EUR 258-20 / WG121-04
RTCA Paper No: 287-20/SC241-007

SUMMARY: RTCA advises the public of the Third RTCA SC-241 Plenary Session
DATES: Thursday, October 15, 2020, 10:00 AM - 1:00 PM Central Time
LOCATION: Virtual WebEx Contact the POC for connection details
POINT OF CONTACT: Contact Al Secen by email asecen@rtca.org, telephone 202-330-0647, or mailing address RTCA, 1150 18th Street, NW, Suite 910, Washington, DC, 20036
FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: Visit the RTCA Website at
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The agenda will include the following:

Thursday, October 15, 2020

1. RTCA/EUROCAE Policy Statements
2. Welcome and Introductions
3. Approve Minutes from Meeting 2
4. Recap previous meeting
5. Work groups update (presentation)
    a. Document Review
    b. Compatibility of Chemicals
    c. Non-Chemical
6. Review Guidance Document and Approve Opening of FTAC/OC
7. Date of next meetings
8. AOB
9. Adjourn

Attendees (extracted from WebEx Attendee List):

Adam Novish AFA
Al Secen (RTCA)
Bernard BALDINI
Bill Tyson
Bob Ireland
Bryan Moran
Candace Kolander, ALPA
Capt Pawan Kumar
Carsten Kohlmeier-Beckmann
Chad Johnson, Transport Canada
Chloe Shen Morosetti (UAL)
David Baron ALPA
Di Reimold
Dinkar Mokadam
Enzo Canari
Hal Adams
Harold Summers
Irene Rexwinkle
Jeff Densmore
Jeff Gardlin
Jerry Wright
Jim Davis (Accufleet)
John Taylor ALPA
Jon Fifield

JP Floyd
Judith Ritchie
Laurent Sabrazat
Lucien Bourlegat
Marie Laure Moulard
Mike Krenz
Nobuyo Reinsch
Odhiamboc
Patrick Guerin
Paul Mcgraw
Iva Pluhackova
Sabine Hoelterhoff
Scott Gandy (FAA SEA AEG)
Sebastian Reschenhofer
Stefania Tomasini
Stephen Yates
Travis Ludwig, ALPA

1 RTCA/EUROCAE Policy Statements

Al Secen (AC) and Sebastian Reschenhofer (SR) read IPR and membership policies of both organisations.

2 Welcome and Introductions

CM conducted a tour de table to introduce the members and new participants.

3 Approve Minutes of Meeting 2

AS discussed the previous meetings minutes and they were approved without any objections.

4 Recap last meeting

Manfred Mohr (MM) recapped the last meeting, pointed out the 3 SGs and mentioned the shortened OC/FRAC time of 28 days.
The most important points is to avoid duplication by any means and work as fast as possible due to the tight schedule and urgent need of cleaning standards.

Chloe Shen Morosetti (CSM) mentioned the discussion of the timeline and described the SGs and their leaders in detail.

Both chairs thanked the plenary for their support and participation in this very important activity!

5 Work groups update (presentation)

5.1 Document Review

Iva Pluhackovai (IP) gave a status report of SG-1 and advised that document was near completion with only a few small minor additions remaining, advised that there will be questions for Plenary at end of discussion related to scope of document for WG1 which will affect definitions section. Would like to know the scope of the document so that the focus can be determined for targeted operation (commercial vs private or all operations) and scope of personnel affected for this document.

Kandace advised there was no changed to roles and responsibilities since last Plenary briefing.

Dave (Byron?) talked about cleaning section but decided to keep high level due to document being about disinfection although DB noted that cleaning needs to take place prior to disinfection.

Paul (M?) discussed assessing the duration of effectiveness of disinfection, viewed as a challenge,

looked at the health risks associated with treatment, means to evaluate effectiveness, and assembled appendix for consideration for evaluation and frequency of application.

IP showed document (definitions section) and walked through definition of “aircraft” as shown in ICAO as to broad. Thought we need to define type of aircraft we are trying to solve for, and will need to define scope of document as it relates to type of operation, type of personnel as stated previously.

CM advised WG that this is the time to focus definition of aircraft for use in this document

Hal advised that this should be used for all operations/aircraft so that everyone has a reference document to look back to, to help each type of operator. Thinks that this could be useful as a general document vs a narrow-defined segment of the industry. Paul M. agrees, Patrick G. agrees, John T agrees with Hal as well.

