

**ICAO**

The Fifth Meeting of the Aerodromes Operations and
Planning Sub-Group (AOP/SG/5)

Video Teleconference, 29 June to 2 July 2021

Agenda Item 4: Provision of AOP in the Asia/Pacific Region

– Reports of Working Group/Task Force Meetings

**REPORT ON THE THIRD MEETING OF THE ASIA/PACIFIC
WILDLIFE HAZARD MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP (AP-WHM/WG/3)**

(Presented by Chairman of AP-WHM/WG)

SUMMARY

This paper presents the Report of the Third Meeting of the Asia/Pacific Wildlife Hazard Management Working Group (AP-WHM WG/3) held as a video teleconference from 19 to 21 May 2021.

Strategic Objectives:

A: *Safety* – Enhance global civil aviation safety

B: *Air Navigation Capacity and Efficiency* — Increase the capacity and improve the efficiency of the global aviation system

E: *Environmental Protection* – Minimize the adverse environmental effects of civil aviation activities

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Third Meeting of the Asia/Pacific Wildlife Hazard Management Working Group (AP-WHM WG/3) was held as a video teleconference from 19 to 21 May 2021.

1.2 The Meeting was attended by 115 participants from 18 Member States, Association of Asia Pacific Airlines (AAPA), Airports Council International (ACI), International Federation of Air Line Pilots' Associations (IFALPA), World Birdstrike Association (WBA) and ICAO.

1.3 The full report of AP-WHM/WG/3 is available on ICAO APAC Office website at <https://www.icao.int/APAC/Meetings/Pages/2021-AP-WHM-WG3.aspx>.

1.4 **Attachment A** to this paper provides a summary report on the outcome of AP-WHM/WG/3 for review by AOP/SG/5.

1.5 Appendices referred in this Working Paper and **Attachment A** carry the same Appendix number as those in the Report of AP-WHM/WG/3 for easy reference.

2. DISCUSSION

AP-WHM/WG/3

2.1 There were 10 Working Papers, 3 Information Papers and 2 Presentations considered by AP-WHM/WG/3.

2.2 Some important discussions of the AP-WHM/WG/3 Meeting are summarized below.

Outcomes of APANPIRG/31 Meeting (WP/02)

2.3 The Secretariat provided a brief summary of APANPIRG/31 Meeting, held as a video teleconference from 14 to 16 December 2020, with particular highlights on Conclusions related to wildlife hazard management adopted by APANPIRG/31. The Report of APANPIRG/31 Meeting can be accessed at: <https://www.icao.int/APAC/Meetings/Pages/2020-APANPIRG31.aspx>.

2.4 The Meeting also noted and thanked Australian Aviation Wildlife Hazard Group (AAWHG) for their generous support in conducting Webinar on Wildlife Hazard Management on 23 September 2020 and 18 May 2021. Webinars on “Reporting and Recording Data on Wildlife Strikes” and “Wildlife Safety Risk Assessment” would be delivered in July and September 2021, respectively.

Report of States/Aerodrome Operators Problems/Issues on Wildlife Hazards Management based on Completed Survey Questionnaire (WP/04)

2.5 In response to Task 2/5, World Birdstrike Association (WBA) prepared and presented a “draft Report of State’s/Aerodrome Operators problem/issues on wildlife hazards management” based on completed survey questionnaire received from 23 States/Administrations.

2.6 The Chairman of the AP-WHM/WG requested ACI and WBA to explore the possibilities to organise WHM training for APAC States and Aerodrome Operators in near future.

2.7 The AP-WHM/WG agreed that the detailed report of the survey analysis provided in **Appendix A to the Report of the AP-WHM/WG/3** would be used to carry out Task 2/5 (b) by group of States.

Draft Asia Pacific Guidance for Establishment of National Procedure for Recording and Reporting Wildlife Strikes to Aircraft (WP/05)

2.8 The AP-WHM/WG/3 Meeting reviewed the “Draft Asia Pacific Guidance for Establishment of a National Procedure for Recording and Reporting Wildlife Strikes to Aircraft” provided in **Appendix B** which was developed by WBA, Nepal, Philippines, Sri Lanka and IFALPA in response to AP-WHM/WG Tasks 1/11, 1/12 and 2/6, and formulated the following Draft Conclusion for adoption by AOP/SG:

Draft Conclusion AP–WHM WG/3–1: Asia Pacific Guidance for Establishment of a National Procedure for Recording and Reporting Wildlife Strikes to Aircraft

What: That, Asia Pacific Guidance for Establishment of a National Procedure for Recording and Reporting Wildlife Strikes to Aircraft provided in Appendix B to the Report be endorsed for publication on ICAO APAC Website.		Expected impact: ☐ Political / Global ☐ Inter-regional ☐ Economic ☐ Environmental ☒ Ops/Technical
Why: For reference by States/Administration	Follow-up: ☐ Required from States	
When: 2-Jul-21	Status: Adopted by Subgroup	
Who: ☒ Sub groups ☒ APAC States ☒ ICAO APAC RO ☐ ICAO HQ ☐ Other: Nil		

Draft Asia/Pacific Guidance for Evaluation of Aerodrome Wildlife Hazard Management Programme (WP/06)

2.9 The AP-WHM/WG/3 Meeting reviewed the “Draft Asia/Pacific Guidance for Evaluation of Aerodrome Wildlife Hazard Management Programme (AWHMP)” provided in **Appendix C** which was developed by WBA, Australia, Bangladesh, India, Thailand and Airport Council International (ACI) in response to AP-WHM/WG Tasks 1/13 and 2/7, and formulated the following Draft Conclusion for adoption by AOP/SG:

Draft Conclusion AP–WHM WG/3–2: Asia/Pacific Guidance for Evaluation of Aerodrome Wildlife Hazard Management Programme (AWHMP)			
What:		That, Asia/Pacific Guidance for Evaluation of Aerodrome Wildlife Hazard Management Programme (AWHMP) provided in Appendix C to the Report be endorsed for publication on ICAO APAC Website.	
		Expected impact: ☐ Political / Global ☐ Inter-regional ☐ Economic ☐ Environmental ☒ Ops/Technical	
Why:		For reference by States/Administration	Follow-up: ☐ Required from States
When:		2-Jul-21	Status: Adopted by Subgroup
Who:		☒ Sub groups ☒ APAC States ☒ ICAO APAC RO ☐ ICAO HQ ☐ Other: Nil	

Draft Asia/Pacific Guidance on Development and Implementation of Aerodrome Wildlife Hazard Management Program (WP/08)

2.10 The AP-WHM/WG/3 Meeting reviewed the “Draft Asia/Pacific Regional Guidance for development and implementation of Aerodrome Wildlife Hazard Management Programme” developed by WBA, Australia, Fiji, India and AAPA in response to AP-WHM WG Task 1/9 and provided in **Appendix D to the Report**. The Meeting noted that the draft guidance document contained detailed guidelines required for development and implementation of AWHMP; however, the draft document required further improvement in terms of its structure to align with the guidelines provided in PANS-Aerodromes (Doc 9981) and Airport Services Manual (Doc 9137), Part 3 – WHM for endorsement by the next meeting of the Working Group.

TOR of AP-WHM/WG (WP/09)

2.11 The Terms of Reference (TOR) of AP-WHM/WG detailed the objective, scope of works, composition, working methods and time frame.

2.12 The TOR of AP-WHM/WG was first adopted by AOP/SG/2 (Bangkok, Thailand, 27 – 29 June 2018) and last amended by AOP/SG/3 (Bangkok, Thailand, 24 to 26 June 2019).

2.13 When the TOR was first developed, considering the scope of works, it was determined that the AP-WHM/WG should last for three years initially, i.e. until September 2021.

2.14 While the main objective of AP-WHM/WG was ‘*To assist States to establish National Wildlife Hazard Management Committee (NWHMC) and Airport Wildlife Hazard Management Programme*’ – the survey conducted by ICAO APAC Office using the questionnaire developed by the Working Group revealed that among 23 respondent States only 11 States had established NWHMC and many aerodromes in Asia/pacific Region had yet to establish effective WHMP. The survey analysis also revealed that the States with limited resources (human and financial) required necessary support in developing their capacity in WHM through workshops and technical assistance. In addition, some tasks of this Working Group were still outstanding as the COVID-19 pandemic had reorganized priorities among States and Administrations.

2.15 The approach proposed in the WP/09 and an extension of AP-WHM/WG until September 2023 was supported by Australia, India, Philippines, Nepal and WBA, and no objection was received from other Members. As such, AP-WHM/WG/3 formulated the following Draft Decision for adoption by AOP/SG/5:

Draft Decision AP-WHM/WG/3-3: TOR of AP-WHM /WG			
What: That, the Terms of Reference of the Asia/Pacific Wildlife Hazard Management Working Group be amended as in Appendix E of the Report.		Expected impact: ☐ Political / Global ☐ Inter-regional ☐ Economic ☐ Environmental ☒ Ops/Technical	
Why: To allow additional time to complete the tasks of the Working Group and address an added scope in TOR.		Follow-up: ☐ Required from States	
When: 2-Jul-21		Status: Draft to be adopted by Subgroup	
Who: ☒ Sub groups ☐ APAC States ☒ ICAO APAC RO ☐ ICAO HQ ☒ Other: AP-WHM/WG			

Task List of AP-WHM/WG (WP/10)

2.16 The AP-WHM/WG/3 Meeting reviewed the Task List, and the updated Task List provided in **Appendix F**.

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) review the Summary Report on the outcome of AP-WHM/WG/3 (**Attachment A**);
- b) discuss above Draft Conclusions (as presented in paragraphs 2.8 & 2.9) and Draft Decision (as presented in paragraph 2.15) formulated by AP-WHM/WG/3 for adoption by the Meeting; and
- c) discuss any relevant matters as appropriate.

— — — — —

Summary Report of the AP-WHM/WG/3 Meeting

HISTORY OF THE MEETING

i- 1

1. Introduction

1.1 The Third Meeting of the Asia/Pacific Wildlife Hazard Management Working Group (AP-WHM WG/3) was held as a video teleconference from 19 to 21 May 2021.

2. Attendance

2.1 The Meeting was attended by 115 participants from 18 Member States, Association of Asia Pacific Airlines (AAPA), Airports Council International (ACI), International Federation of Air Line Pilots' Associations (IFALPA), World Birdstrike Association (WBA) and ICAO.

2.2 10 Working Papers, 3 Information Papers and 2 Presentations were considered by the Meeting.

— — — — —

Agenda Item 1: Adoption of Provisional Agenda (WP/01)

1.1 The Provisional Agenda presented in WP/01 was adopted as Agenda for the Meeting.

Agenda Item 1:	Adoption of agenda
Agenda Item 2:	Review outcomes of related Meetings/Seminars
Agenda Item 3:	Global, Regional and National Guidance/Best Practices on Wildlife Hazard Management
Agenda Item 4:	Progress Update on Tasks assigned to States and International/Regional Organizations
Agenda Item 5:	Asia Pacific Regional Guidance on Implementation of Wildlife Hazard Management Programme
Agenda Item 6:	AP-WHM WG TOR and Task List
Agenda Item 7:	Any Other Business
Agenda Item 8:	Date and Venue of Next Meeting

— — — — —

Agenda Item 2: Review Outcomes of related Meetings/SeminarsOutcomes of APANPIRG/31 Meeting (WP/02)

2.1 The Secretariat provided a brief summary of APANPIRG/31 Meeting, held as a video teleconference from 14 to 16 December 2020, with particular highlights on Conclusions related to wildlife hazard management adopted by APANPIRG/31. The Report of APANPIRG/31 Meeting can be accessed at: <https://www.icao.int/APAC/Meetings/Pages/2020-APANPIRG31.aspx>.

2.2 The Meeting also noted and thanked Australian Aviation Wildlife Hazard Group (AAWHG) for their generous support in conducting Webinar on Wildlife Hazard Management on 23 September 2020 and 18 May 2021. Webinars on “Reporting and Recording Data on Wildlife Strikes” and “Wildlife Safety Risk Assessment” would be delivered in July and September 2021, respectively.

— — — — —

Agenda Item 3: Global, Regional and National Guidance/Best Practices on Wildlife Hazard Management

Wildlife Hazard Management Challenges and Best Practices adopted to Curtail Wildlife Hazard at CSMIA (WP/03)

3.1 India presented WP/03 sharing the experience on grass policy adopted by Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj International Airport, Mumbai (CSMIA) to control the birds and other wildlife hazards which were posing threats to aircraft operating from CSMIA, India. Bird strikes in and around CSMIA were a common phenomenon and its continued increase had put the airport operators to look for effective mitigation measures and undertaken to reduce these hazards in order to provide a safe and efficient flying environment at CSMIA.

3.2 As a policy based on experience, at CSMIA wildlife hazard management (WHM) would maintain long or short grass as per the table given below to control bird activity:

Area	Period	Grass policy
On the runway strip within 90m from the center line of runway.	June - November	Long grass policy (up to 30cm)
	December – May	Short grass (up to 20cm)
Other areas at airside beyond 90m from center line of runway	January – December	Short grass (up to 20cm)

3.3 The paper also highlighted advantages of long grass policy at CSMIA. However, it was not possible to maintain long grass policy for the entire year, except for the period between June to September, owing to drying and seed formation of grass. Inability to maintain long grass, however, would reduce the deterrent effect of long grass near runway zones and therefore would be complemented by different tactical methods.

3.4 The Meeting noted that the grass policy would provide one of the better mitigation measure in habitat management for the airport operator.

Strategy and Mitigation for Bird Strikes (IP/03)

3.5 Indonesia shared occurrence report data of PT Angkasa Pura II for the period from 2016 to 2020 which had shown that the safety issues were runway excursion, bird strikes, and kite strikes. With respect to bird strikes, the number of bird strikes in 2020 increased by 36% compare to bird strikes data in 2019. It was inversely proportional to the aircraft movements that had been decreased by 44.05% compare to 2019 aircraft movement data.

