2013	66	230	172	257	659

2013 Complete Jan - Sep	46	170	102	187	459
2013 Remaining Sep - Dec	20	60(est)	70(est)	70(est)	200(est)

<b>2013 Workshops Remaining (20)</b>	
<b>Dates</b>	<b>Location of Workshops</b>
Sep 5, 6, 2013	Universal Weather & Aviation, Stansted, Essex, UK
Sep 17, 18, 2013	FedEX Corporate, Memphis, TN
Sep 19, 20, 2013	Air Methods, Aurora, CO
Oct 1, 2, 2013	CAE, Whippany, NJ
Oct 8, 9, 2013	EBAA Regional Forum, Istanbul, Turkey
Nov 5, 6, 2013	Swift Aviation, Phoenix, AZ
Nov 15, 16, 2013	Hilton Hotel, Dubai, UAE
Nov 19, 20, 2013	Universal Weather & Aviation, Houston, TX
Dec 3, 4, 2013	FlightSafety International, Atlanta, GA
Dec 10, 11, 2013	Wiggins Airways, Manchester, NH



ISBAO Workshop Schedule for 2014

Dates		
Jan-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	New Orleans, LA
Jan-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	Fort Lauderdale, FL
Feb-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	Daytona Beach, FL
Feb-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	Anaheim, CA
Feb-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	TBD (Italy, Sweden, France)
Mar-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	Manchester, NH
Mar-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	San Diego, CA
Mar-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	Tampa, FL
Apr-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	Shanghai, China
Apr-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	Atlanta, GA
May-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	Geneva, Switzerland
May-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	San Diego, CA
May-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	Manchester, NH
Jun-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	CBAA
Jun-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	San Antonio, TX
Jun-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	Morristown, NJ
Jul-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	Cincinnati, OH
Jul-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	Alexandria, VA
Jul-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	Manchester, NH
Aug-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	Sao Paulo, Brazil
Aug-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	Atlanta, GA
Sep-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	TBD (Italy, Sweden, France)
Sep-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	San Diego, CA
Sep-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	Manchester, NH
Oct-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	Morristown, NJ
Oct-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	UK TBD
Nov-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	TBD (Italy, Sweden, France)
Nov-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	Houston, TX
Dec-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	Atlanta, GA
Dec-14	Fundamentals / Auditing	Dubai, UAE

**Discussion:**

Sonnie Bates, ISBAO Operations Manager provided a thorough briefing on the workshop program results during 2013 year to date.



**Agenda No. – 9 – Amendments to IS-BAO Standard and Audit Procedures Manual**

**Decision: Refer to Appendix A of SB 14 Decision Record.**

**Agenda No. - 10 - Other Business**

**Decision:**

A motion was made to approve the revised APM 8.1, SMS evaluation and the subsequent changes to APM Chapter 5 that were presented to SB 14. Len Beauchmein offered the motion to adopt and Carl Evans seconded. The proposal was unanimously agree to.

Larry Fletcher reviewed the Auditor Monitor process which included 9 monitors year to date and 5 remaining.

**Agenda No. – 11 – Next Meeting**

**Decision:**

The next formal ISBAO Standards Board Meeting SB15 is scheduled to commence at 8:00 AM on October 20, 2014 in Orlando, Florida. An interim conference call will be conducted mid-year 2014, the date and time to be announced by the Chairman.

**Agenda No. – 12 - Adjournment**

The Chairman seeing that there was no other business to be conducted by SB 13, thanked each of the members of the board, the ISBAO management team, and those observers in attendance for their preparation and participation, and adjourned the meeting at 2:50 PM.



