

MINUTES of the CRM INDUSTRY FORUM

Held on Thursday 1 November 2001 at Aviation House, Gatwick

Attendance at the Forum was by pre-registration only and due to the size of the facility at Aviation House, attendance had to be limited to 110 participants. There were a number of no-shows, but there were also a number of non-registered attendees who filled the hall.

The Forum was introduced by Captain Robert Calvert, Head of Training Standards, CAA, who welcomed all delegates to the Forum. He outlined the administrative details and introduced the attendees to the CAA team who are the points of contact for CRM Accreditation issues; himself, Captain Giles Porter of Flight Operations Helicopters and Mrs Patricia Higgins of Flight Operations Standards, who is responsible for the administration and database of accredited instructors and examiners. He also emphasised that there is **not yet** a requirement for the accreditation of Cabin crew and MCC instructors.

Item 1 – Role of the CRM Advisory Panel – Jeremy Butler

JB , the Chairman of the CRM Advisory Panel, outlined the history and terms of reference of the Panel (see Standards Document 29 Appendix A), and their involvement in the process to date. He explained that the Panel was formed to help overcome the problem of a lack of standardisation both within and between companies in their approach to CRM training. The predecessor of the Panel, the Accreditation Focus Group, were instrumental in producing the ‘Guide to Performance Standards for Instructors of CRM Training in Commercial Aviation’ (the Guide), which was based on the national standards model for training and competence.

JB went on to explain that the Guide was a living document, and that it will be continually amended as experience is gained in industry. In the short term, an amendment is expected to change contexts in the document in order to bring them into line with Standards Document 29.

At the last industry forum, held at Aviation House in February 2001, JB had invited interested members out in industry to make application to join the panel. He explained that the Panel had received several applications, but none had so far been accepted for membership yet. As soon as the accreditation process is underway, the intention is for the Panel to be expanded, and he anticipates that a number of applicants will be co-opted onto the Panel.

Item 2 - Standards Document 29 – Accreditation Requirements – Captain Pete Griffiths

PG outlined the history of the accreditation process, which has been in process now for some three years. During that period there have been a number of communication documents put out to industry in the form of AICs and FODComms. He explained that

the commencement of the accreditation process was delayed from 1/5/01 to 1/10/01 as a result of discussion at the previous industry forum in February.

In order to continue to justify the ongoing requirement for improved standards of CRM training, PG gave three examples of recent accidents where CRM failure could have been a major contributory factor, including the recent runway incursion accident at Milan Malpensa and the Swissair MD11 electrical fire in Canada. He went on to suggest that if an improvement in CRM during the emergencies prior to the Swissair crash had prevented that crash, those actions may even have saved the entire airline!

PG explained that there will be a three year transition into the accreditation process, by which time all instructors and instructor examiners will be formally accredited. He then introduced Standards Document 29, and highlighted a number of items from the document, including Initial Accreditation, Instructor Requirements, Authorisation and Training Approvals. On the subject of Training Approvals, he was at pains to stress that where an operator used a third party training provider, it was incumbent upon the operator to retain ownership of the CRM syllabus and training programme. He also made the point that the copies of Standards Document 29 that had been issued to the attendees would not be amended, but that the copy of the document that was on the CAA website would be the copy that would be kept amended and up to date. The location of the document on the website was being revisited in order to make it more easily locatable.

Whilst CRM assessment is not specifically a part of the subject of accreditation of instructors and instructor examiners, PG stated that it cannot be totally divorced from the process, which is why reference is made in Standards Document 29 to assessment. He explained that in order to reach as wide an audience as possible, follow up action would be published in an AIC, and that in turn will be followed by a CAP to encompass all aspects of CRM training. During that period the Guide would be updated as required to keep it up to date with current industry thinking and practice.

During the short Q&A session at the end of the presentation, it was evident that the issue of 'grandfather rights' for existing instructors across the three contexts (ground school, simulator/base and line) was causing considerable confusion amongst the attendees, and lead to some lively questions and debate. There was insufficient time to explore the subject to any depth, so debate was postponed until the Open Forum at the end of the afternoon session.

