



FAI SAFETY EXPERT GROUP (SEG)

Report to FAI General Conference 2013

The FAI Safety Expert Group consists of the following appointed experts:

Dr. Geff McCARTHY, USA
Ian E. OLDAKER, CAN (OSTIV)
Raymond CAUX, FRA
Daniel KNECHT, SUI
Niels-Christian Levin HANSEN, DEN
Jacek KIBINSKI, POL
James BLACK, UK

Point of contact (PoC):
Otto LAGARHUS, EB
(temporary, PoC appointment in process)

General

The Safety Expert Group (SEG) has had moderate activity, in the form of exchange of e-mails concerning the various tasks, as well as 2 meetings using the GoToMeeting (GTM) electronic format. Results are considered adequate for the amount of work and effort invested.

The experience from the SEG this year sends two important messages to the FAI (and hence the EB):

- The scheduled electronic meetings (as practiced with the two GTM meetings held) is a cost-effective way of elevating the discussions to a level above the exchange of e-mails and documents. It is therefore suggested that regular electronic meetings be scheduled, as the e-mail exchanges have a tendency to involve only a few persons, and to «fade out» unless someone is actively pursuing and managing the discussion process.
- The appointment of a Point of Contact with adequate time and suitable expertise is considered a major success factor. The effort finding a «permanent» PoC will be renewed.

The result and impact of the work performed must not be underestimated, and will in the course of the next year or two produce results that will impact the safety work of the FAI in a positive manner.

On the following pages, please find the status reports of the tasks of the SEG.

Task 1 - Status Report:

Establishing a new and improved FAI Safety Policy

(New draft FAI Safety Policy suggested)

Background

An initiative from IPC resulted in a review of the present FAI Safety Policy (as appearing in our Safety Goals & Strategies), with quite a number of possible changes/improvements surfacing during 2012. There is a need to continue this process, and to arrive at a new and improved FAI Safety Policy and ensure that such a policy is communicated and deployed throughout the FAI organization.

Task description

(as approved for 2013)

Establish a new FAI Safety Policy, to be presented at 2013 General Conference.

- **Two FAI Safety Experts were charged with drafting a new (alternative) FAI Safety Policy**
- **This initial draft FAI Safety Policy shall be forwarded to the full SEG for approval/modification, resulting in a formal Draft FAI Safety Policy.**
- **The Draft FAI Safety Policy will then be forwarded to the FAI Executive Board for approval/modification.**
- **The initial draft FAI Safety Policy will be presented to the 2013 FAI General Conference in Kuala Lumpur**

Progress

The various e-mail exchanges and meetings during 2013 showed some disparity in opinions when considering important areas such as management responsibility for safety and Safety Management Systems (SMS). While several of the experts stressed a strong focus on management and SMS, there were notable exceptions from members pointing out the problem if introducing «complex» SMS systems in «simple» air sports activities, creating confusion and a negative attitude towards safety work. As a consequence, this issue will be further evaluated and discussed, in order to find the «middle road», enable application of SMS systems of such nature that they are acceptable, understandable and implementable even in air sports disciplines involving a minimum of systems and equipment.

Below find some comments to the existing FAI Safety Policy emanating from the discussions in the SEG meetings during 2013:

- Lack of «system» or «management» aspects
- Too much emphasis on accident/incident reduction

- The main task is improving the safety culture in the various air sports activities - must be better reflected in the text

Suggestions/cautions emanating from discussions:

- Be careful in applying too «advanced» concepts, please remember the range of users in FAI, e.g. hang-gliders, paragliders, balloons etc. There is a risk of «loosing the basic flyers» through too advanced systems approach.
- Effective deployment (distribution/understanding/acceptance) is a main issue for a major part of our sports disciplines - must be addressed.

Note: During the meetings of the Regulation Expert Group (REG), it became evident that the present concept of SMS by many was seen by many as a cost driver not giving tangible effects, as development was based on the need of larger organizations (airlines, air force), and generally not suited for air sports activities.

The SEG view of what is needed to supplement the present policy:

- The role and responsibility of management, e.g. the FAI, the national organization, the club etc.
- How to develop and apply a a simplified «SMS»; maybe combined with a risk assessment on an individual basis - a «quick-reference tool»

New draft FAI Safety Policy - Suggestion

(Note: The presentation format of our policy is through an overall goal, supplemented by a number of strategies, where the goal expresses the main purpose, while the strategies gives actions to support reaching the goal)

The following is offered as a draft FAI Safety Policy. There has been significant changes in the strategy part, reflecting the discussions at the SEG.

Please note that it is an initial draft only, and that it will be presented to the FAI EB at the August 2013 meeting. The policy (as amended/approved) will be given in a presentation (Keynote/PPT) at the Kuala Lumpur General Conference. The presentation should be ready latest 20 September 2013; this task will be allocated after the EB meeting in August.

Goal

The FAI shall strive to minimize the number and seriousness of accidents and incidents in all air sports activities.

Strategies

- Actively work for an improved safety culture in air sports activities
- Highlight the combined role and responsibility of management (NACs, ASCs, clubs etc.) **and** the individual air sports person in achieving a high level of safety
- Promote the development and application of cost effective Safety Management Systems designed and tailored for air sports activities

- Promote and facilitate the sharing of safety information between the various air sports activities and the NACs
- Promote the development and implementation of effective incident and accident reporting systems

Task 2 - Status Report:

FAI Common Safety Initiative (task still in progress - work continues)

Background

SEG initial findings showed that the safety work of the FAI Air Sport Commissions vary widely. We have not found a high degree commonality in approach to the safety issue, and the methodology and practices vary from high focus/activity to little focus and no specific safety activities. (This must not be interpreted to mean that there is no focus on safety as such, and it should be noted that all of the FAI ASCs have «imbedded» safety in their operations).