## Appendix A to Agenda Item 9

# ISBAO and Audit Procedures Manual Amendments

<u>Table of Content</u>	<u>Page</u>
ISBAO Manual Revision Decisions	13
Audit Procedures Manual Revision Decisions	22



<b>ISBAO Revision Issues</b>				
<b>Issue/Suggestion</b>	<b>Analysis/Recommendation</b>	<b>Document</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Decision</b>
Protocols refer to elements instead of chapters. There should be consistency between the ISBAO and protocols.	<p><b>Analysis:</b> Consistency between the Protocols and the ISBAO is essential.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Modify the titles in the ISBAO to “Chapter”, i.e. “Chapter 3”. Put this in the header. Do the same for the protocols.</p>	ISBAO	All	Agree
The SMS should include Root Cause Analysis (5-Whys Fishbone method) and tracking of contributing factors	<p><b>Analysis:</b> Root cause analysis is an essential part of ensuring effectiveness of reactive hazard/occurrence reporting. Without a proper root cause analysis, the organization is at risk of addressing symptoms instead of the cause.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Add note in ISBAO 3.2.2”For reactive reporting the operator should have a root cause analysis procedure.</p>	ISBAO	3.2.2	Disagree - No Change to ISBAO. Instead add this note to implementation guidance material.
This section of the ISBAO is neither a standard nor recommended practice. It is merely a note that appears to have outlived its purpose.	<p><b>Analysis:</b> This note does not directly support an ISBAO/ICAO standard or recommended practice. Although it may be prudent for HR departments to consider it, having a section in the ISBAO just for this note is not warranted.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Remove the note.</p>	ISBAO	3.5	Agree
4.1.2 Note and GM4.1 (2.5.2: Safety Officer Qualifications) make this impractical for all but large, mature flight departments.	<p><b>Analysis:</b> The last sentence of the note related to ISBAO 4.1.2 indicates that a safety officer may be required. However, ISBAO 3.2.1.c requires a SM.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Delete the last sentence in note related to ISBAO 4.1.2.</p>	ISBAO	4.1.2	Agree



**DECISION RECORD  
ISBAO STANDARDS BOARD 14**

**LAS VEGAS, NV  
OCTOBER 21, 2013**

<p>Fatigue risk management is important to everyone in the organization. ISBAO Chapter 4 addresses topics that are related to the organization as a whole. Therefore, FRM guidance should be in chapter 4.</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> If FRM is removed from Chapter 6 and chapter 9 protocols, it may be overlooked during audits. This is why it was added to Chapter 9 protocols, i.e. to ensure that maintenance personnel are covered as well. If FRM guidance were added to Chapter 4 to indicate that it applies to the entire organization, while leaving the current guidance in Chapters 6 &amp; 9, then the risk of overlooking this critical guidance during an audit would be mitigated.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Add RP 4.8 A FRM Program</p> <p><i>“The operator should develop and maintain a program to assess and manage the inherent risks associated with fatigue for all personnel. The program should include all the elements as required for aircrew members and maintenance personnel as described in Section 6.13.”(Recommended Practice)</i></p>	<p>ISBAO</p>	<p>4.8</p>	<p>Agree</p>
<p>Change 5.1.3.a. (iv) to read: “annual” first aid training for flight crew members Change 5.1.3.b (i) to include “c. first aid training” [annual requirement vs biannual] Add note to 5.1.3 after a. and b. and the bottom of 5.3.2: “<i>Note: It is recommended that CPR training be included into first aid training when possible.</i>” Add elaborate procedures for Travel Health in 6.14</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> Annual first aid training for flight crew members may be slightly more burdensome for the operator, however the crew members will be more proficient in this critical skill. CPR training is an essential part of first aid training. Therefore, recommending it be added as ISBAO 5.3.2 would be prudent. The proposed requirements for ISBAO 6.14 are too prescriptive.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Change 5.1.3(a), 5.1.3(b), and add note 5.3.2 as suggested. No change to 6.14.</p>	<p>ISBAO</p>	<p>5.1.3</p>	<p>Add the term “periodic” to 5.1.3 (a) iv  5.1.3(b): No change  Add note 5.3.2 as recommended.  No change to 6.14.</p>
<p>ISBAO 6.2.3: Add “The operator shall establish procedures to ensure that:” before sub-sections (a) and (b) to reinforce the need for procedures to support policy.</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> ISBAO is quality centric and therefore to clarify the need to establish procedures and processes support the basic philosophy of the Standard.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Add the phrase as suggested.</p>	<p>ISBAO</p>	<p>6.2.3</p>	<p>Agree</p>
<p>ISBAO 6.2.6 is too prescriptive and may conflict with CAA regulations.</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> Current wording in ISBAO 6.2.6 appears to be verbatim from the somewhat dated Annex 6 P2, Attachment 2 guidance. It is prescriptive versus performance-based.</p>	<p>ISBAO</p>	<p>6.2.6</p>	<p>Agree</p>



