

## OFFSHORE HELICOPTER SAFETY LEADERSHIP GROUP (OHSLG)

Document : Meeting Minutes

Date : Wednesday 11<sup>th</sup> November 2020

Location : Virtual Meeting

Present: Mark Abbey (CHC) – Co-Chair  
Rob Bishton (CAA) – Co-Chair  
Rick Newson (CAA)  
David Malins (CAA)  
Steve Rae (Step Change in Safety)  
Derek Whatling (BALPA)  
Matt Rhodes (Bristow)  
Trevor Stapleton (OGUK)  
Grant Campbell (Shell)  
Colin Cheesewright (Chrysaor)  
Ian Cooke (Babcock)  
Mike Gislam (NHV)  
Sue Fay (CHC)  
Douglas Barnes (AAIB)  
Lorraine Smith (CHC) – Secretariat  
Matt Smith (CAA) – in part  
Mike Turner (Oakland Consulting) – in part  
David Kendrick (CAA) – in part

Apologies:

Kirstin Gove (Step Change in Safety)  
Alan Combe (BP / IOGP)  
Jake Molloy (RMT)  
Jamie Carson (Scottish Government)  
Shauna Wright (Unite the Union)

### Welcome and introductions – Co-Chairs

Rob Bishton (RB) thanked the Board for everyone's time and attendance. Rob has been mindful of the work that has been done previously and made note of Mark's involvement in CAP 1145 and the time he has invested in the Group. Rob said great work has been done by the Group and that was the reason he took role of Co-Chair. Rob noted it has been a difficult few months to engage fully but has been helped by Rick, Dave, Mark and Mike Turner and looks forward to fully supporting the Group going forward.

Mark Abbey (MA) thanked Rob for his opening remarks. Mark added that it is Remembrance Day and we would be observing 2 minutes silence at 11am.

## Agreement of Previous Minutes

Agreed as read.

## Previous Agenda Items

The previous actions were reviewed and updated, as per the action log. Where there was a wider discussion, details are provided in the notes section.

Item	Detail	Responsible	Notes
19.2.3	Host a workshop looking at helideck certification audits updates.	Rick Newson	Unable to get offshore. Remain on agenda.
19.3.1	Wrong Deck Landings	Rick Newson / Trevor Stapleton	RN / TS updated the Group. Further update at next meeting.
20.1.1	OHSLG Funding	All	Update of progress at next meeting.
20.2.4.1	Prospect Representation	Ian Cooke	Update. No further action.

### 19.2.3 Helideck Certification Audits - Rick Newson (RN)

Rick advised no-one has been able to get offshore in the present climate. Agreed to leave this item on the agenda.

### 19.3.1 Wrong Deck Landings – Rick Newson / Trevor Stapleton (TS)

TS advised that they were working on a strobe light trial but due to current circumstances has not progressed.

Heli-Offshore are doing work on this also, and TS will reach out to Tim Rolfe. RN was also to check if we could get an O&G operator on the Helidecks steering group.

RN agreed this was discussed at the HTC and has also spoken with Tim Rolfe. The wrong deck landing material has been reviewed and published on their website.

RN advised the CAA safety survey for the last two years is about to be published on their website and there is reference to wrong deck landings. The most significant element of wrong deck landings is flight management system input output to visual acquisition of landing phase.

The IKO designators go a long way to addressing the FMS function. When IKO designators are available and in an AIP format it can then go into the database acquisition system to be picked up by the FMS database providers. This will be achieved through position and radio frequencies. Heli-offshore are fully engaged and a further meeting is scheduled for December.

Grant Campbell (GC) advised that John Parker from BP is part of the Heli-offshore helideck working group and is a good person to join this. Rick agreed. GC to speak with Alan Combe.

It was agreed that the helideck steering group is responsible for leading this project as it can be driven through the data in the AIP system.

Further updates to the Group will be given at next quarterly meeting.