Bob Ireland can resolve this by addressing this topic in the scope of the documents. Does not believe that defining the type of aircraft is necessary for this type of industry document.

Jim Davis does not believe that we should tailor document for small aircraft because most likely will not make economic sense to small aircraft.

IP agrees with Jim Davis that we should define scope to show primary focus is on transport category, however, this document could apply to smaller aircraft

Bryan Moran consideration that focus should be for commercial aircraft, can apply, but advise to use caution for all other operators

Jeff Gardlin agrees with IP that this should be handled in scope clause

Hal advised that this document gives more process related info that does indeed apply to all operations but should be up to individuals to apply information as necessary

AS discussed, options to approve/deny how to move forward with the discussed scope inclusion

IP clarified that her proposal would be to include scope in the document and say primary focus is commercial transportation, nevertheless the principal and guidelines apply to general aviation as well.

Proposal was seconded by John Taylor, moved by Hal Adams, and no objections stated

IP in personal occupation and safety section, personnel, would like to understand scope for which personnel should be targeted for this document (such as the induvial performing the cleaning and disinfection tasks)

Caroline advised from the chemical section, use of PPE section, and training section was specific to person using (handling) the chemical

Hal, from the non-chemical team advised that the proper use of PPE driven by SMS process and whoever owns process for non-chemical process, process oriented not prescriptive. Non chemicals have been a bit tricky since people might not be involved in working process in such processes as UV or ionization.

Steve Gates suggests adding that person doing operation ensures that bystanders are not in line of sight to reduce exposure.

Jim Davis is concerned that any operators using cleaning or applying methods should wear PPE to ensure that the surface in which they are protecting does not get re-contaminated by the operator

sneezing, coughing, or wiping dirty hands on sterile areas post disinfection.

Bryan advises that we cannot overstate the usage of PPE given the range and multitude or chemical solutions that are being used by the cleaners and ensuring that we are protecting he operators.

IP summarized that it was proposed that we should broaden the PPE section a bit to ensure protection to operator and aircraft from operator post disinfection. No vote necessary, just make changes.

AS agrees with IP on no vote, just make changes.

IP gives back to CM to move to team 2

5.2 Compatibility of Chemicals

John Taylor (JT) gave and update of SG-2, advised of challenge of defining chemical usage process due to many different policy and procedures globally advised it should be driven indivisibly by SMS process.

Steven Yates (SY) notices material compatibility section does not include guidelines from manufactures on which materials have potential to be damaged by certain chemicals and generalize possible damage. Suggests putting this info down as a reference point to help user reading document in the future.

Bryan Moran (BM) advised to many chemicals and list changes so often, will not be able to keep up with compatibility and info will go out of date (stale) very, very quickly. To hard to manage such a large list of 479 chemicals with so many fixtures and aircraft surfaces and the effect on each surface.

IP believes that we should have some kind of high-level cross reference to direct which chemicals users should stay away from all together, would be helpful to operator.

John Taylor advised that there are too many nation states that regulate chemicals very differently and that managing this list is difficult enough without now having to separate nation state requirements.

Caroline advised that this should be accomplished through training and the OEM manufacturer

AS wants to ensure we capture that the OEM was brought in to talk about aircraft and part, and industrial hygienist from each nation state to recognized what it approved for their particular state.

BM advised that in multi operator message to airlines for chemical disinfectant gives a NTO for chemicals, no recommendation given from OEM.

JG Irene had proposed a matrix to broad info for information on certain types of chemicals

Irene had proposed matrix, and presented but feedback indicated scope had changed in document and we were more interested in providing guidance on what is clean and what is safe from a health perspective vs a material compatibility perspective. Irene agrees that there is value in providing general guidance, and should say that this matrix should not override seeking NTO's from OEM's. It's worth clarifying what direction do we want to go with for this document.

Hal advised that if you follow the SRA/SMS process generically speaking, you will arrive at what the conclusion on what to do, what works, and what does not. If a chemical is used without going through this process, operator is taking risk.