3.6 As increasing number of bird strikes occurrences was the concern for safety mitigation management toward wildlife and/or bird strikes hazards, PT Angkasa Pura II had conducted Wildlife/Bird Strikes Working Group meeting with the Director General of Civil Aviation (DGCA), Airlines, Air Navigation and Scientist to discuss various safety related issues with the objective to reduce wildlife strikes.

Flight Plan for Updating the IBIS Manual (PPT/01)

3.7 Delivered by USA, PPT/01 presented the ICAO Birdstrike Information System (IBIS) Manual Doc 9332 (3rd edition published 1989) which had not been updated in over 30 years. ICAO Job Card ADOP.015.03 was endorsed on 10 February 2021 to provide a much-needed renovation. Strike reporting throughout ICAO's member states was sporadic, unreliable and lacks standardized protocols to ensure comparable (or usable) quality. There were several challenges with strike data that include, at a minimum, its collection, quality assurance, evaluation and summation. Updating each section of the IBIS manual to provide usable, effective guidance would allow Civil Aviation Authorities, Aerodromes, Biologists, Pilots, Airlines and Engine and Airframe Manufacturers to better understand hazardous wildlife, reduce financial losses and improve safety.

3.8 Throughout the aviation industry, wildlife strike data provided a variety of benefits. Civil Aviation Authorities (CAA) needed a sufficient quality and quantity of data to: 1) track national trends and frequency; 2) determine the hazard level of species struck and; 3) provide a scientific foundation for regulatory guidance concerning mitigation of risks from wildlife strikes. Aerodromes needed a sufficient quality and quantity of data to identify and understand hazardous species, strike dynamics and subsequent habitat attractants as well as to evaluate the effectiveness of their wildlife management programs. Airframe and engine manufacturers needed enough quality data to evaluate the durability of their aircraft components to wildlife collisions as designed.

3.9 Incomplete, lack of, or inaccurate strike data resulted in ineffective risk management and an unnecessary increase in risk to bird strikes. Quality strike data allowed an aerodrome to effectively target hazardous wildlife and their habitat attractants; without reliable data, mitigations methods were less likely to be adopted. Quality data also resulted in improved resource and funding allocation. When an aerodrome had an improved understanding of its daily and seasonal wildlife threats it could more efficiently and cost-effectively prioritize its personnel, maintenance programs and projects to reduce habitat attractants. Furthermore, quality strike data could significantly enhance an effective evaluation to the program. This aided both the CAA when assessing the efficacy of aerodrome wildlife programs as well as each aerodrome when evaluating their own programs. Ultimately, aerodromes that could not effectively mitigate safety hazards, or effectively evaluate the safety goals of their wildlife programs may not be in regulatory compliance.

3.10 The IBIS manual must be updated to complement current ICAO regulatory guidance and to include updated/improved safety reporting systems such as ECCAIRS (European Coordination Centre for Accident and Incident Reporting System) and Excel. Consideration must be given to the benefits of standardized strike reporting protocols as well as determining minimum standards for strike report forms. Although the manual was primarily a guide for submitting strike data to ICAO, it would also provide information on data analysis, quality control/quality assurance procedures, and updated codes for the existing appendices.

3.11 The goal was to update the IBIS manual by Q4 2022 to provide usable, effective guidance that would allow civil aviation authorities, aerodromes, biologists, pilots, airlines and engine and airframe manufacturers. Ultimately, this would allow the industry to: 1) better understand & mitigate hazardous wildlife and risk; 2) reduce financial losses and; 3) Improve safety.

3.12 In response to suspected strikes, it was considered not appropriate to include in the wildlife strike database if they were not confirmed strikes or collisions with aircrafts and no evidences found.

Update ICAO Doc 9137 (PPT/02)

3.13 Albert de Hoon, Member of the ICAO WHM Expert Group presented a brief overview of 5th Edition of Airport Services Manual (Doc 9137), Part 3 – Wildlife Hazard Management.

3.14 Since 1969, ICAO had been addressing the bird/wildlife hazards in their Annexes, guidelines and manuals. With the increasing number of airports, aircraft movements and new generations of aircraft, the early recommendations became standards and guidelines and manuals became more detailed. In 2012, edition 4 of ICAO Doc 9137, the Airport Services Manual, Part 3 Wildlife Hazard Management was published. Following recent developments in wildlife hazard management the ICAO Wildlife Hazard Management Expert Group drafted 5th Edition of Doc 9137, published in 2020.

Agenda Item 4: Progress Update on Tasks assigned to States and International/Regional OrganizationsReport of States/Aerodrome Operators Problems/Issues on Wildlife Hazards Management based on Completed Survey Questionnaire (WP/04)

4.1 Subsequent to the First Meeting of ICAO Asia/Pacific Wildlife Hazard Management Working Group (AP-WHM/WG/1), a survey questionnaire was developed by the Working Group and sent to the States and Administrations in the region to assess the status of the wildlife management measures being adopted by the respective States/Aerodrome Operators.

4.2 The objective of the survey questionnaire was to analyse States' challenges in wildlife hazard management and to formulate prioritised actions to provide assistance to the States as required.

4.3 In response to Task 2/5, World Birdstrike Association (WBA) prepared and presented a "draft Report of State's/Aerodrome Operators problem/issues on wildlife hazards management" based on completed survey questionnaire received from 23 States/Administrations (including 10 responses received earlier).

4.4 Survey analysis were conducted in two parts:

- a) Part I - Analysis was based on States requirements consisted of 12 questions.
- b) Part II – There were 5 Sections with a total of 62 questions:
 - 1) Section 1 – Airport Wildlife Hazard Management;
 - 2) Section 2 – Safety Risk Assessment of Wildlife Strike;
 - 3) Section 3 – Wildlife Prevention Measures inside and outside Aerodrome;
 - 4) Section 4 - Wildlife Strike Reporting and Activity Reporting; and
 - 5) Section 5 – Training.

4.5 In response to question on capacity building/training in WHM, ACI informed the meeting that they had a class room training on WHM; however, due to COVID 19 situation ACI could deliver only online WHM training at this moment. In addition, ACI had its own Handbook on WHM. The Secretariat added that the two Webinars jointly conducted by ICAO and Australian Aviation Wildlife Hazard Group (AAWHG) on 24 September 2020 and 18 May 2021, respectively and additional two Webinars to be held in July 2021 and September 2021 would support for the capacity development of CAA and aerodrome operators involved in WHM.

4.6 The Chairman of the AP-WHM/WG requested ACI and WBA to explore the possibilities to organise WHM training for APAC States and Aerodrome Operators in near future.

4.7 The AP-WHM/WG agreed that the detailed report of the survey analysis provided in **Appendix A to this Report** would be used to carry out Task 2/5 (b) by group of States.

Draft Asia Pacific Guidance for Establishment of National Procedure for Recording and Reporting Wildlife Strikes to Aircraft (WP/05)

4.8 Delivered by WBA, Nepal, Philippines, Sri Lanka and IFALPA, WP/05 presented a “Draft Asia Pacific Guidance for Establishment of a National Procedure for Recording and Reporting Wildlife Strikes to Aircraft”. The paper was prepared in response to AP-WHM/WG Task 1/11, 1/12 and 2/6.

4.9 The AP-WHM/WG/3 Meeting reviewed the “Draft Asia Pacific Guidance for Establishment of a National Procedure for Recording and Reporting Wildlife Strikes to Aircraft” provided in **Appendix B** and formulated the Draft Conclusion for adoption by AOP/SG:

Draft Conclusion AP–WHM WG/3–1: Asia Pacific Guidance for Establishment of a National Procedure for Recording and Reporting Wildlife Strikes to Aircraft			
What: That, Asia Pacific Guidance for Establishment of a National Procedure for Recording and Reporting Wildlife Strikes to Aircraft provided in Appendix B to this Report be endorsed for publication on ICAO APAC Website.		Expected impact: ☐ Political / Global ☐ Inter-regional ☐ Economic ☐ Environmental ☒ Ops/Technical	
Why: For reference by States/Administration		Follow-up: ☐ Required from States	
When: 2-Jul-21		Status: Adopted by Subgroup	
Who: ☒ Sub groups ☒ APAC States ☒ ICAO APAC RO ☐ ICAO HQ ☐ Other: Nil			

4.10 In response to suspected bird strike within 13 km radius from aerodrome reference point, it was clarified that if any evidence of strike with aircraft was available it should be considered as confirmed strike and the location of the strike (whether on aerodrome or off aerodrome or unknown) should be indicated in the bird strike form. IFALPA supported this approach.

Draft Asia/Pacific Guidance for Evaluation of Aerodrome Wildlife Hazard Management Programme (WP/06)

4.11 WBA, Australia, Bangladesh, India, Thailand and Airport Council International (ACI) prepared and presented the “Draft Asia/Pacific Guidance for Evaluation of Aerodrome Wildlife Hazard Management Programme (AWHMP)” in response to AP-WHM WG Tasks 1/13 and 2/7.

4.12 After deployment of the Wildlife Hazard Management Programme (WHMP), aerodromes should develop a process to review WHMP to assure its full effectiveness and correct implementation. The evaluation should be completed at least on an annual basis and include an on-going review process to ensure its currency and functionality at all times. The outsourcing evaluation should consider the general workings of the programme with a view to efficiency and effectiveness.

4.13 The AP-WHM/WG/3 Meeting reviewed the “Draft Asia/Pacific Guidance for Evaluation of Aerodrome Wildlife Hazard Management Programme (AWHMP)” provided in **Appendix C** and formulated the following Draft Conclusion for adoption by AOP/SG:

Draft Conclusion AP–WHM WG/3–2: Asia/Pacific Guidance for Evaluation of Aerodrome Wildlife Hazard Management Programme (AWHMP)			
What: That, Asia/Pacific Guidance for Evaluation of Aerodrome Wildlife Hazard Management Programme (AWHMP) provided in Appendix C to this Report be endorsed for publication on ICAO APAC Website.		Expected impact: ☐ Political / Global ☐ Inter-regional ☐ Economic ☐ Environmental ☒ Ops/Technical	
Why: For reference by States/Administration		Follow-up: ☐ Required from States	
When: 2-Jul-21		Status: Adopted by Subgroup	
Who: ☒ Sub groups ☒ APAC States ☒ ICAO APAC RO ☐ ICAO HQ ☐ Other: Nil			

4.14 In response to question on frequency of wildlife survey, it was clarified that the frequency would depend on environment, size and level of complexity of the particular aerodrome, number of aircraft movements, and number of predetermined survey points, reactive and proactive measures to control wildlife and the outcome the aerodrome operator wished to achieve. In US, morning, day and evening surveys were recommended by FAA and could be staggered, as appropriate.

4.15 In response to question on lagging indicator, such as, “number of wildlife strikes / 10,000 aircraft movements”, it was clarified that this indicator was considered as universally harmonized format for safety performance terminology and was an expression of the ‘rate of incidence’; it did not require 10,000 movements to calculate it. It would allow the aviation users (airlines) to compare one aerodrome with another on a standardised occurrence rate basis.

Agenda Item 5: Asia Pacific Regional Guidance on Implementation of Wildlife Hazard Management Programme

Asia Pacific Regional Guidance on Implementation of Wildlife Hazard Management Programme (WP/07)

5.1 Presented by India, WP/07 suggested a way forward to meet the challenges faced by airports in proper implementation of Airport Wildlife Hazard Management Programme (AWHMP).

5.2 The paper highlighted lack of proper implementation of AWHMP, appointment of competent staff and Safety reporting as main challenges to airports.

5.3 Suggested guidance/solutions for implementation of proper AWHMP included:

- Provision of regulatory agency to monitor the implementation of AWHMP;
- Guidelines for implementation of AWHMP;
- Appointment of Airport Wildlife Hazard Coordinator; and
- Establishment of Airport Wildlife Hazard Management Division under Safety Department.

5.4 The AP-WHM/WG/3 Meeting noted challenges and suggested guidance/solutions presented in this paper.

Draft Asia/Pacific Guidance on Development and Implementation of Aerodrome Wildlife Hazard Management Program (WP/08)

5.5 Delivered by WBA, Australia, Fiji, India and AAPA, WP/08 presented a “Draft Asia/Pacific Guidance on Development and Implementation of Aerodrome Wildlife Hazard Management Programme”. The paper was prepared in response to AP-WHM WG Task 1/9.

5.6 At AP-WHM/WG/2 meeting, Fiji had presented “WP/07 Guidance on Wildlife Hazard Management Programme in Fiji”. AP-WHM/WG/2 meeting considered the development of a Regional Guidance document on Aerodrome Wildlife Hazard Management Programmes (AWHMP) with reference to the best practices from Fiji and other States in the APAC Region.

5.7 The AP-WHM/WG/3 Meeting reviewed the “Draft Asia/Pacific Regional Guidance for development and implementation of Aerodrome Wildlife Hazard Management Programme” provided in **Appendix D to this Report**. The Meeting noted that the draft guidance document contained detailed guidelines required for development and implementation of AWHMP; however, the draft document required further improvement in terms of its structure to align with the guidelines provided in PANS-Aerodromes (Doc 9981) and Airport Services Manual (Doc 9137), Part 3 – WHM for endorsement by the next meeting of the Working Group.

— — — — —

Agenda Item 6: AP-WHM/WG TOR and Task ListTOR of AP-WHM/WG (WP/09)

6.1 The Terms of Reference (TOR) of AP-WHM/WG detailed the objective, scope of works, composition, working methods and time frame.

6.2 The TOR of AP-WHM/WG was first adopted by AOP/SG/2 (Bangkok, Thailand, 27 – 29 June 2018) and last amended by AOP/SG/3 (Bangkok, Thailand, 24 to 26 June 2019).

6.3 When the TOR was first developed, considering the scope of works, it was determined that the AP-WHM/WG should last for three years initially, i.e. until September 2021.