#### 20.1.1 OHSLG Funding

Steve Rae (SR) has confirmed that Stepchange could help with regular funding for Communications work within the Group and was thanked for his support.

Rick is due to meet the DfT safety board and will put OHSLG funding on the agenda. It may be likely to have to go to them with options and detail the benefits associated with safety opportunities.

Rob Bishton (RB) also suggested funding may be available for the GHOST work that is being carried out, and will discuss internally to see if this is possible.

MA asked if further updates on these potential funding opportunities can be given at the next meeting.

#### 20.2.4.1 Prospect Representation

Ian Cooke (IC) advised that Prospect do not represent passengers offshore and the Group agreed it is fully covered by Union representation at present.

MA also noted that Jake Molloy (JM) although unable to join at present is still committed to the Group.

#### New Actions

New items were discussed and added for action. Where there was a wider discussion, details are provided in the notes section.

Item	Action Details	Responsible	Notes
20.4.4	Communication resource availability	ALL	SF and SR to have offline meeting re intern resource. MR to check with his media team.
20.4.5	Effectiveness recommendations	ALL	Discuss outcomes from MT and decide what will be included in the agenda going forward.
20.4.7.1	Tenure of Chair	ALL	To be discussed.
20.4.7.2	OGUK alignment with IOGP 690	Grant Campbell / ALL	To be discussed.

#### 20.4.1 GHOST Update

RN invited Matt Smith (MS) (Public Safety Inspector at CAA) to give the Group an update on GHOST.

The inspectorate are looking after helidecks and rotary. Mario Ranito (Dangerous Goods Inspector) was the sole point of contact and was primarily involved with the helideck oversight. Mario has since resigned and Matt will be looking after ground safety and helidecks, supported also by Felipe Brites (Dangerous Goods Inspector). An addition four inspectors are also trained to go offshore.

Primarily, the team are working on fixed wing but there are offshore, rotary and human factors subgroups. It is represented from all areas of industry including Europe and North America.

Intention now is to look closely at the work currently being done.

Addendum to CAP437 (Inbound Flight Preparation). This is two years of work to establish the standardisation of procedures under which all aspects of the inbound flight preparation should be performed. This has been produced with the support of all the operators looking at pre-flight, in flight and post flight handling of passengers, their baggage and the cargo.

It is the intention to start conducting industry workshops, working with operators to raise standards of handling both onshore and offshore. Top risks are:-

- Lithium batteries, PED's
- Articles, substances
- Information communication to passengers
- Briefings of passengers
- Marking of exits
- 100% screening / baggage
- Dangerous goods

Regulatory oversight requirements will still be done along with more heavy deck inspections. Overseeing certification processes will also be checked. RN wants to work towards CAA certification of helidecks.

GHOST commitments:-

- Output checks
- Helideck inspections / certification procedures and certificates
- Respond to hazards
- Certification of helidecks

Matt Rhodes (MR) asked for a general feeling of the service the HCA are providing, however MS admitted that his exposure has been limited and currently has difficulty getting offshore in the present climate.

RN added that Mario was engaged in a programme predominantly for dangerous goods focus and whilst offshore he also conducted some ground ops oversight functions in accordance with HOFO. It is recognised that the two yearly programme of certification oversight that HCA is supposed to apply is not being fulfilled that well at the moment. The CAA are engaged in the process of oversight within the system of the certification as published on the website and agreed to achieve this from an oversight perspective of HOFO compliance.

There have been a number of low level events which have been identified, many of which are possibly down to coronavirus and inspections are not taking place as often or as effectively. However, the engagement and interaction between the HCA and the helicopter operators is as strong as it has been in the past albeit with room for improvement.

Colin Cheesewright (CC) asked if there was the intention of 100% bag checks offshore, or working towards this.

MS advised this was not the case but bag checks are not as thorough as they could be.

CC also asked if non-conformances against the helicopter operator or against the HCA should be raised directly with the platform operator.