Item 3 – The Abbreviated Standards Guide – Carey Edwards

CE opened the presentation with a short explanation of the difference between a competency based approach, and a 'tick-in-the-box' approach to achieving results. He argued that the competency based approach was by far the better way to achieve positive results. He explained that utilising the Guide was a good method of achieving the competency based approach. He acknowledged that the Guide was not particularly user friendly, and that it needed to be amended to reflect the Standards Document 29 contexts. In order to simplify the basic tenets of the guide for industry, he had drawn up a abbreviated guide, condensed into 4 pages, for practitioners use.

Whilst handing out copies of the Abbreviated Standards Guide to the attendees, he posed two questions to the floor, which he asked attendees to answer during his presentation of the abbreviated guide if anyone thought either of them relevant. Those questions were:

- Is there anything in the abbreviated guide which is unclear, unnecessary, inappropriate or unfair, and
- Is there anything missing?

CE went on and talked through the abbreviated guide using the context of Simulator & Base Training as an example.

At the end of the presentation there were a number responses to both of the questions that had been posed earlier (See attached Q&A list). One respondent suggested that there were inappropriate levels of specification in the performance requirements for some tasks. CE answered that the document was only a guide, and that individuals should cherry-pick appropriate levels of specification for the task which they were currently undertaking, and not blindly follow the guide letter by letter.

Item 4 – Standards Document 29 – Admin Process – Robert Calvert

RC presented to the Forum a new CAA Form for industry to apply to the Authority for CRMI and CRMI(E) authorisations (Application for CRM Instructor/CRM Instructor Examiner Authorisation). This is a new form, and had not been seen by industry until this presentation. A single copy of the form was given to each attendee to take away, photocopy and use as necessary.

During the presentation, the question of the ‘grandfather rights’ for existing instructors was raised again. There were a number of calls for the CAA to postpone further the introduction of the accreditation system as a large proportion of the attendees felt that introduction of such a system at the present time, especially due to the post September downsizing that was occurring in the UK, was too onerous.

Lunch

Lunch was taken some 15 minutes late due to the debate generated by the ‘grandfather rights’ issue.

During the lunch break members of the CAA and the CRM Advisory Panel met to discuss the ‘grandfather rights’ issue. It was decided that Paddy Carver would give a revised presentation starting with clarification of this issue.

Item 5 – CRM Instructor/Examiner Requirements – Paddy Carver

PC began with a short clarification of the ‘grandfather rights’ issue as follows:

- Apart from applying to the Authority for ‘grandfather rights’, no operator needs to do anything immediately. (The deadline for registering instructors and examiners has been extended to 30/11/01)

INSTRUCTORS:

- Existing CRMIs (Ground) who are currently providing ground school instruction of CRM have been given ‘grandfather rights’ for 3 years (until 30/9/04)
- Existing SFIs, TRIs and TREs have been given ‘grandfather rights’ for up to 3 years (until their current authority is revalidated)
- Existing Line Trainers have been given ‘grandfather rights’ for 1 year (until 30/9/02) by which time they should be accredited. Accreditation will consist of completing an instructional technique course, being checked for knowledge of CRM and ability to instruct/check as appropriate (those line trainers that have done an instructional technique course will not have to repeat the course). This check will be carried out by the company nominated CRMIE(Line) and the process will be sampled.

INSTRUCTOR EXAMINERS:

- Existing TRI(E)s and RETREs have been given ‘grandfather rights’ as CRMIEs for up to 3 years (until their current authority is revalidated) but sampling, in accordance with current practice, will take place during that period.

PC reiterated the requirements several times, and apparently cleared the confusion that had existed up to that point.

PC then went on and gave his presentation on ‘Examining the Instructor’, in which he considered the necessity of assessing every course of tuition, and the fact that a good place to start in raising the standard of any course of training was to raise the standard of the tutors. He compared the difference between teaching and assessing styles, and concluded that CRM and technical skills can and must be integrated.

Item 6 – JARTEL Project – validation of the NOTECHS methodology – Mike Lodge

ML outlined the project from its inception, and described the assessment system in the broadest sense. He referred to Standards Document 29 Appendix E which gives an introduction to the NOTECHS behavioural marker system, and the fact that instructors and examiners will need to be trained in the use of this or any similar system reinforcing an analogous comment made by Paddy Carver in his presentation.