6.4 While the main objective of AP-WHM/WG was ‘*To assist States to establish National Wildlife Hazard Management Committee (NWHMC) and Airport Wildlife Hazard Management Programme*’ – the survey conducted by ICAO APAC Office using the questionnaire developed by the Working Group revealed that among 23 respondent States only 11 States had established NWHMC and many aerodromes in Asia/pacific Region had yet to establish effective WHMP. The survey analysis also revealed that the States with limited resources (human and financial) required necessary support in developing their capacity in WHM through workshops and technical assistance. In addition, some tasks of this Working Group were still outstanding as the COVID-19 pandemic had reorganized priorities among States and Administrations.

6.5 The approach proposed in the WP/09 and an extension of AP-WHM/WG until September 2023 was supported by Australia, India, Philippines, Nepal and WBA, and no objection was received from other Members. As such, AP-WHM/WG/3 formulated the following Draft Decision for adoption by AOP/SG/5:

Draft Decision AP-WHM/WG/3-3: TOR of AP-WHM /WG			
What: That, the Terms of Reference of the Asia/Pacific Wildlife Hazard Management Working Group be amended as in Appendix E of this Report.		Expected impact: ☐ Political / Global ☐ Inter-regional ☐ Economic ☐ Environmental ☒ Ops/Technical	
Why: To allow additional time to complete the tasks of the Working Group and address an added scope in TOR.		Follow-up: ☐ Required from States	
When: 2-Jul-21		Status: Draft to be adopted by Subgroup	
Who: ☒ Sub groups ☐ APAC States ☒ ICAO APAC RO ☐ ICAO HQ ☒ Other: AP-WHM/WG			

Task List of AP-WHM/WG (WP/10)

6.6 The AP-WHM/WG/3 Meeting reviewed the Task List, and the updated Task List provided in **Appendix F**.

— — — — —

Agenda Item 7: Any other BusinessList of Experts of Asia/Pacific Wildlife Hazard Management Working Group (IP/02)

7.1 AP-WHM/WG/3 noted the updated list of experts of AP-WHM/WG.

— — — — —

Agenda Item 8: Date and Venue of Next Meeting

2.3 The next meeting of AP-WHM/WG would be held in May 2022 for three days. States/Administrations interested to host the AP-WHM/WG/4 were requested to contact the Secretariat. The venue of AP-WHM/WG/4 will be communicated to States/Administrations through ICAO APAC Invitation Letter.

— — — — —

Closure of Meeting

9.1 Mr. Deo Chandra Lal Karn, Chairperson of the AP-WHM/WG, expressed sincere thanks and appreciation to the participants from States/Administrations, International Organisations (IOs) and members of ICAO WHM Expert Group for their contribution and support to AP-WHM/WG/3. Special thanks deserved to Member States and IOs who provided invaluable contribution to complete tasks related to the development of the regional guidance documents on WHM.

— — — — —

Responses to Survey Questionnaire - State's problems /issues /deficiencies on Wildlife Hazard Management – Survey Analysis

Introduction:

1. A survey questionnaire was sent to all states after the 1st WHM WG meeting. We have received a total of 23 responses.
2. This analysis is based on the different topics of the survey
3. Part I – State requirements consisted of 12 Questions
4. Part II – Aerodrome Operators consisted of 5 sections with a total of 64Q

Section 1 - Airport Wildlife Hazard Management Program – 15 Q


Section 2 - Safety Risk Assessment of Wildlife Strike – 10 Q

Section 3 -Wildlife Prevention Measures inside and outside Aerodrome – 12 Q

Section 4 - Wildlife Strike Reporting – 19 Q


Section 5 – Training – 6 Q

STATE REQUIREMENTS - COMPLIANT




Airport Wildlife Hazard Management Program

COMPLIANT (Response = YES)




Airport Wildlife Hazard Management Program

NON COMPLIANT (Response = NO)




Safety Risk Assessment of Wildlife (Bird/Animal) Strike

COMPLIANT (Response = YES)




Safety Risk Assessment of Wildlife (Bird/Animal) Strike

NON COMPLIANT (Response = NO)




Wildlife Prevention Measures inside and outside Aerodrome

COMPLIANT (Response = YES)




Wildlife Prevention Measures inside and outside Aerodrome

NON COMPLIANT (Response = NO)




Wildlife Strike Reporting

COMPLIANT (Response = YES)




Wildlife Strike Reporting

NON COMPLIANT (Response = NO)




Training COMPLIANT (Response = YES)



Training

NON COMPLIANT (Response = NO)



Overall Performance Rating Scale

Some states seem to need help with being compliant with state requirements
Some Aerodromes Operators seem to be struggling with different sections of the
Questionnaire. Countries have been grouped to show the status of compliance.

- Red: Under Performance
- Orange: Developing but needs direction
- Amber: Meets Expectations
- Green: Meets desired goal

Recommendations with Action Plans can be made in consultation with States/Aerodromes
from WBA/ICAO on all of the below;

Section 1 - Airport Wildlife Hazard Management Program

Section 2 - Safety Risk Assessment of Wildlife (Bird/Animal) Strike

Section 3 – Wildlife Prevention Measures inside and outside Aerodrome

Section 4 - Wildlife Strike Reporting

Section 5 - Training

States Performance Rating Scale

Topic	Countries	Compliance Status	Recommendations
States	Group A Countries	Vietnam, Philippines, Sri lanka, Mongolia, Australia, Pakistan, Indonesia, Bhutan, China, Thailand	Workshop with Group A Countries to come up with Action Plans
	Group B Countries	Brunei, Myanmar, Cook Islands, Laos	
	Group C Countries	Singapore, Bangladesh, Hong Kong, Nepal, India, South Korea, Fiji	

Topic	Countries	Compliance Status	Recommendations
Section 1 Airport Wildlife Hazard Management Program	Group A Countries	Bhutan, Brunei, Bangladesh, Laos, Cambodia	Workshop with Group A Countries to come up with Action Plans
	Group B Countries	Myanmar, Indonesia, China, Nepal	
	Group C Countries	India, SriLanka, Vietnam, Cook Islands, Pakistan, Philippines, Australia	
	Group D Countries	Thailand, Singapore, Hong Kong, Mongolia, South Korea, Fiji	
Section 2 - Safety Risk Assessment of Wildlife (Bird/Animal) Strike	Group A Countries	Bhutan, Brunei, Bangladesh, Laos, Cambodia	Workshop with Group A Countries to come up with Action Plans
	Group B Countries	India, China, Myanmar, Philippines, Nepal, Pakistan	
	Group C Countries	Vietnam, Indonesia, Cook Islands, Hong Kong, Fiji, Mongolia	
	Group D Countries	Thailand, Singapore, Australia, South Korea, Sri Lanka	

Topic	Countries	Compliance Status	Recommendations
Section 3 – Wildlife Prevention Measures inside and outside Aerodrome	Group A Countries	Bhutan, Brunei, Laos	Workshop with Group A Countries to come up with Action Plans
	Group B Countries	Myanmar, China, Bangladesh, Cambodia	
	Group C Countries	Sri Lanka, Vietnam, South Korea, Pakistan, Philippines, Australia, Indonesia	
	Group D Countries	Thailand, Singapore, Hong Kong, Mongolia, Nepal, Fiji, India	
Section 4 - Wildlife Strike Reporting	Group A Countries	Cambodia, Bangladesh, Brunei, Philippines, Bhutan	Workshop with Group A Countries to come up with Action Plans
	Group B Countries	Indonesia, Pakistan, Nepal, Myanmar, China, Laos, India	
	Group C Countries	Sri Lanka, Cook Islands, Vietnam, Mongolia, Australia, Hong Kong	
	Group D Countries	Singapore, Thailand, South Korea, Fiji	

Topic	Countries	Compliance Status	Recommendations
Section 5 - Training	Group A Countries	Cambodia, Bangladesh, Brunei, Philippines, Bhutan, Myanmar, China	Workshop with Group A Countries to come up with Action Plans
	Group B Countries	Vietnam, Pakistan	
	Group C Countries	Laos, Nepal, Indonesia	
	Group D Countries	Thailand, Singapore, Hong Kong, Mongolia,, Fiji, India, Australia, South Korea, Cook Islands, Sri Lanka, India	

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION



ASIA PACIFIC GUIDANCE FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL PROCEDURE FOR
RECORDING AND REPORTING WILDLIFE STRIKES TO AIRCRAFT

[DRAFT]

First Edition 2021

This Guidance Material developed by AP-WHM/WG is
approved by the AOP/SG/# Meeting and published by ICAO
Asia and Pacific Office, Bangkok

[illegible]

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Scope and Purpose of the Document	2
3.	Recording Wildlife Strikes	2
4.	Standard Species Nomenclature across Spectrum for Reporting Purposes	3
5.	Standard Form for Monitoring and Recording of Wildlife Activity	3
6.	Aerodrome Wildlife Safety Risk Assessment.....	4
7.	Data Modelling and Analysis	4
	Attachment 1	
8.	Continual Monitoring: Recording and Reporting of Wildlife Strike	4
9.	Wildlife Strike Reports to ICAO	9
10.	Details of Reporting	9
	Attachment 1	10
	Wildlife Probability Report.....	14
	References.....	15

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ANSP	Air Navigation Service Providers
APAC	Asia and Pacific
ATC	Air Traffic Controllers
IBIS	ICAO Bird Strike Information System
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic Acid
PANS	Procedures for Air Navigations
WHM	Wildlife Hazard Management
WHMP	Wildlife Hazard Management Programme

.....

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The presence of wildlife on, or in the vicinity of an aerodrome poses a serious threat to aircraft operational safety.
- 1.2 In accordance with 9.4.1 of the ICAO Annex 14 Aerodromes, Volume I (Note, 9.4.1 and 9.4.2) Aerodrome Design and Operations, the wildlife strike hazard on, or in the vicinity of, an aerodrome shall be assessed through:
 - a) the establishment of a national procedure for recording and reporting wildlife strikes to aircraft;
 - b) the collection of information from aircraft operators, aerodrome personnel and other sources on the presence of wildlife on or around the aerodrome constituting a potential hazard to aircraft operations; and
 - c) an ongoing evaluation of the wildlife hazard by competent personnel.
- 1.3 Furthermore, the wildlife strike reports shall be collected and forwarded to ICAO for inclusion in the ICAO Bird Strike Information System (IBIS) database (9.4.2 of ICAO Annex 14 Aerodromes, Volume I Aerodrome Design and Operations refers).
- 1.4 PANS –Aerodrome 6.3.1 (page II-6-2) states an effective Wildlife Hazard Management Programme (WHMP) depends on accurate and reliable data. Reviewing and analysing wildlife strikes and wildlife observations will help quantify avian hazards at the aerodrome and its vicinity and indicate the effectiveness of current wildlife strike prevention methods.
- 1.5 Generally, the more information that is recorded about a wildlife strike incident the better. As a minimum, the data required on the ICAO wildlife strike reporting form should be collected as fully as possible. If some data items are not available (e.g. altitude of strike) then as much information as possible should be collected and due account taken of the missing data during subsequent analyses. All wildlife hazard management programs need to be monitored to see if they are working effectively and whether they need to be modified, extended or improved. The only effective way to do this is by collecting data on the strikes including at the aerodrome concerned. Other measures, for example counting the wildlife on the airside, provide useful additional information, but are not a direct measure of the strike risk at the aerodrome.
- 1.6 All strikes should be reported, whether or not they cause damage to the aircraft and report whatever wildlife species was involved. It is important that airport managers do not penalise staff for reporting wildlife strikes. Even though strikes to large jet airliners from small species such as swallows or sparrow-sized birds are unlikely to cause significant damage to an aircraft, staff should report them.
- 1.7 Similarly, the total number of strikes at an aerodrome should never be used as a measure of strike risk or of the performance of the wildlife controllers. Staff must be encouraged to report all sightings and strikes of wildlife. Collection of information on wildlife around the 13 km range refer to (6.3.5.2 of PANS Aerodromes (page II – 6-4) from the aerodrome reference point is of utmost importance and relevance to wildlife hazard management. The main risk arises from strikes with large species, especially birds that form flocks. A risk assessment process that combines potential strike frequency with likely severity needs to be adopted to properly assess the risk. Such a process cannot work effectively unless all strikes are reported.
- 1.8 A properly trained and equipped wildlife controller should be present on the airfield for at least 15 minutes prior to any aircraft departure or arrival. Thus, if aircraft are landing or taking off at intervals of less than 15 minutes there should be a continuous presence on the airfield throughout daylight hours. The controller should not be required to undertake any duties other than wildlife control during this time. Note that for aerodromes with infrequent aircraft

movements, 15 minutes may not be long enough to disperse all hazardous wildlife from the vicinity of the runway. In this case the controller should be deployed sufficiently in advance of the aircraft movement to allow full dispersal to be achieved.

- 1.9 At night, active runways and taxiways should be checked for the presence of wildlife at regular intervals and the dispersal action taken as needed.

2. SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE DOCUMENT

2.1 Purpose of the Document

- 2.1.1 The purpose of this document is to provide guidance to regulators, aerodrome operators, aircraft operators and Air Navigation Service Providers (Air Traffic Controllers) to fulfil the requirements stipulated by ICAO Annex 14 Volume I as described in paragraphs 1.2 and 1.3 above including the materials that are not provided in PANS-Aerodromes (Doc 9981) and Airport Services Manual (Doc 9137), Part 3 – Wildlife Hazard Management and Annex 19 Safety Management.

3. RECORDING WILDLIFE STRIKES

3.1 Record all suspected and confirmed strikes

- 3.1.1 As time progresses and traffic numbers increase, aircraft manufacturers use quieter aircraft that are larger in size and while wildlife populations increase. Accordingly, greater effort is required to control and monitor wildlife activities on and in the vicinity of aerodromes. Every strike must be reported to the relevant authorities, actions taken and communicated to all relevant stakeholders (Annex 14, Volume I 9.4.1 b) & 9.4.2 refer).