RN agreed that is ultimately what the CAA want to achieve. Working with the platform the onus is then on the aviation system and there must be some obligations and some accountability. The CAA can control the helideck certificate through the HCA if the deck has an issue but there is no legal right.

CC asked also for the timeline for the CAA take over from the HCA.

RN advised that the CAA are limited by the civil aviation act. It is not seen as a priority at present but will be raised again with the DfT.

Mike Gislam (MG) stated he was aware of alternative companies starting to show an interest in the certification of helidecks. NHV customers are looking at alternatives and is aware one company is going to be approaching the CAA.

RN stated the CAA are aware that there are a number of companies talking to the operators. RN advised if there is a different way of servicing the operators capabilities through another provider then the CAA would look at that.

MG agreed it was something we needed to consider as an industry because operators have various certificates sitting in different places and needed a consolidated approach.

MA agreed that this has been discussed on many occasions and we are aligned at the moment under the HCA. If we allow the commercial market to expand it will create a lot of secondary issues and if entering into that market we will need to have a discussion on how we are going to do that and control it. It needs the CAA to hold the certification. RN agrees.

Trevor Stapleton (TS) asked if the OGUK and Grant Campbell could be considered to sit with the offshore GHOST team to ensure that things go smoothly. Mario had started to attend the ASTG meetings and asked MS if he would like to attend with the next meeting scheduled for 10<sup>th</sup> December.

TS also asked when the industry workshops were likely to take place.

MS advised these will likely take place in Q1 2021.

Grant Campbell (GC) reiterated that he would like to see an O&G representative on GHOST team. GC also asked how the CAA work with the airfield owner and are they represented in the same way as the oil and gas company and the owner of the installation?

MS agreed to look closely at the terms of reference with the subgroup and see how that fits in with requirements.

GC said the initial GHOST output came from an operator with little interaction with any of the oil and gas companies so it would be beneficial to have some representation.

GC also asked if there was a date for the Addendum to CAP 437.

MS advised that CAA are hoping to publish by end of November.

GC recalled the earlier mention of incidents, which don't appear to be circulated, particularly COVID issues. Is it possible to include these to Heli-offshore and out to the wider group, particularly if it impacts operations.

Matt Rhodes (MR) added that these are low level items identified over the last couple of months but may be precursors to a larger event which we are all aware of and many are shared with Hel-offshore.

MR mentioned two events. Loose articles that hadn't been secured appropriately and wire ropes hadn't been secured appropriately in the heli-deck area. It is agreed HCA are not checking as often as they should but if there was an event raised by flight crew, it will be passed on to the HCA. For the 175 issue where it moved on deck there was inference from Alex Knight that deck painting was taking place, so need to get alignment with HCA.

The MRU is currently out of date and is overdue for a refresh. MR advised these are the areas of concern at present.

GC also agreed it was a concern shared by him also.

CC added getting ownership of the HCA certificate for the website and then whoever owns it moves forward with it and any dispensations that come in.

RN agreed. He stated that the CAP 437 document is used globally, and is law in many countries around the world but not the UK and therefore on the radar.

#### **20.4.2 Sumburgh FAI – Rick Newson (RN)**

The sheriff's principal has now produced a determination. No recommendations but significant comments within the determination. Three significant matters RN believes are relevant for this Group. RN read through one paragraph.

*“Whilst it's the case that the cause of the accident was part of the error, it is not known why, one possible reason in the developing knowledge of the inability of the human brain continuously to monitor flight instruments in all forms of aircraft.”*

It is suggested that the human brain is not good at monitoring flight instruments in all forms of aircraft, particularly in automation motors. The aviation industry and regulatory authorities are looking closely at this developing science. The expert inspectors of the AAIB and Department of Transport concluded that the accident could have occurred with other pilots flying.

RN said this is a really broad statement, well beyond this particular accident. RN has since spoken to the key members that were part of the automation workgroup to ensure there were no loose ends and has since sent a spreadsheet around all of the key players in the original group including Heli-offshore.

