



WORKING PAPER

OCTOBER 16, 2017

RITZ FOUR SEASON HOTEL, LISBON, PORTUGAL

WORKING GROUPS SESSION

FEEDBACK FROM IHAS PARTICIPANTS TO THE WFP AVIATION SAFETY UNIT

&

WFP AVIATION SAFETY UNIT's FEEDBACK TO ATTENDANTS

**FACILITATED BY: JOSE T. ODINI, CHIEF ASU
WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME
AVIATION.SAFETY@WFP.ORG**

This working paper and the information contained herein is intended only for technical discussion purposes and to generate suggestions for improvement and it shall not be used for other purposes.

During the session dedicated to Aviation Safety Unit (ASU) of the World Food Programme at the International Humanitarian Aviation Summit (IHAS), held in Lisbon, Portugal on the 13th of October, 2017, the Chief of ASU Mr. Jose T. Odini called the participants of IHAS to provide feedback on the three selected areas of ASU activities:

1. Air Operators assessments

- Registration and monitoring

2. Accidents & Serious Incidents internal WFP review

- Follow up of some occurrences

3. Safety Communication and Safety Promotion

The aim of the exercise was to collect feedback and to improve ASU work's outputs based on the collected comments and suggestions. The participants were divided into four groups and the feedback was collected from all the participants.

Each group presented the summary of group's responses in the short presentation by a volunteer speaker.

The proposal/feedback from the different working groups is summarized in the following pages together with ASU feedback to the attendants.

ASU would like to thank a lot all the attendants for their contribution to the improvement of the level of safety of the humanitarian flights.

GROUP A

ASU facilitators: Jose and Harish

PROPOSAL/FEEDBACK	ASU FEEDBACK
A1. WFP support is required to enhance the threat assessment in new locations	ASU will work closely with AVSEC to improve the current information system in this area.
A2. Runway conditions and crowd control is a recurrent hazard	A working group will be created to develop mitigation measures which should be implemented in the future.
A3. DFS safety occurrences' summary do not mention the locations and if mentioned it may be of help for operator	ASU will relay this feedback to DFS for consideration.
A4. WFP procedures on safety occurrence reporting are sometimes confusing or not standardized along countries	ASU will improve the standardization in close coordination with UNHAS and will work on an update of current reporting procedures. WFP occurrence report form will be updated. Outputs will be shared through ASU Safety Communication System.
A5. Logistic support for new operation: visa, clearances, flight permits	Support is provided through the Aviation colleagues (WFP Aviation Service & UNHAS) and specific suggestions shall be provided to them.
A6. Deep field focal point training, communication	The training for deep field coordinators will be reviewed together with the Training Unit and implemented accordingly, comprising field coordinator requirements and standards.
A7. DG handling	A working group will be created to develop mitigation measures to be implemented in the future.

GROUP B

ASU facilitators: Samir and Hugo

PROPOSAL/FEEDBACK	ASU FEEDBACK
B1. ASU to share grading with operators (A/B/C) and focal areas or improvement critical to use these score	An air operator is informed of its registration status and briefed in detail regarding areas identified for improvement during ASU assessments. The procedure will be reviewed by ASU to identify if any area requires improvement Note: The different categories within the registration are for internal use.
B2. Overwhelmed deep-field focal points – safety risk! Delayed start-ups due to poor crowd control	See A6.
B3. Reinforce security to reduce unwanted demands (often from military personnel) to catch lifts back to XXX airport	This type of occurrence may happen from time to time in zones with unstable security. The topic will be discussed with AVSEC and operators are invited to keep reporting so mitigation measures are reinforced on case by case basis.
B4. Revise the hazard registry report summary to eliminate duplication and old information	An online survey for internal and external users will be conducted to help identifying specific areas for improvement regarding risk information being shared by ASU. ASU will review the related reports for improvement. A dashboard type of information accessible live is an option being discussed.