3.2 Record all strikes reported by Pilot and ATC irrespective of ground confirmation

- 3.2.1 Aerodrome operators should ensure all strikes reported by airlines/pilots and ATC are logged. In this sense, aerodromes should consider the adoption of smart devices to collate data onto a robust system capable of easy data access and ability to draw speedy conclusions with the help of analytical tools.
- 3.2.2 The cost of downtime for inspection and repair of aircraft following wildlife damage or suspected wildlife damage is significant. The additional costs and disruption as a result of aborted flights, rescheduling of aircraft passengers and air cargo, transfer of passengers to alternative means of transport, overnight accommodation at the expense of the aircraft operator and the deleterious effects on connecting flight schedules that can be significant and damaging to airline operating budgets and the passenger experience which are also major factors in the cost of a bird strike. Therefore, suspected strikes must be treated with greater significance.

3.3 Report all carcass on the runway as suspected strikes

- 3.3.1 Trained and competent staff who should be able to detect and record the presence of wildlife and assess the wildlife hazard and expel hazardous wildlife by using active/passive measures or interventions. It is recommended that the training syllabus for aerodrome staff engaged in wildlife control activities include an element of ecology and biology knowledge, to enable them to make reliable and accurate identifications of wildlife both from observations and post-strike during the collection and analysis of wildlife remains. The management of unidentifiable remains/carcass (including blood smears on aircraft components) should also be addressed in the management program and sent to relevant organizations for deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) analysis.

4. STANDARD SPECIES NOMENCLATURE ACROSS SPECTRUM FOR REPORTING PURPOSES

- 4.1 Wildlife species vary greatly across the Asia and Pacific (APAC) Region. Even within a given area, there can at times be several ‘common’ names for a particular species and so it's important to set up a wildlife library of standard names for all wildlife species.

5. STANDARD FORM FOR MONITORING AND RECORDING OF WILDLIFE ACTIVITY

- 5.1 Ideally, aerodrome wildlife controllers should record the following at least every 30 minutes (if air traffic is sufficiently infrequent that wildlife patrols are more than 30 minutes apart, an entry should be made for each patrol carried out): however patrols will depend and vary on the number of movements, and surrounding habitat. For example, if there has been frequency of rain which might significantly increase presence of insects in the airfield which will lead to more wildlife activity. In such instance's patrols must be customized accordingly.

- i) Areas of the aerodrome patrolled,
- ii) Numbers, location and species of wildlife seen,
- iii) Action taken to disperse the wildlife, and
- iv) Results of the action.

- 5.2 More general information such as the name of the wildlife controller on duty, time on and off duty, weather conditions etc. should be recorded at the start of a duty period. Refer to the standard form below with recommended fields.

- 5.3 A standard form for monitoring and recording of wildlife activity should be developed. A suggested set of fields should include the below Additional fields which are relevant to aerodromes can be added.

i) **General Information:**

- 1. Date of Recording
- 2. Time of Activity
- 3. Zone on aerodrome where activity was spotted
- 4. Sky Condition when Activity is noted
- 5. Wind Direction at time of activity
- 6. Weather Condition at time of activity
- 7. Grid number (if aerodrome grid map is Available)
- 8. Previous 24 hrs. weather conditions (like rain, or hail)

ii) **Wildlife Related**

- 1. Name of Wildlife Species
- 2. Number of the Species Observed
- 3. Activity Species is doing at time of observation
- 4. Altitude at which species was observed
- 5. Direction of flight of species (if relevant)
- 6. Start Time of Activity

-
7. End Time of Activity
 8. Dispersal required
 9. Type of method used for dispersal
 10. Action due to dispersal

iii) **Supplemental Information**

1. Runway in Use
2. Scaring Device used (Type)
3. Time of Scaring device used
4. Number of Pyrotechnics used if used
5. Number of wildlife monitoring personnel on shift at time of Activity
6. Proof of Activity – Photographs

6. AERODROME WILDLIFE SAFETY RISK ASSESSMENT

Note: Please refer to Airport Services Manual (Doc 9137), Part 3 – Wildlife Hazard Management, Chapter 3

7. DATA MODELLING AND ANALYSIS

- 7.1 Aerodrome operators should adopt data modelling and analysis to derive useful information and conclusions from the collected data. Some sample reports from a wildlife data modelling and analysis application is available in **Attachment 1**.

8. CONTINUAL MONITORING: RECORDING AND REPORTING OF WILDLIFE STRIKE

8.1 Continual Monitoring Program for Wildlife Hazards

- 8.1.1 When an aerodrome completes an assessment of wildlife strike hazards, it should consider implementing a continual monitoring program. A continual monitoring program is a best management practice. Recurrent wildlife monitoring to be outlined in the programme.
- 8.1.2 The goal of systematic, long-term wildlife hazard monitoring in an airport environment is to identify changes to wildlife composition, numbers, attractants, travel corridors and the general airport environment in a timely manner that can affect the presence or behavior of wildlife.
- 8.1.3 Continual monitoring allows the aerodrome operator to regularly determine trends in wildlife, and target mitigation practices to reduce the possibility of strikes, thus positively effecting safety. The aerodrome can use this information to quickly and efficiently implement mitigation techniques and evaluate the efficacy of its mitigation program. Ultimately, the frequent hazard identification and adaptable mitigation will reduce the likelihood of wildlife strikes. Additionally, continual monitoring will help decrease the time, effort, personnel hours, and money spent on mitigation because hazards will be identified before they pose a high risk.

8.2 Continual Monitoring Report:

8.2.1 As part of a continual monitoring program, an aerodrome should consider preparing periodic (an annual/half annual) report to summarise the efficacy of its wildlife mitigation program, including:

- i) Identification of the wildlife species observed and their numbers, locations, local movements, and daily and seasonal occurrences.
- ii) Identification and location of features on and near the aerodrome that attract wildlife.
- iii) Description of wildlife hazards to aircraft operators.
- iv) Description of wildlife strikes during the year.
- v) Discussion of any significant modifications on or near the aerodrome property.
- vi) Summary/Analysis of ATC and aerodrome “event logs” or wildlife management, patrol, monitoring data logs.
- vii) Periodic report can be compared with the airlines monitoring report for any gaps.

Reporting wildlife sighting – Process for Aerodrome/Airline Personnel (on-ground)

8.2.2 Process for reporting of wildlife sighting by aerodrome/airline personnel is shown in **Figure 1**.




Figure 1: Reporting wildlife sighting – Process for Aerodrome/Airline Personnel

8.2.3 It is recommended that:

- Use of technology smart application to enable users to just click on location to record species and number for effective wildlife hazard management.
- In addition, the recording system should reflect standard global names of wildlife species and information of the standard reporting form (refer to 5.3)

8.3 Reporting wildlife sightings – Process for Aircrew in-flight




Figure 2: Reporting wildlife sightings – Process for Aircrew in-flight

8.4 Reporting of Confirmed and Suspected Strike Process

Confirmed Strikes

- 8.4.1 Any reported collision between a bird or other wildlife and an aircraft for which evidence in the form of a carcass, remains or damage to the aircraft is found (including blood smears or feathers or may include in-flight ‘smell’ through air-conditioning). Any bird/wildlife found dead on an airfield where there is no other obvious cause of death (e.g. struck by a car, flew into a window etc.).

Unconfirmed strikes or Suspected Strikes

- 8.4.2 Any reported collision between a bird or other wildlife and an aircraft for which no physical evidence is found.




Figure 3: Reporting of Unconfirmed or Suspected Strike Process

8.5 Wildlife Location Determination Process




Figure 4: Wildlife Location Determination Process

8.6 Wildlife Incident Reporting Criteria

- 8.6.1 The reporting forms (paper or electronic format) used by the aerodrome operator or other stakeholders at the aerodrome for reporting wildlife strikes, should contain at least the information provided in *Appendix 2 (Wildlife Incident Reporting Criteria)* to Chapter 6 of Part II of the PANS-Aerodromes. It is recommended that Paper forms should be avoided.

8.7 Common Understanding of Terms

- 8.7.1 It is crucial to standardise the use of various terms and ensure a common understanding among stakeholders, including pilots, air traffic controllers, airport wildlife hazard controllers and other parties. These terms include description of bird size (large/medium/small), number of birds, etc. These parameters must be determined and understood by all relevant stakeholders.

8.8 Risk Assessment

- 8.8.1 In the report, it would also be useful to include the wildlife actions or type of activities, e.g. flying, standing on ground, roosting, hovering, etc if observed, at the time of the report. The information will be useful for risk level analysis, which is related to the type of activities, size, number, whether in flocks, etc.
- 8.8.2 Please refer to *Airport Services Manual (Doc 9137), Part 3 – Wildlife Hazard Management, Chapter 3*, for carrying out the risk assessment of the wildlife strike hazards.

8.9 Real-time Reporting Format

- 8.9.1 Aviation frontline personnel including pilots, ATC and aerodrome wildlife management staff constantly face time pressure in their jobs. They are required to make decisions based on the available information in a timely manner. Therefore, it is crucial to standardise the format of real-time wildlife reporting to minimise the time for transmitting the information and subsequent clarifications.
- 8.9.2 In Doc 4444 PANS-ATM Para. 7.5.2, temporary hazards including birds on the ground or in the air are regarded as essential information on aerodrome conditions. PANS-ATM Para. 7.5.3 has the following procedure:

Essential information on aerodrome conditions shall be given to every aircraft, except when it is known that the aircraft already has received all or part of the information from other sources. The information shall be given in sufficient time for the aircraft to make proper use of it, and the hazards shall be identified as distinctly as possible.

- 8.9.3 As a minimum, the following items could be considered when formulating the real-time reporting format:
- i) Date and UTC Time;
 - ii) Altitude of aircraft (for pilot reports only);
 - iii) Location of sight/strike;
 - a) With reference to prominent features on ground or in the air;
 - b) Aerodrome zoning to be applied for ATC and aerodrome personnel.
 - iv) Movement and altitude of birds;
 - v) Number of wildlife – with a standardized categorization; and
 - vi) Size of wildlife – with a standardized categorization.
- 8.9.4 It is recognised that the frontline personnel may face various workload at the time of wildlife sighting and strike. Therefore, flexibility for fewer items may be allowed during the first reporting, but the personnel involved should supplement missing information at the earliest opportunity and submit as much information as they can including attaching photos, if required. Below is a detailed Sample Reporting Format of a wildlife Strike Form.
- 8.9.5 Standardized wildlife strike reporting forms are available in Manual on the ICAO Bird Strike Information System (Doc 9332-AN/909) for use by States/Administrations.

9. WILDLIFE STRIKE REPORTS TO ICAO

- 9.1 Effective analysis of wildlife strike data is particularly important. For example, separating strikes that occur on the aerodrome (under 200 feet on approach and 500 feet on climb out using the ICAO definition) from those that occur further out in the approaches helps to define those strikes that are likely to be influenced by the aerodrome bird management programme. Similarly, separating strikes with species that are over 100g in weight (i.e. those more likely to cause damage), and giving greater emphasis to strikes with flocks all help to identify trends in the real wildlife strike risk at the aerodrome. So, for example, an aerodrome with an increasing rate of wildlife strikes is not necessarily becoming a more risky place to fly. If the increase in strikes is due to an increase in incidents with small species, whilst the rate of strikes with large species and flocks is falling, then this is indicative of both better wildlife control and better reporting of strikes.
- 9.2 The wildlife strike reports shall be collected and forwarded to ICAO for inclusion in the ICAO Bird Strike Information System (IBIS) database (9.4.2 of ICAO Annex 14 Aerodromes, Volume I (Note, (.4.1 & 9.4.2) Aerodrome Design and Operations refers).
- 9.3 Ideally, States should submit wildlife strike reports to ICAO in the format of either ECCAIRS.e5f files or the standard ICAO ECCAIRS Excel-based form available at <http://www.icao.int/ibis>. –(IBIS is currently under review)
- 9.4 The reports should be sent to the following email addresses:
wildlife@icao.int, icaohq@icao.int, aoi@icao.int, and iaa@icao.int


10. DETAILS OF REPORTING

- 10.1 Aerodrome operations staff may conduct numerous wildlife activity monitoring inspections throughout the day, to build up a more complete understanding of wildlife patterns around the Airport. Extensive reporting functionality in compliance with ICAO and regional civil aviation authorities, allows wildlife data to be drilled down, so that aerodromes can better understand their most prevalent species, locate high wildlife traffic areas, wildlife attractants, seasonal distributions and patterns. Adopt adequate hazard management plans to mitigate the risk by better understanding the environment.
- 10.2 Example of reports for Activity and Strike is provided in **Attachment 1**.


2. Monthly Activity Report (Weekly can be seen as well)




3. Wildlife Count Distribution




4. Species Trend



- Activity Maps
- Dispersal Maps
- Dispersal Patterns




5. Zone Heat Maps




6. Wildlife Strike Data

- Year to Year Analysis
- Strikes Per Month
- Wildlife Strike vs Phase of Flight
- Wildlife Strike Vs Runways Used
- Wildlife Strikes per Light Conditions
- Designated Wildlife Strikes Per Runway Used
- Wildlife Strikes at Flight Altitudes
- Wildlife Strike per Species (High Risk Species)



7. Wildlife Probability Report



REFERENCES

1. ICAO Annex 14 Aerodromes, Volume I – Aerodrome Design and Operations
2. Procedures for Air Navigation Services - Aerodromes (Doc 9981)
3. ICAO Airport Services Manual (Doc 9137), Part 3 – Wildlife Hazard Management
4. World Birdstrike Association – Recommended Practices No1. Standards for Aerodrome Bird/wildlife Control, Standard 4 Logging Wildlife Management Activities
5. Australian Airports Association – Wildlife Hazard Management at Airports
6. Advisory Circular – Protocol for the conduct and Review of Wildlife Hazard Assessments and Wildlife Hazard Management Plans

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION



ASIA PACIFIC GUIDANCE FOR EVALUATION OF AERODROME WILDLIFE
HAZARD MANAGEMENT PROGRAMM

[DRAFT]

First Edition 2021

This Guidance Material was developed by AP-WHM/WG and
approved by the AOP/SG/# Meeting and published by ICAO Asia
and Pacific Office, Bangkok

RECORD OF AMENDMENTS

[illegible]

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. EVALUATION PROCESS	1
3. WHMP EVALUATION CHECKLISTS	3
4. PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT OF WHMP	5
5. REFERENCES.....	7

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Wildlife populations in and around the vicinity of aerodromes are constantly changing in response to land use, national and local management policies, and environmental factors such as climate changes. In addition, wildlife might adapt or habituate to control strategies that were once effective, adopting new behavioural patterns of feeding, resting and nesting on or near the aerodrome. New wildlife control technologies might become available, or established products or techniques might be withdrawn or banned. Finally, there might be changes to wildlife control and management personnel at an aerodrome.
- 1.2 Once a Wildlife Hazard Management Programme (WHMP) is in place, aerodromes should develop a process for ongoing review of the WHMP to provide safety assurance that the programme is fully effective and correctly implemented. An evaluation should be completed on an annual basis but also must include an on-going review process to ensure that the programme is always current and fully functional at all times. If there is an external agency being used for the evaluation of WHMP The outsourcing evaluation should consider the general workings of the programme with a view to efficiency and effectiveness and follow respective country legislation on management of wildlife habitat and species.