RN advised they are due to meet early December. RN is also engaging with others internally at CAA as this is a global issue. Component failure is technical, but two thirds are human error. RN stated that something needs to be done collectively.

RB shared that he was surprised with the statement and would like others to share their views. In the coroner's report it also mentions support for anybody involved in any kind of serious event and there are very important aspects of the coroner's summation, including a piece of further loss of life, despite surviving on the day due to the impacts of the incident.

RN advised that there are two versions of the determination and has urged the Group to read the full determination.

RN continued with the three matters. The second, HFDM. The workshops that have been held produce some really good material to identify stabilised approaches, however, we should be striving for continuous improvement in flight data monitoring. RN stated the CAA has engaged with and is continuously talking to the HFDM group, and has provided guidance material for next version of HOFO.

On the 31st of December, every current law as we know it becomes UK law. Beyond that date, it becomes material we may wish to incorporate into UK law.

RN suggests HFDM should be added to the agenda for six monthly updates to ensure that we can be driving this from a leadership team perspective and to ensure that we collectively raise the bar.

Thirdly, the commitments of flight crew operating manuals. After CAP1145 was published this was something that both the joint operator and EASA was driving and now have rule material for all aircraft. This gives the manufacturer the opportunity to identify how you should use the product.

RN stated the missing element is the Flight Crew Training Manual (FCTM). We need to determine how you train to operate your aircraft. This is a piece of work we may want to discuss in the coming months.

### 20.4.3 C-MED Activation, Risks and Issues

MA stated that this is an opportunity for the three operators to comment on anything that they may see evolving in terms of potential risk and vulnerability to C-MED processes as we are beginning to see a second spike developing across the globe.

Ian Cooke (IC) noted that Babcock are seeing some activity around that. Transportation restrictions is causing the most issues particularly for flight crew training and current training for the simulators. IC also mentioned passengers and complying with the requirements for company processes and HSE and ensuring they are aware the restrictions are in place for their safety and also the company's.

Mike Gislam (MG) noted NHV echo that of IC. NHV have a few positive cases of pilots in the south, and some lessons learned from the Group. One of our pilots left his mobile phone on a planning desks and the app subsequently then alerted half the workforce that they were at risk, even though they hadn't been in contact. There is some guidance there to make sure that mobile phones are not being left in the office space.

Matt Rhodes (MR) agreed Bristows had couple of instances in the engineering departments, which was handled without any major impact operation. The HSE have looked at processes again with some concern around social distancing within briefing lounges, although nothing developed on that at the moment. MR confirmed protocols and procedures remaining in place with minimal impact to delivery of operations.

MA confirmed in his capacity as Accountable Manager for CHC it's a very similar picture. HSE has visited on two occasions and have been approved. Office staff are still working from home and we have made a decision that we are not even going to attempt to return to the office so most of the administration functions within the business are home based to allow separation of the crews and engineers on shift. Operations have been maintained including all COVID flights.

Trevor Stapleton (TS) noted that he has had feedback in terms of HSE inspectors getting a bit overzealous so if that is the case let TS know and he can raise it at the appropriate levels.

RN confirmed he is talking to HSE in the background and there have been a number of events both aeroplane and helicopter where a more rigorous approach to enforcement has been recognised. We have advised everything to do with the aircraft and operations and procedures is CAA territory and we have a Memorandum of Understanding written up between the two regulators to delineate those responsibilities. COVID is a different case and the remit for enforcement is clear. There has been a meeting already with another planned.

Grant Campbell (GC) asks if anyone else is getting pressure from anyone to do onsite audits.

MR agreed there had been a little bit of a push but had pushed back saying in the current climate they were not willing to consider that. With the technology we have now, it shouldn't be an issue for us to be able to provide oversight to a level that people are comfortable with given everything that we are dealing with.