	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Modify 6.2.6 to read similar to the ICAO Standard (performance-based) Annex 6 Part 2 section 2.2.3.8. This will place the burden on the operator to develop procedures versus making it another PIC duty.</p> <p>ISBAO 6.2.6 Oxygen Supply Requirements:</p> <p>The operator shall have a procedure to ensure that a flight is not commenced unless a sufficient quantity of stored breathing oxygen is carried to supply all crew members and passengers in accordance with the national regulations of the State of Registry.</p>			
<p>ISBAO 6.4.5: Clarity and emphasis needed regarding approach ban procedures.</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> Annex 6 Part 2, Section 2.2.4.1 and Annex 6 Part 3, Section 2.4.1.1 include standards that restrict continuing the approach if outside the OM or above 1000' above the aerodrome if the visibility is less than the specified minima. ISBAO 6.4.5 is somewhat vague, and many operators are not sure if it implies the restrictions stated above.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Modify 6.4.5 to read:</p> <p>6.4.5 (a) Operators shall establish procedures to restrict continuing an approach beyond the outer marker for precision approach or below 1000 feet above the aerodrome for a non-precision approach if the reported visibility is less than the specified minima. These procedures shall include actions for the flight crew to take if the visibility is reported less than specified minima after passing the outer marker for precision approaches or below 1000 feet above the aerodrome for non-precision approaches.</p> <p>6.4.5 (b) The operator may allow deviations from these procedures if the State of Registry and State of Operation allows. However, in any case, the aircraft shall not continue its approach-to-land beyond a point at which the limits of the aerodrome or heliport operating minima would be infringed.</p> <p>6.4.5 (c) Whenever such deviations occur, the flight crew shall file a safety occurrence report to include the details of the event and the outcome.</p>	<p>ISBAO</p>	<p>6.4.5</p>	<p>Agree</p>



**DECISION RECORD  
ISBAO STANDARDS BOARD 14**

**LAS VEGAS, NV  
OCTOBER 21, 2013**

<p>ISBAO 6.4.6 is a standard that describes a requirement of basic instrument flying and should be deleted.</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> This standard is related directly to the FAA Safety Info Letter 11009 dated March 28, 2011. This letter warns pilots of descending below MSA when following GS guidance outside the OM.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Remove the standard and associated note since it does, in fact, simply reinforce a basic requirement of instrument flying.</p>	<p>ISBAO</p>	<p>6.4.6</p>	<p>Agree</p>
<p>ISBAO 6.5.2 should be presented before 6.5.1. In the current location it appears to be related only to CAT II and III ops, when it is not.</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> Many auditor overlook 6.5.2 as it appears to be related, due to its location, only to CAT II/III operations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Switch numbering label of 6.5.2 to 6.5.1. Change current 6.5.1 to 6.5.2.</p>	<p>ISBAO</p>	<p>6.5.1</p>	<p>Agree</p>
<p>ISBAO 6.6 Should be modified to reflect more contemporary requirements related to PBN.</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> The current wording does not include references to PBN, ADS, and CPDLC.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Modify 6.6, 6.6.1 and 6.6.2 to read:</p> <p>6.6 Special Communications, Navigation, and Surveillance (CNS) Requirements and Approvals</p> <p>6.6.1 Prior to operations in airspace where special CNS requirements exist such as Performance Based Navigation (PBN) Specifications, Minimum Navigation Performance Specification (MNPS), Reduced Vertical Separation Minimums (RVSM), Controller Pilot Data Link Communication (CPDLC), or Automatic Dependent Surveillance (ADS) B/C, an operator shall have a process to ensure that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the aircraft and operator has been authorized by the State of Registry and, if required, the State of Operations;</li> <li>b. the aircraft meets the aircraft system, airworthiness, continuing airworthiness (including maintenance personnel training) and operational requirements for the operations concerned; and</li> <li>c. continuing RVSM height monitoring requirements have been met</li> </ol>	<p>ISBAO</p>	<p>6.6.1</p>	<p>Agree</p>