2. EVALUATION PROCESS

- 2.1 Periodic evaluations of an aerodrome's WHMP including the activities undertaken for its implementation are critical because of the dynamic nature of wildlife hazards and control technologies. The foundation for these evaluations is the maintenance of consistent records of wildlife control activities and the submission of accurate and timely wildlife strikes and wildlife-related incident reports.
- 2.2 The following should be considered in the evaluation of an aerodrome WHMP:
 - 1) Comprehensive periodic evaluation should be prepared and compiled by an appropriately qualified wildlife control team/or outsourced agency who has full knowledge of the programme and the standards required for effective delivery. This report would nominally be prepared annually. The completed report along with all conclusion and recommendations should be considered by the aerodrome wildlife committee and the senior management responsible for delivery of the programme.
 - 2) The wildlife manager (or appropriate professional) tasked with performing the annual evaluation should seek feedback from staff on general effectiveness and observations on all aspects of the programme during evaluation. The evaluation seeks areas for improvement. Staff are often best positioned to provide valuable feedback on the plans. Feedback should be sought from WHMP team and staff, Runway Safety Team of the Aerodrome, Airline personnel (in particular aircraft engineers and pilots), Pilot Association(s), Air traffic control, Ground handlers and other parties as required.
 - 3) A wildlife survey is a valuable tool for aerodromes to ensure that WHMP are effective, meets all national and international regulations and standards requirements including environmental protection. The survey should ideally be completed formally on an annual basis by a qualified independent professional/organisation. Evaluation of all operational, practical, procedural and technical aspects of wildlife management will form part of this survey.
 - 4) It is extremely important that accurate statistics are gathered and interpreted by a competent person (who understands WHM) to ensure that aerodromes can have effective control measures in a timely fashion. Reference should be made to previous

statistical activity and strike data over the last five years and recommendations and action points raised accordingly. In case there is no 5 years available data, any available data can be used. Particular attention should be placed on the quality and accuracy of aerodrome wildlife species activities, incidents and strikes statistics and how these statistics are interpreted so that trends are measured, and mitigation measures immediately put into place.

- 5) A comprehensive review of all control procedures and practices should be undertaken to ensure that effective control measures are in place and are correctly followed and documented. The Wildlife survey should include seasonal migration.
- 6) A full equipment audit shall be undertaken annually or biannually to establish serviceability and effectiveness to support wildlife management and also consideration of new technologies or equipment.
- 7) A systematic review of rotational control procedures and the perceived effectiveness of the process should be done. Particular attention shall be paid to emerging/existing species of concern to identify the most important risk and prepare proper control measures to reduce the risk.
- 8) Where possible, aerodromes should have a dedicated Wildlife Control Team, internal or outsourced organisation, that will ensure advances in the field of wildlife management and habitat management; whether that is scientific, procedural or proven improved control techniques, are reflected in the aerodrome's WHMP of aerodrome also to be reviewed.
- 9) Wildlife activity monitoring on and in the aerodrome and 13 km range can contribute greatly to ensuring that control measures are effective. As a part of the aerodrome's safety management system (SMS) the WHMP should include interfaces with the SMS including, but not exclusively, a commitment in part to educate people. A plan for sharing information with other local aerodromes is a useful process of mutual benefit where control measures are compared and evaluated.
- 10) Maintain a record of, and annually summarise, all training that WHMP team have received. Include attendance at conferences, course, workshops, self-study courses, and specialized on the-job training.
- 11) An evaluation of all reports and records to ensure these meet appropriate standards as accurate information that can be understood and that will be of value in the evaluation process must be provided.
- 12) A full check of all WHMP documentation, paying particular attention to following:
 - i. Recording of wildlife activities like, feeding, resting patterns, and analysis of this information;
 - ii. Identification of wildlife species of concern;
 - iii. Nuisance species reports, pest wildlife;
 - iv. Protected species, endangered species register;
 - v. Was displacement measures used? What precise methodology and how effective this was/wasn't?
 - vi. Monthly alert reports;
 - vii. Wildlife Control Unit's survey records - analysis;
 - viii. Identify and record aerodrome wildlife hot spots (on/off aerodrome) and potential high risk or near miss records; must require further analysis to remove the high risk.

- ix. Analysis of wildlife dispersal technique records;
- x. Analysis of reported wildlife strikes and incidents (over last 5 years) reports;
- xi. Analysis of unconfirmed wildlife strike e.g. carcasses found;
- xii. Analysis of the quality of all records in particular daily logs to ensure best practice is established and this information can be reported back into the plan in a timely fashion.

3. WHMP Evaluation Checklists

Note:- The following checklists are developed based on guidance provided in Section 9.2 Wildlife Hazard Management Programme Evaluation provided in Airport Services Manual (Doc 9137), Part 3 – Wildlife Hazard Management.

- 3.1 An evaluation of a WHMP should seek to determine the effectiveness and future outcomes of the WHMP, not simply a compliance ‘tick the box. This said, the most basic level of WHMP evaluation should be to respond affirmatively or negatively to the questions contained in **Table 1**. If the answers to the questions below are negative or unclear, measures should be established to address these negatives to mitigate the identified risks.

Table 1: Basic checklist for evaluation of WHMP

S. No	Description	Response (Yes/No/NA)	If No/N/A Why	Comments
1	Are wildlife management roles, tasks and responsibilities adequately established at the aerodrome?			
2.	Is the “wildlife manager or coordinator” considered in the WHMP?			
3	Is there a reporting process in place to alert the different stakeholders about the presence of strikes with wildlife?			
4	Are the wildlife management personnel aware of the species that pose a risk to air traffic and about attractive areas for wildlife at the aerodrome and in its vicinity?			
5	Are wildlife observations and strikes recorded and reported in the correct format?			
6	Does the WHMP include an appropriate wildlife risk assessment conducted by competent personnel?			
7	Are habitat management measures and measures of dispersion and extraction of wildlife undertaken at the aerodrome?			
8	How Is the effectiveness of these measures measured?			
9	Is there regular WHM meetings with external stakeholders?			
10	Is the local wildlife committee effective?			
11	Is there support from local councils and external stakeholders towards WHM?			
12	Is training on wildlife management given to personnel involved in wildlife management duties (at all different levels)?			
13	Is there regular review of evaluation of the WHMP being performed?			

Table 2: Advance checklist for evaluation of WHMP

S. No	Description	If No/NA why?	Comments
1	Has a land use plan been established with regard to effective land use on and off the aerodrome, as it pertains to the WHMP?		
2	What ecological measures are implemented to reduce wildlife attractiveness on and off the aerodrome		
3	Are there illegal garbage dumps been identified around the aerodrome?		
4	If yes, within what distance are they?		
5	What mitigation steps have been taken to reduce risk of attracting wildlife to the garbage dumps?		
6	Is the aerodrome perimeter fencing suitable to prevent hazardous wildlife incursions?		
7	Which repellent methods are implemented at the aerodrome?		
8	Have any repellent methods which work on certain species been identified?		
9	Are aerodrome personnel employed and trained specifically to control and disperse wildlife at the aerodrome?		
10	What is the wildlife strike rate at the aerodrome over the last five years (with or without damage to the aircraft)?		
11	Is there a procedure to regularly collect information about wildlife on, and in the vicinity of, the aerodrome, both dead and living?		
12	Has a procedure for the positive identification of wildlife remains been established?		
13	How many reports from pilots were related to intrusions of wildlife, other than birds, over the last five years?		
14	Do the pilot reported strikes match the reported strikes at your aerodrome?		
14	Has a list of wildlife attractants at, and in the vicinity of, the aerodrome been identified?		
15	What mitigation steps have been taken to reduce risk of wildlife towards the attractants?		

3.2 Once the base for WHMP is established, complexity can be increased by asking more specific questions as per **Table 2** to determine the degree of compliance.

4. Performance Measurement of WHMP

- 4.1 The most rigorous and systematic method to know how well wildlife is being managed at the aerodrome would be to use a performance measurement mechanism. Performance indicators (parameters used for monitoring and assessing performance) are select metrics that are most closely aligned with the ultimate goal of reducing wildlife risks, and will help to assess if the wildlife hazard is adequately managed by the aerodrome operator.
- 4.2 Performance indicators should be metrics obtained and measured in a simple way, and which are clear about what they measure. They can be primary (lagging) or secondary (leading) indicators.
- 4.3 Lagging indicators are typically reactionary oriented, easy to measure but hard to improve or influence (e.g. number of wildlife strikes), while leading indicators are typically proactive oriented, hard to measure and easy to influence (e.g. number of repellent activities).
- 4.4 Although there has generally been a tendency to use lagging indicators (number of wildlife strikes related to aircraft movements, percentage of strikes resulting in damage or effect on flight, etc.) as measures of the effectiveness of a WHMP, leading indicators are good indicators. Leading indicators show how personnel are performing their tasks and how the system is prepared to prevent the worst events (incidents and accidents) from happening, through good safety practices, correct use of procedures, etc.
- 4.5 Performance measurement matrix indicators and targets for different components of the WHMP that may be considered by aerodrome operators is provided in Table 3.

Table 3: Performance Measurement Matrix

S. No	Performance Measurement	Performance Indicators	Performance Target
1.	WHM Programme	Review at least once a year and revise based on the learnings from wildlife management	● Status and reporting of wildlife strike and activity. ● Update on wildlife/bird movement and wildlife/bird strike data half yearly ● Adopt probability to forecast strikes by analysis based on previous strike history, activity reporting and number of flights.
2.	Habitat Management	Review at least once a year based on the wildlife and environment.	● Review status and reporting of habitat measures must be as required and at least annually
3.	Airport Environment Management Committee meeting	Minimum two AEMC (Airport Environment Management Committee) stakeholders comprising of CAA, ATC, WCT, Council/local country Municipality meetings in a year	● Prepare planned actions from the meeting outcomes ● Monthly follow up to be recorded based on the planned actions

S. No	Performance Measurement	Performance Indicators	Performance Target
4.	Airport Wildlife Assessment Survey	Aerodrome wildlife assessment survey to be conducted every 2 years	Survey reports to be shared with stakeholders including proposed resolution and adoption plans
5.	Public Awareness Program	1. On Airport 2. Off Airport	Meeting minutes and records to be maintained and published.
6.	Equipment for control of wildlife activities	Maintain check lists of equipment/pyrotechnics	Serviceability records of individual equipment is to be maintained. Inventory control of usage of pyrotechnics, understand which pyrotechnics work for which species.
7.	Competency of staff	Ensure staff are adequately resourced with proper wildlife hazard management training and experience.	Records of recruitment to be maintained.
8.	Training	Specialised and refresher courses must be conducted by ICAO recognised authority.	• Minimum 2/3 training/workshops to WHM team (local) in a year • Records to be maintained and updated. • Ensure staff are well versed in new techniques and share knowledge.
9.	Wildlife Strikes (ground)	Number of reported wildlife strikes at airports per 10,000 aircraft movements	Reduce the number of wildlife strikes - need to determine the reduction by number or percentage
10.	Wildlife runway incursion	Number of runway incursions by animal at airport per 10,000 aircraft movements	Reduce the number of incursions by wildlife – need to determine the number or percentage
12.	Wildlife Documentation Audit	Annual audit to be conducted by relevant wildlife management authorities recognised by ICAO.	Consolidated report/ record to be available to Safety department and Wildlife Hazard management team
13.	Annual report	Annual report to contain all WHM related data and analysis	Sharing of report with airport stakeholders
14.	Adoption of technology for wildlife hazard management	Manual paper forms will not be accepted. Ensure new technology like wildlife reporting application tools are adopted to save time and reduce manual and excel analysis, adopt automated reporting tools which are more cost effective	Adopt a simple smart WHM tool.
15.	Wildlife strike Incident Reporting	Report to airlines regarding wildlife control measures engaged by the aerodrome after wildlife strike incident	Maintain data recording of the presence of wildlife and action taken

5. REFERENCES

- 1) Airport Services Manual (Doc 9137), Part 3 - Wildlife Hazard Management
- 2) World Birdstrike Association Recommended Practices No. 1 Standards for Aerodrome

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION



**DRAFT ASIA/PACIFIC GUIDANCE ON DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF
AERODROME WILDLIFE HAZARD MANAGEMENT PROGRAM**

[DRAFT]

First Edition 2021

This Guidance Material was developed by AP-WHM/WG and approved by the **AOP/SG/#** Meeting and published by ICAO Asia and Pacific Office, Bangkok

RECORD OF AMENDMENTS

[illegible]

This Generic document lists the overview of **Aerodrome Wildlife Hazard Management** taking into consideration of:

- Adopting the Passive and Active Management,
- Creating a Wildlife Hazard Management Program,
- Detailing the Roles and Responsibilities.
- Taking Actions to reduce risk.
- Objectives of the Training Program,
- Risk Assessment.
- Continuous Evaluation of the WHMP