David Malins (DM) confirmed the CAA have a policy of some oversight activities being conducted on site across the whole airworthiness approvals, they are limited, and they are focused. They're either focused on intelligence, or they're focused on a very limited scaled back planned oversight on each intermediate audit, but they are not a compliance audit they are more just troops on the ground.

MA added CHC had a major audit with Avitech, but we did it remotely. We were not in a position to put them onsite and we managed to do it through virtual measures.

#### **20.4.4 Change Management Projects Overview – Mike Turner**

##### **Introduction**

MT advised the Group that some time would be spent reviewing where each of the three subgroups have got to in terms of planning and implementing the different change projects that the Group commissioned in September and MT would then share the results from the responses on the team effectiveness questionnaire.

RN advised he is part of the Risk group but has yet to share any changes with that group as yet as has been with Matt's group.

MT advised the Group that he saw this as the first project which was principally focused around the operator companies getting together to look at operator base risks to then feed that in to a review of risk in totality which would then come to the OHSLG for agreeing what the priorities would be.

MT also stated the second project was about building a system once you got those risks to allow delegation out to acting groups.

David Malins (DM) added that both himself and Rick discussed the opportunity to use the CAA's current risk scoring methodology once the operators had identified what they believed were their clear risks.

Matt Rhodes (MR) gave a summary of what the Operations Group had achieved to date. MR stated the group were aware of a number of risks which are shared within the oil and gas arena in the UK. MR noted there are a number of bodies who address these, whether through safety management systems, Heli-offshore or through working groups sitting with IOGP. The minor ones with Heli-offshore look at a global approach, but this Group want to look at what affects the safety of helicopter operations within the UK, within our areas of operation and within our accountabilities.

The operations working group agreed to work through three key areas of operation to identify top risks or concerns which are common across all SMS systems.

- Ground operations
- Flight operations
- Engineering department

The wider Group should then determine where the appropriate action should be placed and which working group or body should take responsibility for the action.

The OHSLG Group is an oversight group and it should be responsible for delegating responsibilities and actions to the various bodies ie ASTG, Heli-offshore.

The key thing that came out of the working group discussion is distraction which is a top risk for everyone. It features across all departments and onshore and offshore operations. This is something to address and fix.

From an air worthiness and engineering perspective, two or three key areas where there are shared common risks are critical parts for the aircraft, whether failure to fit and maintain them effectively, delivery that has passed or non-compliant parts being received.

RN added that the Global Aviation Safety Programme, along with the Regional Safety Programme and EASA have identified that key risk areas have sub risks that sit underneath them. We have an offshore set of sub risks that sit entirely around CFIT(?) loss control and system component failure non-power plant. There is an overarching system in place that will answer to the State Safety Board against those key risk areas.

David Malins (DM) showed the tool and advised that the information from the accountable manager meeting and the intelligence from the CAA's oversight activities, whether flight operations airworthiness, are entered into the entity performance tool.

DM and RN looked at those risks across all four operators, one of which is Dangerous Goods but when you scan through, you can see that there are a number of risks that are specific to an individual operator, and also across the operations. DM gave an example whereby there is pilot distraction recorded against one of the operators. It is specifically COVID-19 PPE. In the current climate this is broader and fits across all operators. The CAA have a picture of individual risks, and individual risk registers, but when we pulling it together into something very high level for OHSLG we have some work to do. That is the work Matt and the AM's have been putting together to identify the key risks in agreement with the CAA.

MT queried if this was tool that will coordinate and gather analysis to bring back to the OHSLG Group.

RN advised he would like to introduce Ray Foster at the next meeting. As a collective they have a much better risk picture of this particular sector than anywhere else in the CAA. It was recognised that this could be a really good method of using the CAA safety management system from a standard entry on the RMSM for offshore then populate that and manage the data on behalf of this team. We are then managing that data using a system that we're moving into for key risk areas which will be a great way of proving the concept and the system that supports it.