	<p>6.6.2 Flight crews engaged in operations in airspace where special CNS requirements apply (i.e. PBN, RVSM, MNPS, CPDLC, ADS - must be so authorized by an appropriately authorized manager. To be considered qualified to be so authorized, each flight crew member must have completed training in the subject areas as required by the specific State authorizations and as necessary to ensure competency in operations in such airspace. Such authorizations shall be included in the pilot training records.</p> <p><i>Note 1: For further information on Performance Based Navigation, operators should review ICAO's guidance at:</i>  <a href="http://www.icao.int/safety/pbn/Pages/default.aspx">http://www.icao.int/safety/pbn/Pages/default.aspx</a></p> <p><i>Note 2: For information on global Communications, Navigation, and Surveillance systems planning, operators should review ICAO Doc 9750, Global Air Navigation Plan at:</i>  <a href="http://www.icao.int/publications/Documents/9750/3ed_en.pdf">http://www.icao.int/publications/Documents/9750/3ed_en.pdf</a></p>			
<p>Add "all" to 6.11.5.d so the operators and auditors know what is required.</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> By not indicating "all" many operators and auditors ask questions such as, "Does this include the first aid kit, the AED, etc.?" However, if making the requirement include "all" emergency equipment, the many operators will have to modify their briefing cards accordingly.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Modify 6.11.5d to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d. the location of other emergency equipment on board the aircraft in accordance with the State of Registry requirements.</li> </ul>	<p>ISBAO</p>	<p>6.11.5.d</p>	<p>Agree</p>



**DECISION RECORD  
ISBAO STANDARDS BOARD 14**

**LAS VEGAS, NV  
OCTOBER 21, 2013**

<p>Add guidance to address top safety issues in our industry such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• manual flying skills proficiency management,</li> <li>• stabilized approach criteria,</li> <li>• runway excursion prevention,</li> <li>• upset recovery proficiency, and</li> <li>• automation management.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> Adding performance-based recommendations related to these issues will encourage both operators and auditors to address these common concerns.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Add Recommended Practice 6.21:</p> <p>Pilot Competency in Key Safety Areas</p> <p><i>The operator should establish procedures and training requirements to ensure each pilot maintains competency in key safety areas such as:</i></p> <p><i>a) Manual Flying Skills</i> <i>b) Stabilized Approaches</i> <i>c) Runway Excursion Prevention</i> <i>d) Upset Recovery</i> <i>e) Automation Management</i></p>	ISBAO	6.21	Agree
<p>Chapter 7 title should be modified to be “International Operations” since Chapter 6 addresses requirements in airspace with special Communications, Navigation, and Surveillance (CNS) requirements.</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> Because sections 7.3 and 7.4 repeat the requirements in section 6.6 and are recommended to be removed, leaving the chapter to address International Operations only, then the title should be modified accordingly.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Modify title of Chapter 7 Title and Section 7.1 as follows:</p> <p>7.0 International Operations</p> <p>7.1 International Airspace</p> <p>The territory of a State is deemed to be the land area and territorial waters adjacent thereto under the sovereign protection of such State. The airspace above such land and water is sovereign airspace. For the purpose of this chapter, all airspace outside the territory of a State is referred to as international airspace.</p> <p>The operator shall establish procedures to ensure that when operating in the sovereign airspace of a State other than the State of Registry, the flight crew shall identify and apply the most restrictive requirements regarding the State of</p>	ISBAO	7.0 7.1	Agree