Item 7 – CRM Training Evaluation Effectiveness – Paul O’Connor

PO’C outlined the recently completed research project to test the effectiveness of CRM training amongst UK AOC operators. The project report had not yet been sent to the CAA, but it was expected that it would be in the public domain in the very near future.

The essence of the findings of the project were that not many operators carry out any formal evaluation of their CRM programmes, but tend to rely on informal feedback from

participants. This does not fulfil the Guide requirements of continuous improvement of CRM courses.

After a short tea break the floor was opened to questions. (A list of the questions raised both during the various presentations and at the end of the day are attached to these minutes at Appendix 1.)

The forum closed at 1630.

The following information from the forum is also available on request by email from giles.porter@srg.caa.co.uk

1. List of attendees
2. Powerpoint presentation – CRM Accreditation - Pete Griffiths.
3. A Short Guide to Performance Standards for CRM Instructors
4. CAA Form CRM01/2001 - Application for CRM Instructor/CRM Instructor Examiner Authorisation.
5. Powerpoint presentation – Examining the Instructor – Paddy Carver
6. Powerpoint presentation – CRM Training Effectiveness - Paul O'Connor.

3.2.5	Should this information form part of the syllabus of our facilitation for trainers course? A crew member cannot fail his LPC for CRM failings alone? The LPC form contains a CRM assessment field with spaces for 2 tries. Yet he can apparently fail his OPC for CRM failings? Why the difference?	Capt Geoff Iliff-Rolfe (British European) (contd)	Yes, put the info into your facilitation course.
Appendix B	Ground school CRMIs qualification – will there be a page for this in the individuals licence?		Correct The LPC form is being amended. Not CRM failings alone, they must be tied to a technical failure
Appendix C Para 4	Should all trainers (TIs, TEs, LTCs and CRMIs G/S) hold a copy of the guide		No.
Appendix D	Is this table now legally binding? Para 3.1.2 suggests so. However at the AEA meeting at Seeheim (7-9/4/00) we were led to believe that we would get plenty of warning of the finalisation of this crucial table but have heard nothing. What, if any, is the timescale for implementing App D?		No, it should merely be available to them. Not yet. When JAR-OPS 1 is amended to include the table.
<u>3./PG</u>	Dates for line and simulator trainers?	FRA – Chris Chadwick	See minutes & Stds Doc 29
<u>4./PG</u>	No help in Stds Doc for single-pilot ops. Forcing us into doing it. Should be CAA putting it out not RAeS.	Peter Abbott London Helicopter Centre	A lot applies to single-pilot (PG). RAeS website (CRM SG) includes single-pilot material (CE) Point taken.
<u>5./PG</u>	Letter from FOLG sub-committee reflect industry concerns that CRM accreditation imposes an improbable burden <i>now</i> . Appear to be vested interests.	Julian Bond (Airtours)	Until CAA puts a date for action, most do nothing. We gave thought as to the need to proceed. (PG) No! Process controlled by CAA. Need to seek expertise as not all in SRG. (PG) (PC also objected to use of term “vested interests”).