MR stated that we are beginning to share information which is quite a big breakthrough. We understand this is purely in the interests of improving safety within helicopter operations. The group has not gone into huge amounts of detail but the key areas that we have identified primarily around distractions sits across all of them and primarily around ground ops and Dangerous Goods. MR stated we just need to target one specific area and that can be captured or aligned with what the CAA has on their risk register. We can then we identify how we resolve the issue through technical groups or committees.

RN added as an observation that he thought his meeting with the accountable managers was one of the most meaningful meeting he has had since OHSLG was formed in terms of the risk discussion, because it moved away from the fear of collective risks which made it more meaningful.

MR stated the next step is to sort the information that the AM's were looking at and asked for a copy of those top risks identified within each area. MR will then collect them and share to RN and DM to identify where there is alignment and then feed this into the system so that we get an appropriate representation of where the risks are.

MR suggests a workshop meeting with the wider group to get agreement alignment to get things moving as time is of the essence primarily around the distractions and ground operations.

MR stated that this should become a standing agenda item within the OHSLG meeting process where we can track and assess the actions that have been allocated out of the Group.

MR also added that as there is a level of unease at the moment around distraction it would be helpful if there was a communication drafted to demonstrate the OHSLG as a leadership group is still very focused on the safety of the operations and circulated in the general domain.

MT agreed this would raise the profile of the OHSLG and give some confidence amongst our stakeholders.

MR will draft a communication highlighting what the issues and concerns are and will circulate.

Grant Campbell (GC) advised that the distraction events are on the agenda of Heli-offshore and IOGP and appears we are all identifying the same risks and would be good to have a joined up message with this.

DM stated they were going to use the internal CAA expertise and were going to put some thoughts together on destruction events and were going to circulate that to the team and distribute under OHSLG.

DM added there has been a lot of work done for distraction already but there may be some link up required with Heli-offshore. There is not a formalised process on delegating work as yet and further work is needed on this.

MT asked who would lead and produce a formalised process of delegating and tracking. MT added if there is no formalised process around it the Group are in danger of losing track of everything.

DM stated that the risks identified will be added to the CAA system which will allow us to bring it back to the leadership group. They will be scored and tracked in the system and can be delegated as required.

DM has agreed to track the risks in the system but will be working closely with MR to get the risks from all four AM's.

MT moved to the Communications Project and asked Steve Rae (SR) to update the Group.

SR apologised but advised that the communications group had not progressed at all. SR stated they are not adequately resourced with only Steve, Sue and Kirsten effectively in the team with the union representation so far being absent. Kirsten is also on long term sick leave and Steve advised he only has a small team within Stepchange.

MT asked the Group how we plan to resolve the issue. Asking if we have any other resources we could utilise. MA also questioned whether this was a long or short term issue.

SR advised Kirsten would return on a soft start likely early next year so suggested this was delegated elsewhere.

MA noted that he would not want a disconnect between the communications group and Stepchange as Stepchange is the primary communication tool to the offshore workforce. Therefore we need to keep some alignment to ensure that we don't end up with a completely bespoke communication framework going forward.

SR agreed it was not the intention to disengage but more concerned that he has taken on a role that he may not be able to fulfil right now.

SR confirmed Kirsten's role has been backfilled temporarily by Ian McLaren (Innes Associates) although not to the same level as Kirsten in post.

MR said there is an opportunity for the Group to rally round and help. MR is willing to offer support and will see what he can do as currently they subcontract their comms through The BIG Partnership.

It is really important that Stepchange is the voice for this Group. We have been looking how we can get more information out about helicopter operations, RTB and helicopter awareness courses that were championed by this Group in the first instance many years ago.

SR agreed additional horsepower would be a starting point and would be most welcome. It would allow work to start on developing a proper plan.

Sue Fay (SF) asked if OGUK could commit some time. SR agreed he would approach OGUK Comms and see if they had availability.

Colin Cheesewright (CC) asked where we were on the invite for Heli-offshore representation to join the Group.