	<p>Registry and the State where the operations are being conducted. The rules in force relating to flight and manoeuvre of aircraft when operating outside the airspace of any sovereign state, i.e. oceanic or high seas, must be in accordance with ICAO Annex 2, Rules of the Air.”</p>			
<p>Chapter 7 should be modified so that it does not repeat the requirements of 6.6.1 and 6.6.2.</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> ISBAO 6.6.1 and 6.6.2 address approvals and preflight requirements before operating into PBN, RVSM, RNAV, MNPS, and other special use airspace. Having requirements in both chapter 6 and 7 leads to confusion and inefficiencies for both operators and auditors.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Remove references to special use airspace requirements from 7.3 and delete 7.4 in its entirety.</p>	<p>ISBAO</p>	<p>7.3 7.4</p>	<p>Agree</p>
<p>8.6.1 Ensures helicopters engaged in offshore operations further than 25 nm from land fitted with a permanent, or rapidly deployable, means of flotation. Specifying 25 nautical miles may be introducing potential for conflict (for example the requirements for the UK Overseas Territories apply the same threshold here as for commercial air transport, ie. 10 min at normal cruise speed).</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> This relates to the Standard 4.3.1 in Annex 6 Part III, Section III (General Aviation) which applies when “flying at a distance from land specified by the appropriate State authority” Annex 6 Part III does not stipulate 25nm distance. Instead, it addresses the 10 min at normal cruise speed.)</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Revise 8.6.1 to read:</p> <p>8.6.1 All helicopters shall be fitted with a permanent, or rapidly deployable, means of flotation so as to ensure a safe ditching of the helicopter when engaged in any overwater operations where the helicopter flight crew is likely to be forced to execute a ditching maneuver in the case of a power-plant failure.</p>	<p>ISBAO</p>	<p>8.6.1</p>	<p>Agree</p>



**DECISION RECORD**  
**ISBAO STANDARDS BOARD 14**

**LAS VEGAS, NV**  
**OCTOBER 21, 2013**

<p>9.1.2 Should provide more clarity on the operator’s responsibility to provide oversight of the CAMO.</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> This section applies only to EASA CAMO certified operations. EASA stipulates oversight responsibility as the owner’s or lessee’s for private operations and the operator’s for commercial operations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Add the following notes to 9.1.2:  <i>Note 1: It is the owner's/lessee's/operator's (as applicable) responsibility to take all appropriate actions to ensure adequate oversight of the contracted CAMO for the continued airworthiness of its aircraft/fleet. See IG 9.1.2 for more information.</i>  <i>Note 2: The CAMO oversight process should be integrated into the compliance monitoring system required by ISBAO 3.3.1.</i></p>	<p>ISBAO</p>	<p>9</p>	<p>Agee</p>
<p>There is no standard to provide guidance to operators for protecting maintenance employees who occasionally “work alone”.</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> This is a very common risk and is discussed at many workshops as a concern.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b>          Make a standard:          9.1.4.(n): Procedures to manage the risks associated with maintenance personnel working alone. These procedures shall include the requirement for a risk assessment.</p>	<p>ISBAO</p>	<p>9.1.4.n</p>	<p>Add 9.1.4.n, except delete the second sentence so that a risk assessment is not required.</p>
<p>9.1.11 Needs to be modified to add clarity and remove repetition of other standards.</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b>          Human factors requirement embedded in the paragraph leads to confusion about the entire section. The HF requirement should be listed in sub-elements with other requirements.          9.1.11 a appears to echo 9.1.4.d          9.1.11.c repeats 9.1.8          9.1.11.e repeats, in essence, 9.1.4.d</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b>          9.1.11 An operator of turbojet-engined aeroplanes or those with a maximum takeoff mass exceeding 5 700 kg or any aircraft engaged in commercial operations, shall ensure the maintenance program:          a. observes Human Factors principles according to the State</p>	<p>ISBAO</p>	<p>9</p>	<p>Agree</p>