SECTION 1

1. BACKGROUND OVERVIEW

- 1.1. This Guidance Material has been developed using material sourced from the ICAO Doc 9137, Aerodrome Services Manual, Part 3 — Wildlife Hazard Management, the Aerodromes Council International Wildlife Hazard Management Handbook and other CAA/Aerodrome Operator documents available online, in an attempt to put together, in one document, best practice in this area. Having this best practice information in one document will assist the aerodrome operator to effectively develop and implement a suitable wildlife hazard management programme for the aerodrome to meet the requirements of the Safety Department.
- 1.2. Annex 14, Volume I,– Aerodrome Design and Operations requires that all aerodromes used for international operations shall be certified and other aerodromes open for public use should be certified. As part of the certification process, aerodrome operators are required to develop an aerodrome manual which includes information on the aerodrome site, facilities, services, equipment, operating procedures and management, including a safety management system.
- 1.3. The growing traffic numbers consist of quieter aircraft and the increase in wildlife (birds and other animals) populations, greater effort is required to control and monitor wildlife movements on and within the vicinity of aerodromes. In addition, the cost of downtime for inspection and repair of aircraft following wildlife damage or suspected wildlife damage is significant. The additional costs and disruption as a result of aborted flights, rescheduling of aircraft passengers and air cargo, transfer of passengers to alternative means of transport, overnight accommodation at the expense of the aircraft operator and the deleterious effects on connecting flight schedules that can be significant and damaging to airline operating budgets and public goodwill (the passenger experience) are also major factors in the cost of a wildlife strike.
- 1.4. An analysis by ICAO in of all wildlife strike data collected from participating States reveal that approximately ninety per cent (90%) of wildlife strikes occur on or in the immediate vicinity of aerodromes. In some cases, this threat can be reduced by adapting the aircraft's schedule in favour of the wildlife, especially when the presence of wildlife is for a limited time. Reducing the presence of wildlife in aircraft flight paths can be achieved through ecological means such as habitat management or the dispersal or removal of hazardous wildlife. While the wildlife control programme will be aerodrome-specific, the development of such nature and environmentally sensitive programs should adhere to national environmental regulations. Refer Doc 10004 Global Aviation Safety Plan for ICAO Aspirational Safety Goal “Zero fatalities by 2030 and beyond”
- 1.5. Wildlife Hazard Management is thus a critical component of aerodrome operations and this must be reflected in States Safety Program document which can establish the acceptable level of safety performance for wildlife strikes.
- 1.6. Safety Performance Targets must be regularly reviewed by Aerodromes Safety Department. Data collected on wildlife strikes, must be reviewed by the Safety department to ensure its safety performance targets are being met and will continue to review and set new targets annually.
- 1.7. Wildlife hazards, just as any other hazards to aviation safety, should be identified, assessed and managed in order to reduce the risk, through a Safety Management System (SMS). The two-step risk process is employed in much the same way, i.e., identify the level of risk; the species present in and around the

aerodrome including severity of damage each species could cause to an aircraft if struck (this is the risk level). Once the risk level is identified, past data is assessed to determine which species are more likely to be involved in a collision (this is the probability level). The product of these factors provides us with the risk for a particular species. An assessment of habitats in and around the aerodrome that have the potential to attract wildlife must be also completed, so that the habitat can be managed to reduce the presence of species identified as constituting a risk to flight safety.

- 1.8. Following the conduct of the risk assessment, aerodrome operators, where practicable, should implement a program tailored to local conditions, with assistance from the national committee or other qualified wildlife consultants from outside agencies, as required by the Aerodrome's Safety Department. This program sets out the actions required to reduce wildlife hazards in and around critical aircraft operating areas and decrease the risk of a strike.
- 1.9. The analysis of wildlife data in respect of wildlife strikes and observations and monitoring of wildlife activities can reveal trends that will assist aerodrome authorities to recognize areas of concern which should be addressed through a well-managed wildlife control programme. Wildlife strike statistics can also be analysed to determine those times of year or day when wildlife control is needed the most.
- 1.10. A program to reduce the risks associated with wildlife strikes is referred to in Annex 14, Volume I, Aerodrome Design and Operations," Section 9.4 - Wildlife strike hazard reduction".
- 1.11. PANS-Aerodromes (Doc 9981) requires that an aerodrome operator shall develop, implement and demonstrate an effective WHMP at the aerodrome, and this should be tailored to and commensurate with the size and level of complexity of the aerodrome, and the number of aircraft movements and their type, taking into account the wildlife hazards identified and the risk assessment of those hazards.
- 1.12. Given the unique nature of a wildlife hazard management, it is important that each aerodrome develop its own WHMP based on their unique environments, following the best practices and standards of ICAO and States regulatory requirements.

2. WHAT IS WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT?

- 2.1. Wildlife management involves manipulating an animal's behaviour or its habitat in order to achieve a specific goal with regards to an animal's behaviour, population, or geographic distribution. At aerodromes, the goal of wildlife management is to change the behaviour of animals so that they do not occupy critical safety zones where aircraft operate. The key to managing wildlife at aerodromes is to understand the animals' basic requirements and how their behaviour can lead to an aviation safety hazard. Essentially, it is imperative to know why animals behave the way they do and take necessary actions to prevent a wildlife strike, this ongoing process is wildlife management.

3. WILDLIFE NEEDS AND HABITATS

- 3.1. All wildlife has basic requirements for survival and reproduction and these requirements dictate how they will behave. They need energy and nutrients, including water, to survive and thrive. They must maintain the core temperature of their bodies, they must avoid being eaten by other animals, and they must reproduce. All of the behaviour can be traced to these basic requirements. Different species have different behaviours and some of these can lead to high risk situations at aerodromes. Once the aerodrome operator understands the needs of the wildlife that lead to its high risk behaviour, they can begin to take steps to change that behaviour.
- 3.2. Wildlife meets its basic requirements by utilizing habitats within the environment. A habitat is any kind of distinguishable feature within the environment, such as an open meadow, a stand of trees or a water

body. Different animals use different habitats to meet their requirements, and some vary the types of habitats they use at different times of the year, depending on the specific requirement they are fulfilling.

4. MANIPULATING HABITATS

- 4.1. With an understanding of how wildlife behaves and use different habitats to meet their requirements, we can begin to manage them. Which is a continuous process. Around the aerodrome, this usually means manipulating habitats, especially around the critical safety zones, so that wildlife is not able to fulfil their requirements there. This kind of manipulation varies depending on the wildlife involved and the requirements they need to fulfil. For example, a drainage ditch full of water will provide ducks with a safe place to bathe and feed. If the ditch is directly adjacent to a runway, there may be a risk of ducks being struck by aircraft as they move to and from the ditch habitat. When the drainage ditch is enclosed with a culvert, the habitat that the duck requires is gone. The duck is no longer able to fulfil its requirements in that location and will have to find another suitable habitat. As a result, there will be fewer ducks in a critical safety zone for aircraft, and, therefore, a reduced risk to aviation safety.
- 4.2. Manipulation of Habitats with the aerodrome and outside the aerodrome is an ongoing process, it might require several ways and approaches to manage the Habitat to reduce the risk of wildlife strikes.

SECTION 2.

5. NATIONAL LEGISLATION AND GUIDELINES

5.1 Management of wildlife at airports is regulated under national, state and territory requirements. These mainly relate to the use of firearms, lasers, pyro techniques. legal humane and safe control and disturbance of wildlife. The clearing of vegetation or other habitat management must be under the guidelines of state and legislative requirements.

SECTION 3

6. WILDLIFE HAZARD MANAGEMNT PLAN

6.1 A wildlife hazard management plan documents an airports wildlife hazard management program with a framework of documents

- 6.1.1 Safety Management Plan
- 6.1.2 Aerodrome Manual
- 6.1.3 Standard Operating Procedures
- 6.1.4 Aerodrome Environment plan

7. PASSIVE AND ACTIVE MANAGEMENT

7.1 Passive Management:

7.1.1 Wildlife is attracted to the aerodrome environment for food, shelter and water. Passive management is habitat management. This reduces the wildlife population by making the

environment less attractive to wildlife providing longer term risk reduction. All aerodromes must adhere to Passive management.

7.2. Types of Passive Management:

Grass Management	Grass height management
Drains and Drainage	Removing water, or excluding access to water is recommended
Built Environment	Remove disused buildings, aircrafts and other building materials. Avoid posts, signs and poles that wildlife may perch on. Manage apron lighting enclosures to discourage nesting and manage runway lighting to reduce insect attraction. Ensure perimeter fences are regularly monitored for damage. Regularly monitor buildings and other infrastructure for nests and roosts.
Landscaping	Identify suitability of flora species used in the aerodrome's landscaping. Do not include plants bearing fruits or flowers attractive to wildlife. Regular pruning must be done to get rid of dense growth. If sprinklers are to be used ensure they are monitored and do not leave them unattended as water will be a source of attractant for wildlife.
Waste Management	Poor waste management will be a major significant risk to an aerodrome and vicinity. All bin lids must be closed at all times to restrict wildlife attraction and access, avoid waste overflow and ensure frequent waste removal. Provide guidance and training to all food and storage operations.

7.3 Active Management

7.3.1 Sometimes nothing can be done to change a habitat on an aerodrome, so active management is necessary to manipulate wildlife behaviour directly. For example, concrete tarmacs commonly required for aircraft operations, can provide a habitat attractive to wildlife. In cold weather, the concrete can warm faster than its surroundings and become the warmest habitat available attracting congregations of birds. For e.g. Kites are attracted to the warm thermals on the runway. To change the behaviour might need an intervention involving stimulating the wildlife in a way that it perceives a danger that outweighs the gains it will receive by not changing its behaviour. In the case of birds warming themselves on concrete tarmac, a loud noise from a pyrotechnic explosive, rifle shot, or air siren can provide enough stimulus to make the wildlife fear for their safety and leave. There could multiple methods may need to be adopted to reduce the risk of wildlife approaching the runways. It's important to Aerodromes to consider a wide range of methods and not bank on one particular option as Wildlife are very smart and often desensitise themselves to these methods.

7.3.2 Dispersal: Dispersal aims to maintain separation between aircraft and wildlife by harassing wildlife from the airside area. Wildlife control team will endeavour to 'train' resident wildlife to

respond in certain ways, wildlife becomes familiar with the management techniques applied at the aerodrome especially when the approach is consistent irrespective of which Wildlife controller is on duty. This is predictable wildlife behaviour. Understanding the response and being aware of other airside activities and aircraft movements, the wildlife controller team can choose how to initiate a dispersal and when. The Wildlife Controller team must understand wildlife habitual behaviour towards dispersal and must overcome this habitual behaviour with a wide variety of tools and techniques. Various aerodromes use different dispersal methods and techniques, these techniques will be determined by each aerodrome after understanding their wildlife issues and trial different dispersal methods.5.4 Types of Dispersal Tools:

Recommended Dispersals
Acoustic Devices with Distress and alarm calls
Raptor kites and balloons
Reflecting Tape
Predator Models
Pyrotechnics
Trapping and remote release
Stock Whip

Note: Trapping and release of wildlife must be conducted following local country and state rules and regulations in a humane manner.

7.5 Removal

7.5.1 In some cases, it may be not feasible to manipulate the habitat or change wildlife behaviour permanently. Removal of wildlife or a group of wildlife may be the only option. This can involve trapping and releasing them in a new location. Aerodrome operators must ensure that they are compliant with all regulations regarding the wildlife species in question, and that they carry out removals in a manner as humane as possible. In some cases, wildlife establishes breeding and nesting sites which can create a strike hazard. Wildlife defending their nests and young ones can become oblivious to aircraft traffic. The young hatchlings and juvenile wildlife are inexperienced and lack awareness of the environment, making them prone to strikes. Removing nests will deter and limit the establishment of breeding. Permits from environment authorities are required for native and endangered wildlife species.

7.6 Ethical Responsibility

7.6.1 Wildlife management at aerodromes is a critical part of safe aircraft operations. Furthermore, aerodrome operators have an ethical responsibility to contribute to the conservation of wildlife and biodiversity. Some of the species that present a high risk to aviation safety might be critically endangered or threatened. It is the responsibility of the aerodrome operator to deliver solutions that maintain aviation safety whilst conserving the species in question. Culling wildlife is not an option as often the empty space of the culled wildlife is replaced by another.

7.6.2 Wildlife management is a complicated practice that involves thorough understanding of wildlife biology and behaviour, including the ways in which they fulfil their basic requirements. Aerodrome operators will generally achieve the greatest level of safety if they invest in a dedicated Wildlife Hazard Management Programme. Each aerodrome will have a different set of challenges associated with wildlife, but the fundamentals of wildlife management apply to all of them. Aerodrome operators must work with wildlife's behaviour, and not against it, if they are to successfully maintain aviation safety.

7.6.3 The first step in preparing a Wildlife Hazard Management Programme is to conduct an Assessment of Habitat and environment of the Aerodrome and vicinity through relevant qualified associations recognised by ICAO or States. Organisations who understand not only wildlife behaviour but also the safety aspect. The Assessment, which gives aerodrome operators understanding wildlife in their habitat to enable them to develop, implement, and refine a Plan.

7.6.4 The objective of an Assessment is to provide a baseline of data and understanding of wildlife species considered hazardous on or near an aerodrome, and of attractants that provide food, water, and shelter. An Assessment must be completed within a set period taking into consideration migratory seasons. It is also recommended that data collection procedures such as point counts, trapping indices and vehicle routes be set up and used to allow future repetition for consistent, continued monitoring or comparison to previous findings. The Assessment identifies wildlife populations and trends at the aerodrome, such as the location and seasonality of wildlife hazards. It also identifies how these fluctuations in behaviour and abundance may affect aviation safety, with particular emphasis on wildlife strikes to aircraft. Assessments promote an integrated approach for wildlife mitigation to effective management

SECTION 4

8. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

8.1 Clearly defines responsibilities will determine accountability and ownership. Roles and Responsibilities should be commensurate with airport operations, existing responsibilities and include the wildlife hazard management program.