MA agreed to take this as an action and suggested we could perhaps get help from their comms also.

DM said both himself and RN have talked with Tim Rolfe (CE Heli-offshore) working with OHSLG and Tim is very much wanting to be part of it, but it is for the OHSLG Group to decide in what capacity that would be.

MA stated that there has been a dilemma on the board about the role of Heli-offshore within OHSLG.

MA asked for clarification as to the role being offered.

MR agreed that Hel-offshore could bring some value, therefore they should be invited as a permanent member.

Sue Fay (SF) asked the Group on thoughts of perhaps an RGU internship and given the comms as a full time project. Sue asked if there was funds for this kind of thing.

SF and SR to explore options and will hold a separate meeting to discuss.

#### **20.4.5 OHSLG Feedback on Responses to Team Effectiveness Survey**

MT gave a recap.

At the beginning when I spoke to a number of stakeholders, ahead of starting this work a number of you said we really need to look at the effectiveness of the OHSLG as a team. Following the last meeting in September I sent the Group a survey which was analysed and the conclusions can now be shared with suggestions for improvement.

There was a net response rate of 70% and MT thanked the Group for responding.

MT explained the first section looked at how the Group go about achieving its work. There were theories which MT asked the Group to get a relative response as to the extent to which you agreed in that statement.

From the 12 returned, just over half have a level of agreement, there is a large number neither disagreeing or agreeing, with one respondent disagreeing.

MT interpreted this as some of the Group are relatively new and not yet in a position to agree or disagree until some work has been completed.

The Group know what work and why it is doing the work, but there is disagreement in the planning and how the Group can manage and track success.

It was noted that some are a little frustrated with lack of time and resources, but this should improve over time with the planning mechanisms in place and work outsourced effectively.

The second section asked the Group how they worked as team. It is clear the Group have the right people, the right knowledge, capability and understand the role of the Group.

The Group need to dedicate enough time to building team effectiveness. Key gaps have been identified as lack of full commitment with some persistent absenteeism. This needs to be addressed and perhaps stand-ins of the same authority can attend when absenteeism arises. Without full commitment the team will not be effective.

MT suggested a checklist for the end of each meeting ie, how did the meeting go? Did we have the right information to make decisions etc? This checklist will help to drive the effectiveness in the Group.

MT suggested that each member has an annual one to one with the Chair to discuss their role and contribution within the Group. This also drives up effectiveness.

MT advised there are issues with communication and this is due to lack of attendance and also lack of inter team communication. A simple web based communication system or visibility of the tracking system where you can see what is happening will aid this.

One of the challenges the Group faces is Trust. The Group has a strong core purpose and work as a team on objectives that have a significant impact on the industry. However, the Group work for different organisations which have their own objectives. This can cause conflict of loyalty and if Group members feel they cannot be open then the team will be less committed and effective in their role.

The third section asked how each Group member works as a team. It is clear members feel they have clarity on their involvement and are able to contribute. It was noted each member has sufficient communication to fulfil their role, however as previously noted there are struggles with lack of resources to fully deliver.

MT concluded that the Group has the right people and knowledge capability to deliver on its purpose and objectives. The Group has enthusiasm and commitment but there is room for improvement. Every member of the team needs to be involved with the planning, visibility and tracking of work to be effective. There is a need to be robust when allocating work and ensure there are resources in place to cope with the request. There is also a need to spend some time at the end of each meeting to discuss team effectiveness and individual contribution.

Finally, MT strongly recommends the Chair holds one to one meetings with the Group to discuss Conflict of Loyalty and to discuss any individual concerns.

MA thanked MT on behalf of the Board, for the effort he has spent working with the team. MA added that the Group identified the need to change direction and Mike has shown dedication and professionalism throughout.

#### **20.4.6 Brexit Update – David Kendrick (DK) (CAA)**

DK joined the meeting to give the Group an update on Brexit including cross border operations. DK stated that there are approx. 52 days left to negotiate before the end of the transition period with many key areas still to be resolved.