GROUP C

ASU facilitators: Alvaro and Ieva

PROPOSAL/FEEDBACK	ASU FEEDBACK
C1. Which support may ASU provide regarding to communication with CAA's of the Country of Operation	Support is usually provided through the WFP Chief Aviation Transport Officer (CATO) in the Country. However, ASU keeps fluent relationships with most of the CAAs of the countries of operation and is ready to give additional support through the CATO.
C2. Rotation of ASU officers who perform safety assessments is recommended	The recommendation is agreed and it will be implemented as much as feasible.
C3. To have more than one ASU officer for safety assessments	This concept is applied for base assessments (BORE) and considered for other assessments only when feasible due cost implications.
C4. Hazard/safety issue: 1) Airstrip surface condition 2) Runway incursion 3) Wear Mics 4) Hand held radios/communication with field	See A2 & A6.
C5. Timely feedback from safety assessment	This is normally achieved being the actual standard within 14 days. It will be reviewed within ASU for improvement.
C6. Oversight of Dangerous Goods in the field	See A7.
C7. Field safety focal points – they should give feedback on reports submitted to them from the operation	Feedback is to be provided by UNHAS. See A6 for follow-up.
C8. Birds, people around runways	See A2.
C9. Security: for internal planning and assessments of security, can the WFP assist with domestic visits to facilities, airstrips and critical air infrastructure?	ASU & AVSEC routinely assess the mentioned points. Further discussion of this topic will be performed between ASU & AVSEC.
C10. Hire more staff	This is not necessary a solution for all challenges and it is subject to budget availability. It will be good to have specific recommendations provided to the specific operation/s to be considered locally.

PROPOSAL/FEEDBACK	ASU FEEDBACK
C11. ASU issues quarterly/annual safety summaries. We want to suggest the hazard report made by each operator viewed vis a vis the number of aircraft on a contract	See B4.
C12. Risk evaluation to be conducted at different time for the same operator stationed in different places to facilitate operator's preparation/response.	This is in general conducted at different times for one operator stationed in different places. It may however be conducted simultaneously only if a potential serious concern has been identified and/or when immediate monitoring for safety reasons is required.
C13. Reducing the subjective factor of an ASU officer performing an assessment	This is an on-going process always considered by ASU and the suggestion will continue to be taken into account.
C14. Security on ground – better coordination between airfield focal point and UNHAS	See A6.
C15. WFP coordination in regards with flight planning to be enhanced, e.g.: helipad occupied on arrival to destination	ASU will review this topic with Aviation in order to identify specific mitigation actions which may be put in place.

GROUP D

ASU facilitators: Marco and Valentin

Proposal	ASU comment
D1. Sharing of information between customers/organizations in the same operating environment, i.e. two different risk assessments	See A1. In addition: Global Safety Summary is ASU's routine report comprising occurrences. The sharing platform could be facilitated by WFP by providing access for all operators working in one Aviation Field Operation to share information. To be reviewed by ASU to define feasibility and possible action.
D2. How do we incorporate FRMS in humanitarian operations. All available guidance material is based on scheduled airline operations	Fatigue's topics are not at this stage a specific ICAO standard, however it is recommended that the operator should develop in detail the topic in their internal procedures. FRMS in humanitarian air operations will be included in ASU future technical discussions in order to specifically adapt FRMS to WFP operational environment in coordination with the operators.
D3. Ability to message the flight crew through other means than HF, i.e. AFIRS	The proposal has cost implications which are suggested to be discussed further between operators and Aviation so specifics may be built-in in charter agreements.
D4. Quality Assurance audits are proposed to be conducted by the operator and WFP at the same time	It may be a good proposal as far as conflict of interest is avoided when implemented. ASU will review this possibility internally and give further feedback through ASU safety communication system (SCS).

ACTION/S

ASU will follow-up on the items detailed above which require action and will give further feedback in the next GHAC/IHAS.

This paper will be uploaded in the GHAC web page and attendants informed accordingly through the WFP Safety Communication System.

Attendants are invited to provide additional feedback directly to aviation.safety@wfp.org.

Thanks to all for your support.

END OF WORKING PAPER.-