8.1.1 Assignment of personnel (roles and responsibilities of personnel in the programme):

8.1.1.1 A manager who is accountable for developing and implementing WHMP;

8.1.1.2 A coordinator who should oversee the daily activities and analyse the collected data and carry out risk assessments in order to develop and implement the WHMP;

6.1.1.3 Trained and competent staff who should detect and record the presence of wildlife and assess the wildlife hazard and expel hazardous wildlife. It is recommended that the training of staff engaged in bird control activities include an element of ornithological knowledge, to enable aerodrome bird control staff to make reliable and accurate identifications of birds both from observations and post bird strike during the collection and analysis of bird remains. Should there be a facility by which stakeholders can obtain a scientific analysis (feather or DNA) taken from snare (bird remains) or an unidentifiable carcass following a strike should also be described in the management programme;

8.1.2 A process to report, collect and record data on strike and activity.

8.1.3 A process to analyse the data and assess the wildlife hazard in order to develop mitigation, proactive and reactive measures. This should include a risk assessment methodology and identification of the wildlife species that are a priority for risk reduction;

6.1.4 A process of habitat and land management both on the aerodrome and in its vicinity in order to reduce the attractiveness of the area to wildlife. Where applicable and relevant, this should include effective grass management techniques and, where applicable, a long/tall grass policy for “on-airfield” areas;

8.1.5 A process to expel or remove hazardous wildlife, including by lethal means where appropriate i.e. prescribe actions necessary to reduce the risk associated with individual species;

8.1.6 A process for liaison with non-aerodrome agencies and local landowners, etc., to ensure the aerodrome operator is aware of developments that may contribute to creating additional bird hazards in the infrastructure, vegetation, land use and activities in the aerodrome vicinity (crop harvesting, seed planting, ploughing, establishment of land or water features, hunting, etc., that might attract wildlife)

8.1.7 Establishment of an aerodrome wildlife hazard management committee and a process to have regular meetings with all stakeholders including a communication strategy for ensuring that the information necessary for managing wildlife risk is shared effectively, and

8.1.8 A Training Programme for the personnel involved in Wildlife Hazard Management where considered applicable, particularly at international/larger aerodromes.

8.2 Each aerodrome's WHMP will be unique to that aerodrome, tailored to and commensurate with the size and level of complexity of the aerodrome, taking account of the identification of the bird /wildlife hazard and the risk assessment of that hazard.


8.3 To ensure that the WHMP remains effective, an ongoing monitoring and evaluation strategy for the entire programme should be developed and implemented.

9. RECOMMENDED APPROACH TO DEVELOPING A WILDLIFE HAZARD MANAGEMENT PROGRAM



9.1 Key to managing wildlife hazards at Aerodromes are the SOPs included in the Aerodrome WHMP. The SOPs provide aerodrome safety personnel with a systematic and replicable approach to identify, manage and Monitor hazards.

10. SAMPLE SOP PROCESS



10.1 Procedures for pilot notification in response to any significant wildlife concentration or activity both on and in the vicinity of the aerodrome. Notification must include

10.2.1 Species,

10.2.2 Location,

10.2.3 Attraction

10.2.4 Duration

10.2.5 Work with local land planning authorities and town planners

10.2.6 Assess on-aerodrome wildlife attractants which provide food, water or shelter.

10.2.7 Habitat management, dispersal methods, waste management, grass management and appropriate landscaping

10.2.8 Ongoing management of wildlife hazard reduction.

10.3 The WHMP should explicitly identify the personnel who will be involved in the programme, including the roles and responsibilities they will fulfil. Chapter 2 of the *Airport Services Manual (Doc 9137), Part 3 – Wildlife Hazard Management* outlines the specific roles and responsibilities associated with wildlife management at an aerodrome.

10.4 Summary of Roles and Responsibilities;

Role	Responsibility
Aerodrome Manager	Must endorse and have full visibility of the Wildlife Hazard Management Programme. Must establish enough resources for implementing the Wildlife Hazard Management Programme.
Aerodrome Safety Manager	Ensure implementation and review of the Wildlife Hazard Management Program. Ensure that staff are trained and competent in conducting activities required for wildlife hazard management including wildlife activity count, identification, harassment and reporting. Ensure procedures are available and are followed by all relevant staff

	Ensure that all wildlife hazard management staff follow the listed responsibilities Liaise with airlines, aircraft operator's local government and other stakeholders to assist in identifying and managing wildlife issues at regular wildlife management meetings. Ensure Wildlife Hazard Management Program is reflected in the Aerodrome Operations Manual.
Wildlife Control Team Officers	Inspect, assess, remove, count, record and report wildlife or potential attractions as described in the relevant sections of the WHMP and SOPs. Use, store and maintain firearms as required by the aerodrome's firearm policy. Accurately update and record management actions as described in the relevant sections of the WHMP and procedures.
Aerodrome Tenants	Ensure waste is disposed of appropriately and bins and other waste storage facilities are suitable for the level of waste generated and maintained with closed lids or other suitable covering. Ensure waste levels in surrounding areas are monitored and maintained Immediate reports of observations of bird nesting in hangars to aerodrome operations staff. Report observations of bird nesting in hangars to aerodrome operations staff. Attend wildlife committee meetings
Local Government Authorities	Consider the potential for the wildlife attraction when developing land use strategies and approving development. Attend wildlife committee meetings
CAA	Ensure audits are completed thoroughly and in accordance with National and ICAO requirements Ensure all regulatory changes relevant to wildlife strike management are communicated to aerodrome operators. Attend WHM committee meetings.

11. COMMUNICATION STRATEGY

11.1 Aerodrome operators should create communication procedures for managing and reacting to wildlife hazards and for acting when a strike does occur.

11.2 It is critical for the safety that key personnel are notified when there is an elevated risk of wildlife strike. The communication strategy should summarize which personnel are responsible for recognizing and alerting of an increased wildlife hazard, and which personnel should be notified. The communication strategy should be inclusive of wildlife management technicians, pilots, and air traffic controllers. A communication strategy is also necessary for when a strike does occur. This allows the effective collection of data pertaining to the strike, including the airline and type of aircraft involved, the stage of flight, the damage to the aircraft and whether there was an effect on flight, and the species of wildlife involved. The wildlife strike data can then be used as an evaluation tool.

12. TAKING ACTION TO REDUCE RISK

12.1 Once the risk presented by various wildlife species is prioritized, a series of actions for reducing that risk is outlined. The actions needed to reduce the risk can take several forms and include managing aerodrome habitats so that they are less attractive (fulfil fewer of the animals basic requirements); dispersing wildlife with behavioural stimulants; physically excluding wildlife from the aerodrome; physically removing wildlife from the aerodrome; and strategies for managing habitats that are within the vicinity of the aerodrome but outside its boundaries. The actions should also include a system for communicating the risk of bird strikes to critical personnel, including pilots, air traffic controllers, and wildlife management personnel.

13. TRAINING PROGRAMME

13.1 A Training Programme should be established through the WHMP. Effective training ensures that actions taken to reduce wildlife hazards are consistent across all personnel. Refer to the training section of this document.

14. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

14.1 Once action is taken to reduce risk, it is important to establish monitoring procedures to collect the information needed to evaluate the efficacy of the action. The WHMP must define this strategy. Refer to general requirements of monitoring and evaluation.

15. RESEARCH PRIORITIES

15.1 Research projects should be designed to assess the efficacy of novel management practices and control actions on reducing wildlife hazards. Proper experimental design is critical to the successful evaluation of novel practices, and aerodrome operators should whenever possible consult with local biologists when considering their research priorities.

16. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF STAKEHOLDERS

16.1 This chapter looks at the various roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders involved in wildlife hazard management at aerodromes. The assignment of actual roles, titles and tasks will vary from

aerodrome to aerodrome. At smaller aerodromes the roles might be divided or merged to just one or two levels. Larger aerodromes will require larger, possibly dedicated teams. Some tasks or roles may be contracted to an external company or organization with suitable expertise.

16.2 Wildlife (birds and other animals) on, and in the vicinity of, the aerodrome may represent a threat to aircraft safety. In some cases, this threat can be reduced by adapting the aircraft's schedule in favour of the wildlife, especially when the presence of wildlife is for a limited time. Reducing the presence of wildlife in aircraft flight paths can be achieved through ecological means such as habitat management or the dispersal or removal of hazardous wildlife. Whilst a WHMP will be aerodrome-specific, the development of such nature and environmentally sensitive programs should adhere to national environmental regulations.

17. THE AERODROME OPERATOR

17.1 Because of the importance of wildlife control, each aerodrome operator has the responsibility to develop, implement and demonstrate an effective wildlife strike and wildlife control programme at the aerodrome, and this should be tailored to and commensurate with the size and level of complexity of the aerodrome, taking account of the identification of the bird hazard and the risk assessment of that hazard.

17.2 Aerodrome operators, where practicable, should implement a programme tailored to local conditions, with assistance from the CAA, national committee (where one has been established) or other outside agencies, as required. Where practicable, the aerodrome operator should appoint an aerodrome wildlife control coordinator who is responsible and accountable for the aerodrome's wildlife hazard management programme and the personnel engaged in wildlife hazard control. This may include the formation of a local aerodrome wildlife hazard management committee that will develop and implement the specific programme. It is imperative that personnel responsible for these tasks are able to demonstrate competence, are trained by qualified personnel and are provided with the appropriate resources and equipment to carry out their tasks.

17.3 The aerodrome operator's responsibilities should be borne by the senior manager role and this should be specified in the aerodrome's Safety Management System

18. THE AERODROME WILDLIFE HAZARD MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

18.1 Wildlife hazard management on an aerodrome often requires communication, cooperation, and coordination among various groups on the aerodrome. This is especially true when identifying hazardous wildlife situations, executing large-scale habitat management actions, or developing management strategies for hazardous wildlife that are endangered or threatened. Establishment of the Aerodrome Wildlife Hazard Management Committee is required to facilitate this communication, cooperation and coordination. This committee could be included within the safety management committee.

18.2 The aerodrome wildlife hazard management committee should include those involved in wildlife hazard management, aerodrome planning, maintenance, operations and any other stakeholders. It should also include air traffic services, flight operators, rescue and firefighting services, security, duty managers, finance, etc.

18.3 The committee should review strike data collected and observations of wildlife, assess wildlife risks and summarize trends in order to evaluate and determine what effective control measures should be implemented in order to manage the issues arising.

18.4. The committee will ensure that all stakeholders are engaged in the programme.

18.5. Members of the Committee should include the following:

18.5.1 Aerodrome Safety Manager

18.5.2 Wildlife hazard Management Coordinator / Manager

18.4.3. Wildlife Control Officer Representative

18.4.4. Aircraft Operator representative

18.4.5. Aerodrome Planning Manager

18.4.6. Aerodrome maintenance and operation Manager

18.4.7. ATC representative

18.4.8. Local runway safety team representative.

18.4.9. Local authorities. Depending on the organizational structure of the aerodrome, other representatives can also be included, such as the Fire and Rescue Service.

19. THE AERODROME WILDLIFE HAZARD MANAGEMENT COORDINATOR/MANAGER

19.1 The Wildlife Hazard Management Coordinator/Manager is in charge of the day-to-day management and efficient implementation of the WHMP.

19.2 The coordinator (or equivalent) should coordinate the activities of the WHMP with air traffic control (ATC) and other stakeholders. The coordinator's responsibilities should allow for the time required to be involved with observations, control and reporting.

19.3 The coordinator should also review strike reports, monitor daily activity records and maintenance reports to determine the requirements for short- and long-term management programs, and this information should be passed to managers accountable for safety on a regular basis (recommended at least monthly).

19.4 The person might be a technical specialist, such as a biologist, or such expertise might be outsourced. In more detail, this role will involve key duties such as the following:

19.4.1. Advising the Aerodrome/Senior Manager on all matters relating to wildlife hazard prevention;

19.4.2. Develop and implement the WHMP;

19.4.3. Planning and organizing wildlife control operations in accordance with the WHMP;

19.4.4. Supervising and monitoring wildlife control operations to ensure that the WHMP is implemented correctly.

19.4.5. Supervising wildlife control record keeping (log, bird counts, wildlife strike recording and reporting, bird dispersal, culling and habitat management diaries, etc.);

19.4.6. Providing technical supervision of Wildlife Control Operators, intelligence gathering, and planning;

19.4.7. Facilitating active surveillance, wildlife dispersal, culling and other field tasks; Ensuring that all necessary passes and permits are current.

19.4.8. Ensuring the supply, safe keeping and correct maintenance of wildlife control equipment and consumables

19.4.9. Coordinating with operation and/or grounds maintenance to ensure that habitat is managed according to the WHMP; and Providing a communications channel between the aerodrome policy

makers/providers, wildlife control operators and other interested parties, such as airline operators and air traffic control.

20. AERODROME SAFETY MANAGER

20.1. An Aerodrome safety Manager should be identified who has overall responsibility for wildlife control. This may be a dedicated role or included in the responsibilities of the safety manager. The role should involve tasks and responsibilities that include:

- 20.1.1. Ensuring that the WHMP is developed and implemented;
- 20.1.2. Ensuring the WHMP is referred to and becomes part of the aerodrome Safety Management System (SMS) and the operational safety culture of the aerodrome;
- 20.1.3. Ensuring sufficient financial and human resources, including initial and on-going training are provided to enable implementation of the WHMP.
- 20.1.4. Participating on the aerodrome Wildlife Hazard Management Committee;
- 20.1.5. Working with external parties such as local, regional and national governments in order to avoid or mitigate regulation that might impinge on the safe operation of aerodromes

20.2 Specific responsibilities arising from items that should be included in the WHMP would include the following:

- 20.2.1. Ensuring that the protected species register is included in the WHMP and that proper safeguards for these species are in place;
- 20.2.2. Ensuring that the required reports are submitted (monthly or at other agreed intervals) to the CAA;
- 20.2.3. Ensuring that, where appropriate, habitats and land uses identified in the WHMP, especially those that will require capital expenditure, are included in the Aerodrome Master plan.