Traffic rights, have been agreed in principle on both sides for freedom rights however there will not be internal cabotage on either side. Political issues need to be resolved before it can be taken further. The EU is quite keen to ensure the agreements that were in place previously between the UK, however old they are, get included in the conversation, whether or not they would remain as part of the process depending on their international nature.

DK touched a little on supply chain and advised the UK has very clearly set out what it is prepared to do and allow, whether or not it is the same approach as the EU. The EU have not been as clear. Current

negotiations are difficult because there are areas of natural agreements ie security where quick progress has been made but areas like supply chain are interlinked to include air service and trade in general. Much of the issues for supply chain are border issues in terms of paperwork for movement of supplies and parts, etc. Within the service agreement it has been stated these are standard provisions. It has been agreed the movement of spares for aircraft on the ground, or equipment that you move to support security, safety etc would be exempt and not caught by the supply chain, however until the trade agreement is in place this cannot be confirmed.

MA asked for confirmation if the TCL arrangements for traffic rights have been granted but for aerial work permits there will not be the ability to do commercial air operations.

DK advised a G-registered operator would not be unable to fly to ie Holland as that would be cabotage. The same principle applies if flying Holland into Germany.

MA asked if there was a transition period. DK confirmed we were in it currently with it ending at the end of December. DK stated the Prime Minister had the option of extending the transition period for up to a further two years on the 15th of June which he made the political decision not to. However, if there is a political will on both sides to extend the transition period it will be extended but there is currently no political will at present within the UK Government.

MA also asked what the current licencing arrangement was for UK engineers who have EASA licences.

DK advised from the UK perspective they are prepared to accept EASA licences for two years. If the other way round, the Commission previously offered a period of up to nine months where they would allow the same flexibility. However, that was in a no deal contingency arrangement but there are no contingency arrangements at present.

David Malins (DM) added that he could cover some key areas of the Air Safety Agreement. The initial airworthiness agreements remains the focus in terms of certification and production. DM advised it was unlikely a maintenance agreement would be in place and DK touched upon provisions in place for acceptance and validity of licences and certificates. If Part 145 approval is from a third country it is highly unlikely to release a UK registered aircraft. This will affect one of the four operators. This is with EASA at present. This will be covered in seminars being held over the next few weeks. DM advised from an airworthiness point of view, the UK industry will continue to be able to function even in the event of a no deal.

DK stated that similar conversations to those being held with the CAA need to be happening with their equivalent for those with European operations to allow them to lobby it for the EU side and if not done to date suggests this is done pretty quickly.

Colin Cheesewright (CC) asked if there was any risk to spares or components that have been certified in Europe and the USA and asked if they will still be of use to the helicopter operators in the UK.

DM confirmed that there will be no impact because the validity of the certificates will still be valid.

If you have a C rated UK organisation, after the 31st December, it must release its components on a UK CAA Form1 unless it has a third country approval from EASA which it can then release parts on a dual release.

Ian Cooke (IC) asked how the certification and tracking of components are going to be managed after 31<sup>st</sup> December as many components go back into pools. These may have UK Part 145 approval which will go back into a circulation not acceptable to EASA.

DM agreed this could potentially happen and that there needs to be a level of mutual acceptance.

MA thanked DK for joining the meeting and giving the Group an update to the Brexit deal.

#### **20.4.7 Closing Remarks / AOB**

Matt Rhodes (MR) mentioned the reporting of RTB's has been raised by a number of Bristow's clients. This has previously been managed and monitored by Stepchange but looks to have fallen by the wayside. This should be picked up offline with Steve Rae.

MR also asked for the tenure of the Chair position to be discussed given MA has held the position for some time. MA agreed to add to the agenda for the next meeting.

Grant Campbell (GC) asked for an agenda item at next meeting to discuss Oil and Gas UK standards alignment with IOGP 690. MA agreed and will include on the agenda.

Meeting close.