



Medical standards

What is an acceptable incapacitation risk for different tasks?



What is it?



John Chaplin Past director UK CAA Safety Regulation Group





What is an acceptable in-flight incapacitation risk?

- Assessment procedure developed for cardiac disease
- * Early 1980s
- Applies to any potentially suddenly incapacitating illness
- Called "1% Rule"



Further assumptions.....

- Only flight close to the ground ("critical period") poses any safety risk
- Incapacitation outside critical period poses no safety risk





Risk during "critical period"

How often will the second pilot fail to take over safely?

Simulator incapacitation study (Chapman 1984)

- * 1 in 400 incapacitations in critical period -> 'crash'
- 'Real world' risk is greater assume risk of 1 in 100







What do the figures mean?

 $10 = 10^{1}$ 1,000 = 10³ 1,000,000 = 10⁶ 1,000,000,000 = 10⁹

Acceptable risk per year

- What is the acceptable incapacitation risk per year for a professional pilot?
- Compare aeromedical risk with other flight safety risks



What is an acceptable target medical cause fatal accident rate?

- Target all cause fatal accident rate = 1 in 10⁷ flying hours (not greater than)
- Target single system (weather, engine, hydraulics, <u>pilots</u> etc.) contribution to risk = 1 FA in 10⁸ flying hours
 - Most pilot related risk due to error
- Target medical contribution to risk
 - = 1 FA in 10^9 flying hours



- Target medical cause fatal accident rate = 1 in 10⁹ (1,000 m) hours
- Acceptable in-flight incapacitation rate for an individual pilot is 1,000X greater than 1 in 10⁹ hours
- \Rightarrow = 1 in 10⁶ hours

Acceptable in-flight incapacitation rate = 1 in 10⁶ hours

- ✤ 1 in 10⁶ hours = 1 in 1,000,000
- **♦** = 100% in 1,000,000 hours
- ✤ = 1% in 10,000 hours
- * = approx 1% in 1 year (8,760 hours per year)
- ♦ = 1% in 1 year = 1% 'Rule'

The "1% Rule"

"If a professional pilot has an in-flight incapacitation risk greater than 1% per annum he is unfit for professional flying"

Advantages of objective risk target

- * Reduces influence of 'eminent opinion'
- Enables doctors not familiar with aviation risks to assist in medical assessment
- Improves consistency of decision-making
 - Within and across specialities, over time
- Accepted by unions

Disadvantages

- Many diseases not amenable to numerical analysis
 - Especially psychiatry
- Judgement still necessary in many cases

Conclusions

- Objective decision-making is desirable
- Despite its limitations the "1% Rule" has been found to be a useful aid to objective aeromedical decisionmaking

Acceptable Aeromedical Risk for Pilots

Dr Anthony Evans Chief, Aviation Medicine Section ICAO, Montreal



Lima, Peru, March 2009