<u>6./PG</u>	Support for FOLG position. We put our line-training captains through CTC. Future requirement is <i>only</i> CRM knowledge?	Mike Wood, British European	No (PG). See Para 1.3.4 of Doc 29 (RC).
<u>7./PG</u>	Absence of CRMIE accreditation by CAA is putting ‘cart before the horse’ (ie, CRMI first). Is it acceptable for the company to appoint CRMIEs?	Nicole Svatek, Virgin Atlantic	Ask and CAA will visit. (PG) No. CAA to standardise. (PG)
<u>8./PG</u>	Does every CRM course need to be monitored by CRMIE?	Bill Little, Cityflyer	No. (PG)
<u>9./PG</u>	When a CRMIE is appointed what determines his competency in the sim and on the line?	Richard Scott, Monarch	We are looking largely at ground school; the line is largely up to the company. TRI/TRE will be done by TIs. More sampling of RETREs than in the past. (PG)
<u>10./PG</u>	Extend debrief?	Julian Bond, Airtours	Process should be as is, as far as line pilots are concerned.
<u>11./PG</u>	I am an observer; I have to conduct annual line observer checks (on others). Do I need to be a CRMI to undertake checks?	Steve Woolley, Dorset Police ASU	No, probably not (PAOC differs from AOC). (PG) The CRMI can be portable. (RC) If purely in-house, answer is ‘No’ if for observers <i>only</i> and not crew (PAOM definition). However, if for pilots not working to JAR-OPS 3 but to PAOM, clarification is needed!! (PG)
<u>12./PG</u>	Accredit TRI/TRE to conduct Licence Skill Tests, ie, in MCC versus CRM?	Bob Katon, GECAT	If not doing checks <i>for</i> operators, will <i>not</i> apply. Applies to AOC Holders <i>only</i> . (PG)
<u>13./PG</u>	Requirement for facilitation skills?	??	Able to facilitate a constructive debrief. (RC)
<u>14./PG</u>	CAP360 not JAR-OPS operator?	??	Doc 29 still applies as they are AOC Holders. (RC)
<u>15./Short Guide –CE</u>	Unit D2, attends CRM conferences, et al?	Mike Wood, British European	Means keeping abreast of advances in industry. (CE)
<u>16./CE</u>	Not all trainers design training.	Mike Lodge, BA and Colin Budenberg, Britannia	Trainers need to check materials are appropriate. (CE) (Afterthought (PH): someone in the company/third party provider must be <i>responsible</i> for training design!). Sim/base trainers do not necessarily design (PG/CE).

<u>17./CE</u>	It is a guide!(statement)	Graham Cruse, Go!	-
<u>18./CE Post-its</u>	(In response to CE flip chart question “What’s missing?”) Collection of informal feedback from the trainers is mentioned; that feedback should be collated and <u>assessed</u> by the training designers for possible course improvement.	Peter Hunt, CAA	Good point
<u>19./CE Post-its</u>	A1 Performance (Sim & Base): suggested wording is: “ <u>Plans</u> CRM elements and identifies needs” (not “Designs”).	??	(Afterthought (PH): the A1 Unit definition derives from NVQ and is not for amendment?).
<u>20./CE Post-its</u>	CE Q1: Too many words; not pragmatic. CE Q2: Clarity.	René Livingstone, Brymon	
<u>21./CE Post-its</u>	Unit C2: remember this is the instructor role not the examiner? Attend CRM workshops where appropriate.	??	
<u>22./CE Post-its</u>	Omission Page 1, Para 3, the text ends abruptly at “The Short”.	??	PH: I think this is a typo only: close up text to read, “The Short Guide describes in detail ...”.
<u>23./CE Post-its</u>	Several items are more applicable to CRMIE although all items are satisfactory.	??	
<u>24./CE Post-its</u>	Missing comment re CRMIE	??	(We know)
<u>25./CE Post-its</u>	Page 1 duplication ‘context’ box: repetitive and confusing. People do not read it. Unit A competence box straight repetition and unlikely to be read. However, overall a welcome document. Thanks!	??	
<u>26./Doc 29 Admin - RC</u>	TRI will not have seen TRI(E) form. Will TRI(E)s have grandfather rights as CRMIEs, ie, 3 years? If we can demonstrate competencies of CRMIs as RETREs/TRI(E)s will they have grandfather rights as CRMIEs (Sim/Line)?	Steve Hunt, BA/Panel	Yes, but SRG will sample. SFI/TRI will need training as CRMIE want to avoid bureaucracy and unnecessary checks. (PG) If you want someone to be observed as CRMIE, give us notice. (RC) For the groundschool context, CAA will want to see CRMIEs <i>before</i> appointment
<u>27./Doc 29 Admin - RC</u>	Are all FOIs trained and ready to go to CRMIE standards? Are there grandfather rights for TRI(E) now as CRMIE? (Similar to BA question at 27)	Charlie Cantan, Virgin Atlantic	Some TIs in SRG have greater knowledge of CRM than others. We will monitor who goes out on accreditation visits. (RC) You could be CRMIE for all 3 contexts, but not necessarily, eg, for third party training provider. (RC)