Irene's matrix that was proposed on chemicals and material compatibility was to show general classes of risk ranking from high risk, to low risk, to unknown. This info maybe valuable to airlines

John Taylor thought that this matrix was to be put into the document in the SMS section (in the appendix section)

IP would like to see this matrix included in the document, has tremendous value

Jeff Davis would like to see this matrix included as well

John Taylor advised that the matrix will live in the SMS process section, and also it will be put into the chemical section for reference

John proposed to move onto efficacy and see if that might provide some clarity to previous points

Dave addressed efficacy, looked back into SMS and SRA process to make sure there was guidelines that individual chemicals were effective and safe to use on aircraft. Broke down aircraft into four environments. Needs to make sure that there is a feedback loop with testing and evaluation. Suggest to loop in regulators for nation state, OEM manufacturers, and third party testers if necessary.

Sabina (?) have we addressed usage of chemicals in cargo when carrying line animals, food, expensive cars and other valuable cargo, yes this is addressed.

Bryan advised that 3.3.2 will need to come up with new title, suggest changing to “Chemical Availability”, proposed to group, no response from anyone, noted that title Chemical Makeup does not work for this section

AS advised that Plenary needs to stop reviewing line by line and take this time to advise if there are any major issues with content and readiness for FRAC.

John advised that 3.3.7, frequency was left very specific, following IATA document

3.3.8/3.3.9 Caroline advised no concerns noted in these sections, very generic and high level

5.3 Non-Chemical

Hal Adams (HA) gave and update of SG-3, and approach that was taken to creation of document. Worked with John Taylor with regards to parallel with SMS, advised of science-based explanation and known not chemical solutions. Three solutions used for non-chemical process are not new, but rather been around for quite a while. Waiting on a few documents to come in but would consider the document mostly complete. Requested info on ECS (sp?) HEPA filters, info still trickling in. Hal had to go to manufactures to get info, still waiting on that return communication for more info. Has lots of info on ionization, have some documents. No information on thermal sanitization, it is emerging technology and just not available. Because this is a living document, we can always update at a later time as the technology evolves. Overall, pretty much complete with section 3.

Stephen Yates (SY) in UV section, the key issue is dose. Hit it hard or hit it lightly with UV. Referred to efficacy in terms of dose, safety in terms of dose, and materials compatibility in respect to dose. With respect to materials compatibility, this section that was written cites two white papers from Honeywell, made white papers available publicly on website. Has Stephen and his team followed proper criteria to cite these papers since making them publicly available? Second item is with respect to efficacy, approach is to provide via references a large number of documents, for what dose is required to get what % disinfection with witch germs. Info is provided in references, advised for each device, user needs to know intensity of light, that reaches the surface then the time. Those two items will give dose.

Capt Pawan Kumar (PK) advised that he can provide lab testing results for this document and is

willing to share as public document. Hal advised that this must follow RTCA criteria.

Cynthia wanted to note that UV acceptance by national health authority in Germany for surface disinfection is not accepted, only for water germ reduction. Cannot say UV in connection with disinfection. Hal advised that the way we deal with this in document is through SMS process.

Bryan Moran (BM) should we add ozone as a by-product of UV? Hal advised that he has a document from AFRL but is marked for official use only, so they are trying to get this document "unsealed" to reference. Hal advised that they add in comment about ozone generation.

SY advises that it is important to note the possibility of ozone as by-product of some products

6 Review Guidance Document and Approve Opening of FRAC/OC

AL shared presentation on FRAC process and walked through "how to" deal with comments to document during review process

As previously agreed, this is a shortened 28-day review process (not 30-45 as normal)

CM suggests opening FRAC one week from today on 10/22 for final inputs, then FRAC will be open for 28-day review and comment

CM WG team leads will get all final inputs to AS by COB 10/20

CK will address scope addition

RTCA and Eurocae agreed on trimline implementation

CM What happens after 28-day window?

AS Al will compile comments and will provide feedback to committee and then will schedule time to address prior to submission for publication

CM suggests one week after FRAC closes (11/19) for resolution with working groups prior to next plenary

7 Date of next meeting

Review of the schedule and recommendation for the next plenary.

The date will be December 10, 2020 and this will be a virtual plenary only

The next plenary will work through comment resolution and publish the document

ACTION: RTCA to plan and schedule the next plenary session for December 10, 2020

8 AOB

Action item review was requested to be done through the meeting minutes

9 Adjourn

Motion to Adjourn
Motion offered: PG

Motion seconded: TL