In the opinion of the SEG, there is quite a lot to gain in developing an FAI suggested structure/guide for safety work. This need not be «invented», as certain ASCs have already developed such structures/guides («best practices») that can be modified to be used as the «official FAI guide» for the benefit of all air sport disciplines.

Progress and further task

Based on our knowledge of the safety work taking place in the various Air Sport Commissions (ASCs), our objective is to develop a suggested (rudimentary) general guide for safety work within FAI. We envisage a small pamphlet of A5 size, with content of 8-12 pages.

The SEG shall provide layout and content list for such a guide to the FAI safety work, and suggest a method of cooperation/communication between ASCs in order to benefit from being part of the FAI structure.

The Safety Experts has submitted additional input, over and above what has been submitted before, and what was reported in the SEG 2012 Annual Report. Such input was asked to be rather «free-ranging» in a brainstorming fashion, in order to get as many «good ideas/best practices» as possible.

When sufficient material was accumulated, the PoC called two meetings by way of «GoToMeeting» Internet Software, in order to discuss and agree on a «FAI Safety Guide» format and content list, and to determine the further work programme.

These meetings were constructive and useful, but also served to highlight the need for a continued discussions and information gathering, ref. notes below.

Some points from the SEG discussions under this item:

- Focus on training and training programs, «engraved safety through training»
- Use a three-tiered approach, from top (FAI, national organizations, regulators), then to the «local organization» (club etc.) and then to the individual.

- Training is not the total answer; what about the experienced air sports person developing complacency..? How do we reach them..?
- Old, known problems causing accidents are not solved or sufficiently addressed (examples given from hang gliding); killing pilots every year for 30 years.
- Best practices within the industry and within FAI should be identified and developed.
- The large variation in knowledge, culture, experience etc. is a major challenge that must be addressed in a common FAI Safety Initiative. Large variations in experience in (e.g. Europe vs new members in Asia) and in equipment (e.g. experimental jet vs paragliding)

Present status of task

- **There will be further meetings/discussions during this fall.**
- **Based on these, the SEG will allocate further tasks to complete the first draft of a rudimentary FAI Safety Guide as described above.**

Task 3 - Status Report:

FAI Improved Safety through Shared Responsibility - ISSR (concept being evaluated - work continues)

Background

The ISSR concept was initially brought up at the FAI Executive Board meeting in AUG 2012, and has further evolved in thoughts and discussions thereafter.

The concept is built on the concept of “collective responsibility”, providing the individual air sports person with a strengthened collective responsibility (and also collective pride/shame) for his group’s success/failure to reach good and improving safety values/results.

For further background information, please refer to document SEG ISSR CONCEPT 18SEP12 V1, distributed to the SEG fall 2012.

Progress

The SEG pursued the ISSR concept development, and discussed the «ISSR Concept Description», in order to determine if the concept would be mature enough to be presented to the EB, and if considered feasible, the concept could also be presented at the 2013 General Conference, probably as an information paper only.

Our work is based on the following argumentation generally supported by the SEG members during the 2012 and 2013 dialogue, as follows:

- Significantly improved safety focus and awareness may be achieved through stimulating involvement from an “individual accident prevention oversight” to a “collective accident prevention oversight”.
- Our theory is that this should result in a passive and an active effect in safety work, as follows:
 - Passively: Stimulating an air sport person’s attitude into one that welcomes any safety comment or suggestion instead of considering it as an intrusion, in exchange for a reduction of the likelihood of actually becoming the “1 out 100” accident case as described in the referenced background information.

- Actively: Stimulating a propensity to meddle, to “mind somebody else’s business” by observing safety aspects of other members of one’s community, in expectation of a reciprocal behavior and accepting this for the same benefit: the reduction of likelihood of becoming the “1 out 100” accident case as described in the referenced background information.

The above argumentation can be summarized as: “it pays to also care about others and to accept being cared for”.

However, some of the SEG members expressed doubt of the concept as such, and others thought the concept needed more discussions to mature.

Below find a few excerpts from the discussions, both negative and positive.

Negative:

- This can backfire, too negative, may well be seen as a unwelcome intrusion
- A more positive approach should be taken, based on existing reporting systems, as follows:
 - Focus on current reporting systems, they are strong and also supplemented by anonymous reporting systems.
 - Sharing these reports (incidents, mishaps, close calls etc.) will be a strong driver for increased focus on safety

Positive:

- A very interesting system, with strong potential for safety improvement
- The «unit focus of collective caring» has proven its value in airlines, air force etc.; there the «meddling» or «caring» culture is present to a high degree, and is producing solid safety results.
- Acceptability of «meddling» can be sold in by describing the system in a positive way, and through pointing out the «caring» element; «I criticize because I care»; examples as follows:
 - «I saw that coming», or «we all saw that coming» - hindsight..!
 - Observed basic faults or bad behavior, nobody took action. Nobody cared?
- The challenge is the seasoned air sports person who has developed bad habits that need correction - how can we ensure a practice of active feedback (criticism) and how do we ensure acceptance for such behavior.
 - Probably through simple, effective communication.
 - As such, this system of «collective pressure» could be useful.

Present status of task:

- **Further meetings/discussions are needed during the fall of 2013 in order to arrive at a refined concept description which can be accepted by the SEG members, and then be further developed.**
- **Based on the outcome of these meetings/discussion, the SEG will determine further action/progress.**