**DECISION RECORD**  
**ISBAO STANDARDS BOARD 14**

**LAS VEGAS, NV**  
**OCTOBER 21, 2013**

	<p>of Registry’s guidance material;</p> <p>b. includes, if applicable, a continuing structural integrity programme; and</p> <p>c. includes, when applicable and approved by the State of Registry, condition monitoring and reliability programme descriptions for aircraft systems, components and powerplants.</p>			
<p>12.2 There is an error in Note 1, the last sentence seems to be unrelated to the paragraph.</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> The last sentence is actually related. However, due to the structure of the sentence it is not completely obvious.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Delete the last sentence of Note 1.</p>	<p>ISBAO</p>	<p>12.2</p>	<p>Agree</p>
<p>Change the wording in 13.3 to cover any person</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> Chapter 9 covers maintenance personnel with the new changes. Chapter 13 covers all employees, not just maintenance.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Change “aircraft maintenance technicians” to “any person”</p>	<p>ISBAO</p>	<p>13.3</p>	<p>Agree</p>



### Audit Procedures Manual Revision Issues

Issue/Suggestion	Analysis/Recommendation	Document	Section	Decision
APM Section 1: Add definition for significant risk	<p><b>Analysis:</b> The term “significant risk” is utilized numerous times in the APM to indicate the presence of a Major Non-conformity. However, many auditors ask for the definition of this term.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Place a note after the definition of Major Non-Conformity in Ch 1.</p> <p><i>Note: A significant risk to safety is any risk identified as moderate or high via the methodologies described in ICAO Doc 9859, Safety Management Manual.</i></p>	APM	1.3	Agree
APM 3.4.2 Some auditors may be performing audits on operators which speak a language in which the auditor is not proficient on speaking or, more importantly, reading.	<p><b>Analysis:</b> There is currently no policy or guidance to govern this.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p>Add 3.4.2 c. as follows: “The auditor shall only audit operators whose language the governing and technical documents are in is one in which they can speak and read, unless they utilize the services of a language specialist, who must be part of the audit team.”</p>	APM	3.4.2	Agree
APM 3.5. The period of auditor accreditation should be shown, i.e., 2 years from the date of training.	<p><b>Analysis:</b> Section 3.5 does not accurately reflect the requirements stipulated in Policy Letter 2012-2, Auditor Currency Requirements.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p>Change 3.5.1 (e) and (f) to reflect the policy letter more clearly to show “24 months”. Add 3.5.4 to show currency requirements of PL 2012-2.</p>	APM	3.5	Agree



<p>APM 3.6 Clarify that we are talking about HAI HMSS</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> There is room for clarity, especially in the second sentence to ensure the reader understands that this information is referring to HAI’s auditor accreditation process.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> add HAI as appropriate</p>	<p>APM</p>	<p>3.6</p>	<p>Agree</p>
<p>APM 3.10.3 Underline the importance of submitting the audit report (and/or other renewal document) within the two weeks following the audit.</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> The operator has 30 days to develop and submit a remedial action plan to address findings. Therefore, the auditor must be allowed enough time to account for this.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b>  Add to 3.10.3, “Auditors must submit the completed report to IBAC within 5 weeks from the closing meeting.”</p>	<p>APM</p>	<p>3.10.3</p>	<p>Agree</p>
<p>Conflict of Interest clarity needed in the APM</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> This is often debated during workshops. Auditors ask for more clarity for how they should proceed if they want to provide insight into risk mitigation in certain areas.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b>  Modify 3.11.2 to read:  “.... should not disqualify them from conducting future audits.  <i>When offering strategic guidance, the auditor may present two or more options without indicating a bias toward one. For example, the auditor may point out that fatigue management guidance is located in the ISBAO Implementation Guide, the ISBAO Generic Company Operations Manual (GCOM), and on various websites. However, if the auditor offers opinion or outright assistance, they have crossed the line and provided consulting services.</i></p> <p>Therefore, auditors must govern...”</p>	<p>APM</p>	<p>3.11.2</p>	<p>Agree</p>