<u>28./Doc 29 Admin - RC</u>	Too many questions unanswered and too much vagueness to implement, eg, not a clue to start. Where is documentary evidence (for manager)? TRE becoming CRMIE; this was not evident from Doc 29 charges.	Kevin Dawson, KLM (UK)	Evidence is in Doc 29 and NPA-OPS 16 matrix. Depth required. (RC) No charge for sim or line, <i>only</i> for groundschool. (PG)
<u>29./Doc 29 Admin - RC</u>	RETRE becoming CRMIE?	Julian Bond, Airtours	All got grandfather rights <i>until</i> revalidated. No extra activity. (PG)
<u>30./Doc 29 Admin - RC</u>	Apparent change over proposals. No other European country is as advanced. We are strong supporters of CRM. We ask CAA to reconsider timescales.	Mike Wood, British European	Until a firm date is given, no one does anything. Last forum (Feb 01), we <i>listened</i> and delayed implementation by 6 months.
<u>31./Doc 29 Admin - RC</u>	Since September 11, industry in survival mode/some redundancies.	Nicole Svatek, Virgin Atlantic	??
<u>32./Doc 29 Admin - RC</u>	Malaise in industry <i>pre</i> September 11 – freeze proposals, cut us some slack.	Mike Wood, British European	Under consideration
<u>33./Doc 29 Admin - RC</u>	Guide was published 3 years ago; some are more prepared than others. Stick to the timescale; need another forum. Think positively and move forward. The reality is that it is here; let's get to grips with it. (Statement)	Mike Stonehewer, FDM(UK)/CRM Panel	-
<u>34./Doc 29 Admin - RC</u>	To be CRMIE, target is 30 September 2002. Not realistic; we have not got time.	Geoff Iliff-Rolfe, British European	Concerned if we slip timescale. (PG) Note: Clarification by PC after lunch of many of the points raised in this session, re grandfather rights et al.
<u>35./Final Wash-up</u>	Re letter to H FOD (David Chapman) from FOLG: timescale for reply?	Andy Gaskell, JMC	Will be addressed in the FOLG at its next meeting. (PG)
<u>36./Final Wash-up</u>	Line trainers need to have done a training course and need CRM knowledge; will TRI core course suffice?	Jeff Bowie, Monarch	Depends on course. (RC)
<u>37./Final Wash-up</u>	Paddy Carver's presentation was tremendous! There is an element of confusion between implementing CRM and improvement of standards. Still unsure of direction. Told we do not need to do anything for a year, but <i>not</i> true. We ask CAA to think again about the way forward. LPC failure?	A Clark, British European	Cannot fail LPC for CRM failings, only an OPC. Therefore the operator must set the standards (RC)

<u>38./Final Wash-up</u>	CRMIE at various levels of understanding and not bought into by instructors. Every other area we train first, but we have not trained CRMIEs.	Steve Hunt, BA/Panel	We hear what you say. (PG)
<u>39./Final Wash-up</u>	What are we going to provide for those CRMIs we fail? They are sub-standard and promulgating the wrong message. Could be messy. Need to preserve integrity. We need support systems in place <i>before</i> the failures.	Nicole Svatek, Virgin Atlantic	Undoubtedly, we will fail people. (PG)
<u>40./Final Wash-up</u>	What is CAA doing to validate FOIs?	Steve Hunt, BA/Panel	Running course to make them CRMIE equivalents. (PG)
<u>41./Final Wash-up</u>	Two issues: first, TAWS introduction, but still need SA. Second, CRM enthusiastic volunteers might fail as CRM facilitators. Can fail instructors but can't fail the pilot. To stop accidents, we need to stop the rogue pilot.	Chris Chadwick, FRA	??
<u>42./Final Wash-up</u>	Pilot selection process.	Mike Stonehewer	We can't run before we walk. IFALPA has said "not in our lifetime" - don't trust people who assess pilots. Today is a good example, everybody is getting behind the process: instructors up to standard, then examiners, <i>then</i> assess pilots. (CE) Now we have the opportunity to hang CRM on technical failure/weakness. We are doing much of this already, linking to technical, which is safe. (PG)
<u>43./Final Wash-up</u>	Has CAA got a database of instructors?	Mike Veal, Air Cordial	Yes, of instructors and will have of examiners. (PG)
<u>44./Final Wash-up</u>	[Aside to PH] Suggest NOTECHS language be integrated into the Guide when it is rewritten.	Richard Coward, British Mediterranean	[For Panel to examine – 13 Dec 01?]