<p>Propose that we add guidance for conducting renewal audits so that the auditor checks for changes to ISBAO over the past two years and previous Non-conformities.</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> APM 7.2.1 states that findings from previous audits are a starting point for renewal audits. This should be indicated in chapter 4 for audit procedures. Also, checking to see if the operator has implemented the changes to the ISBAO requirements since the last audit is an effective way to see how the operator’s quality systems are operating.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Add 4.4.4 4.4.4 For renewal audits the auditor should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Obtain the previous audit documentation from the operator to ensure that all non-conformities have been rectified effectively. If the operator does not have a copy of the audit, the auditor may ask the operator to obtain a copy from IBAC. (IBAC will not send a copy of the audit directly to the auditor.)</li> <li>2. Review of all the ISBAO standards and recommended practices that have been incorporated since the last assessment to ensure the operator has effectively updated their policies, processes, procedures, and programs to reflect these changes.</li> </ol>	<p>APM</p>	<p>4.4.4</p>	<p>Agree</p>
<p>The SMS Audit Protocol and associated assessment procedures should be better aligned with ICAO.</p> <p>Utilize performance criteria statements found in ICAO SMM Doc 9859 and/or SM-ICG SMS Evaluation Tool.</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> Current SMS Audit Protocol assesses 13 items for Sound, Appropriate, and Effective. Although the 4 Components required by ICAO are reflected in this protocol directly or indirectly, the 12 Elements required by ICAO are not. However, the detailed protocols do reflect the 4 Components and 12 Elements. Currently, the operator (for an internal audit) and auditor must utilize both sets of protocols to ensure: 1) the ICAO framework exists (detailed protocols) and 2) the SMS is maturing and performing effectively. This is inefficient and, in the case of the SMS Audit Protocol with 13 items not aligned with ICAO, not as effective as it should be.</p>	<p>APM</p>	<p>5.8</p>	<p>Agree</p>





	<p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Delete the SMS Audit Protocol which is embedded in the Audit Report Form.</li> <li>2) Add performance indicators for soundness, appropriateness, and effectiveness to the detailed protocols.</li> <li>3) Modify APM 5.8 to provide guidance on how to evaluate the SMS with the modified protocols.</li> <li>4) The SMS performance indicators shall reflect industry recognized criteria indicated in the ISBAO APM Section 5.8, ICAO SMM Doc 9859, and/or the Safety Management International Collaboration Group (SMICG) SMS Evaluation Tool.</li> </ol>			
<p>Auditors are not filling out the Audit Report form correcting. If they indicate “Action Required” non-conformities, then “Full Conformity” should NOT be checked.</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> Many auditors are checking the “Full Conformity” block on the audit report form even if there were non-conformities indicated and documented in accordance with APM 6.2.3, i.e. not on a finding form.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Add to the end of 6.2.3, “Full Conformity” should not be selected on the Audit Report Form if there are any instances of non-conformities, regardless of how they are documented, i.e. on the Finding forms or in Analysis of Non-conformities block.</p>	<p>APM</p>	<p>6.2.3</p>	<p>Agree</p>
<p>The amount of work required from the auditors for a finding is perceived as somewhat onerous. Examples in the APM would help.</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> There are currently no examples in the APM for how to document a finding. Most audits with findings are not documented properly.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Provide examples of how to document findings in APM.</p>	<p>APM</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>Agree</p>



**DECISION RECORD**  
**ISBAO STANDARDS BOARD 14**

**LAS VEGAS, NV**  
**OCTOBER 21, 2013**

<p>If NA, then a comment should be required to explain “why”</p>	<p><b>Analysis:</b> Audit items are often marked NA with no indication of why they are NA. Upon further review and questioning, some auditors realize that the element was applicable. By having to state the reason why an item is NA, should help to prevent an inadvertent NA assessment.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Add the following to the end of 7.1.4: The auditor shall provide a comment of reason for any protocol element indicated as “NA”.</p>	<p>APM</p>	<p>7.1.4</p>	<p>Agree</p>
--	---	------------	--------------	--------------