21. WILDLIFE CONTROL OFFICER

21.1. A Wildlife Control Officer performs the front-line role and may be any suitably trained and qualified member of aerodrome staff. This role will involve key duties such as:

- 21.1.1. Maintaining surveillance of wildlife activity on the aerodrome and beyond;
- 21.1.2. Implementing active wildlife control measures and interventions in accordance with the WHMP to counter any detected wildlife hazards;
- 21.1.3. Providing the air traffic service, where applicable, with details of a potential wildlife hazards; Recording wildlife control activity;
- 21.1.4. Recording actual, potential or suspected wildlife strikes;
- 21.1.5. Advising senior personnel on improvements to the wildlife control tasks or WHMP; and assisting with surveys, etc.

22. STAKEHOLDERS OUTSIDE THE AERODROME

22.1 Aerodrome operators should also identify which stakeholders will be responsible for providing input and consultation. Stakeholders can include transportation officials (including government), other aerodrome staff, airline representatives (including pilots), conservation organizations (government and non-government), local municipalities/cities, and organizations that are responsible for land management in the area surrounding the aerodrome.

SECTION 5

23. RISK ASSESSMENT

Note- Please refer to “Chapter 3 of the Airport Services Manual (Doc 9137), Part 3 – Wildlife Hazard Management” for more detailed guidelines on aerodrome wildlife safety risk assessment.

Alternative method for the assessment of the risk of wildlife hazards is described below.

23.1 Risk Assessment

23.1.1 An important step in managing wildlife hazard is to assess the level of risk that each species of animal presents to aircraft operations at the aerodrome. This risk assessment is more than simply surveying the species found in and around the aerodrome; it involves assessing the likelihood of each species striking an aircraft and the probability and extent of damage that may result. This allows the aerodrome operator to prioritize its actions to target the highest risks. The Risk assessment should whenever possible, identify the biological factors that cause different wildlife species to present a risk to aviation safety. Identification of these factors will greatly aid in the formulation of a Wildlife Hazard Management Programme.

23.1.2. There are several methods of conducting a Risk Assessment of Wildlife Hazards. The risk assessment methodology set out by the International Birdstrike Committee is recommended guidance and this is provided in the ensuing paragraphs. The guidance will outline a simple, qualitative method that can be used as a starting point for a more detailed Risk Assessment. In its most basic form, a Risk Assessment determines the level of risk that each species of wildlife presents based on the combination of the probability that it will be struck by an aircraft and the severity of the outcome.

23.1.3 Prior to discussing the assessment of the risk of wildlife strikes, it is important to ensure that consistent terminology is used. The words “hazard” and “risk” are often used interchangeably in normal conversation, but they have specific meanings in the science of risk analysis:

23.1.1.1. A hazard is defined as a situation that, in certain circumstances, can lead to an event that results in harm. In this context, a hazard is the presence of certain wildlife on or near an aerodrome.

23.1.1.2. Risk is the probability that the harmful event will occur, multiplied by the severity of the harm that could result. In this context it is the probability of a wildlife strike by a group of wildlife multiplied by the severity of damage to the aircraft that results.

23.1.1.3. Risk = (probability of an event) × (severity of harm) and so for wildlife strikes:

23.1.1.4. Risk = (probability of a strike) × (severity of damage caused)

23.1.4. It is therefore possible to have a large number of large wildlife close to an aerodrome (a significant hazard) which results in a very low risk if the wildlife never moves onto the airfield or fly across the operational airspace. It is also possible to have a large number of small wildlife (typically weighing less than 120 g or 4 oz.) that are regularly struck by aircraft but which result in a low risk because of their size and weight, meaning that the level of harm resulting from the strikes is always very low (except when colliding with dense flocks).

23.1.5. Any assessment of risk therefore needs to estimate the probability that a strike will occur and the likely level of harm that will result. Estimation of harm is relatively straightforward because

analysis of various wildlife strike databases around the world shows that there is a consistent relationship between wildlife mass and the level of damage to aircraft. Strikes involving flocks of birds (even small species) are also more likely to result in damage to the aircraft than strikes with single birds. Thus, the larger the wildlife and the greater its tendency to be struck in groups, the greater the risk.

23.1.6. It is more difficult, however, to estimate the likely strike frequency of a particular population of bird or other wildlife because their behaviour cannot be predicted with certainty. There are a number of possible approaches to estimating strike probability, which vary in sophistication and in the level of skills and experience needed to apply them.

23.1.7. The most common form of risk assessment involves the categorization of both strike probability and likely severity into a number of arbitrary levels, usually low, medium and high. Again, this is easily done for strike severity using the mass of the wildlife involved, with a correction for their tendency to occur in groups. Assigning wildlife to a category for strike probability is more difficult and requires some specialist knowledge of the behaviour of the species involved and how that behaviour is influenced by the environment around the aerodrome concerned. Some aerodromes may have staff that are sufficiently experienced in wildlife behaviour to allow them to undertake this work. Otherwise, contracting the services of wildlife strike prevention specialists or local ornithologists may be necessary.


23.1.8 A typical option for risk assessment may involve a numerical approach that uses the number of strikes encountered with different species over the recent past as a measure of the probability of likely future strikes. For this process to work reliably the aerodrome's records must indicate that the majority of strikes that occurred at the aerodrome have been reported, that reporting has been consistent from year to year and that the wildlife species involved have been identified correctly. If these three requirements have not been met, it is better to use one of the more generic risk assessments described above. One such numerical approach involves taking the mean number of strikes recorded for each species in the past five years and using this to assign the species concerned to one of five frequency categories. The mass of the species is then used as a measure of likely severity and the species are assigned to one of five severity categories. The boundaries of these categories can be set by the aerodrome or regulator concerned. The frequency and severity measures are then combined into a 5 x 5 risk matrix (see Figure 1) with the different cells of the matrix designated as one of three risk levels.

23.1.9 The first step in a risk assessment of wildlife hazards is to define the area that will be assessed. This generally includes the entire aerodrome. The area of the risk assessment should include the take-off routes and landing approaches when significant wildlife hazards are present in these zones.

23.1.10 The next step of a risk assessment is to rate the probability that species will be involved in a strike. The examples below use a scale with 5 levels but fewer or more levels could be used. The probability can be assessed qualitatively on a scale, for example, from Very Low to Very High. Species that shy away from aircraft noise or that learn to avoid aircraft could be rated as Low or Very Low. Birds that flock in large numbers to certain habitats in the flight path could be rated a High or Very High. Solitary animals might be rated as Medium but other behavioural factors might have to be considered. This probability might also vary with the season or other conditions such as grass length or rain and weather conditions

23.1.11 The next step is to rank the expected severity of the impact or damage resulting from a strike event. Sometimes called the Hazard Level Ranking, this can use a scale similar to strike probability scale. This ranking will depend on the size of the animal and its tendency to flock or congregate. Heavier animals have a greater capacity to damage an aircraft and impact its flight performance. As a guide, birds that tend to flock and weigh more than 1.8 kg can cause the most severe damage to aircraft. The birds (or bats) that are solitary and weigh less than 50 g might be expected to cause the least severe damage. Flocking behaviour might mean that a strike event could include multiple impacts, or it could increase the probability of a strike.

23.1.12 Wildlife Strike Probability Dashboard Sample Report



Note: The probability is based on the average of flight movements, recorded and reported wildlife activity and wildlife strikes

SEVERITY	PROBABILITY				
	Very high	High	Moderate	Low	Very low
Very high	3	3	3	2	2
Moderate	3	3	3		
High	3	3	2	1	1
Low	2	2	1	1	1
Very low	1	1	1	1	1

23.1.13 The three risk levels require different responses from aerodrome managers as follows.

23.1.14 Risk level 3. Risk from this species is currently very high. Additional management actions should be implemented for this species as soon as possible.

23.1.15 Risk level 2. Risk from this species merits further review of available options and action if appropriate. Current risk management for this species should be reviewed and additional steps taken if appropriate.

23.1.16 Risk level 1. Risk from this species is currently low. No further action is required beyond the risk management measures currently in place.

23.1.17 It is also accepted that there may be local variations to this matrix, such as:

23.1.17.1 Green (Level 1). No further action is required.

23.1.17.2 Amber (Level 2). The current residual risk requires a review of available options and possible action.

23.1.17.3 Red (Level 3). The current residual risk requires further action to reduce it.

23.18 The actions and assessment need to fit with the reality of what can realistically be achieved within the legislation available and the resources at the aerodrome's disposal. It should be noted that where the risk assessment in a Level 3 indicates "unacceptable" there may be very little the aerodrome can do about managing this risk to entirely remove it, for example, due to the coastal location of the aerodrome, or where the aerodrome is surrounded by conservation areas and the aerodrome operator is unable to access and influence the wildlife hazards due to constraints placed upon the aerodrome by local wildlife legislation. The risk assessment matrix may also need to be adapted to cater for the risk posed by multiple strikes, whereby this risk would need to be raised to a high level. A quantitative approach (see Figure 2) uses historical strike records at the aerodrome expressed as the number of strikes (by species) per 10,000 aircraft movements. As a guide, 4 or more strikes per 10,000 movements would constitute a Very High probability of a strike, whereas less than 1 strike per 10,000 movements constitutes a Very Low probability.

			Severity of Strikes				
			Catastrophic	Critical	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
Probability of Strikes			A/C Crash & Severe	A/C Crash & Light Casualty	A/C Severe Damage & No Crash	A/C light Damage	near miss
Definition	Meaning	Value	A	B	C	D	E
Frequent	5/10,000 movements	5	5A(Unacceptable)	5B(Unacceptable)	5C(Unacceptable)	5D(High)	5E(Moderate)
likely	4/10,000 movements	4	4A(Unacceptable)	4B(Unacceptable)	4C(Unacceptable)	4D(Moderate)	4E(Moderate)
Occasional	3/10,000 movements	3	3A(Unacceptable)	3B(High)	3C(High)	3D(Moderate)	3E(low)
Seldom	2/10,000 movements	2	2A(Unacceptable)	2B(High)	2C(Moderate)	2D(Low)	2E(Very Low)
Improbable	1/10,000 movements	1	1A(Unacceptable)	1B(High)	1C(Low)	1D(Very Low)	1E(Very Low)

Figure 2

Note: - The level of risk for each species of bird, bat and terrestrial animal is determined as a combination of the Probability of a Strike and the Severity of the Outcome. In the example the Risk is also rated on a scale of 5 – Very Low, Low, Medium, High and Unacceptable. Alternatives might use a scale of 3 and the traffic light colours (Green, Amber, and Red) to highlight the high priority species.

23.18 The risk assessment will rank the risk of each species and highlight those species that should be prioritized for risk mitigation in the WHMP.

23.19 Severity can be rated in terms of aircraft damage and human casualty. Negligible could mean near miss and aircraft damage. Minor could mean light aircraft damage. Moderate could mean severe aircraft damage. Critical might mean that the aircraft could crash with no human death, just wounded, and Catastrophic might mean an emergency situation with aircraft crash and severe wounds or death casualty. Each aerodrome should determine its own scale. The range of aircraft sizes operating at an aerodrome will

also need to be taken into consideration, so clearly the views of the aircraft operators should be considered. All of the above techniques are designed to assess the total risk of a wildlife strike at an aerodrome. This is effectively the aerodrome operator's risk exposure. In order to assess the risk to an airline or an individual passenger flying to or from an aerodrome, some account of movement rate.

23.20 This needs to be incorporated into the risk assessment. The simplest approach to this is to express strike frequency per aircraft movement or, more conventionally, as strikes per 10 000 aircraft movements. As with the techniques described above, the sophistication with which this strike rate can be interpreted depends upon the level of detailed information available concerning the wildlife strikes that are encountered. If information is limited to the total number of strikes per year then the strike rate per 10 000 movements may simply be categorized as low, medium or high. If wildlife strikes are reliably reported and identified and there is a sufficient data set, then it may be possible to treat the strike rate for an individual species as a measure of strike probability. However, it should be borne in mind that the severity depends on the mass of the species and the flocking behaviour. Whatever risk assessment technique is chosen, it is essential that the findings are followed up by effective risk management. For those risks that are judged very high (Level 3), a list of available actions should be developed, in consultation with wildlife management experts where necessary, and the costs and benefits of the various options assessed before a decision is reached on which options to select. It is equally important that the effectiveness of these options is evaluated at appropriate intervals after they are implemented. Repeating the risk assessment process annually to determine if the risk is falling to an acceptable level is recommended.

23.21 At the same time for those risks judged low (Level 1), the actions in place should not ease and should continue at the same intensity and frequency. Finally, it is essential that the entire process be properly documented in order to show that the aerodrome operator concerned is acting with due diligence in managing the wildlife risk on and around its property. A more thorough discussion of the assessment of risk can be found in ICAO's Safety Management Manual (SMM) (Doc 9859)

24. IDENTIFYING ROOT CAUSES OF WILDLIFE HAZARD

24.1 The final stage of the risk assessment of wildlife hazards is to identify the root cause of each wildlife hazard. Here, it is critical to understand the behaviour and basic requirements of each hazardous species of wildlife. Remember, each animal has a basic requirement for energy and nutrients, including water. They must maintain their bodies core temperature, they must breed and reproduce, and they must avoid being predated by another animal. When identifying root causes of wildlife hazards, consider each species and its basic requirements. Then, observe the aerodrome and surrounding areas to determine how the different habitats may aid the species in fulfilling its requirements.

24.2 This stage of the risk assessment should, wherever possible, involve a trained wildlife biologist who is familiar with ecology and animal behaviour. Ideal habitats for hazardous wildlife may not be readily apparent, and the attractiveness of aerodrome habitats may vary seasonally. Consider all stages of an animal's requirements throughout the annual cycle. Breeding seasons, annual migrations, seasonal weather patterns, and food availability are all factors that can contribute to temporal changes in wildlife hazard.

25. USING ADVANCED RISK ASSESSMENT METHODS

25.1 The risk assessment outlined in the sections above are one of the more basic ones that an aerodrome can utilize to quantify wildlife hazards. Aerodrome wildlife managers may wish to consider a greater set of variables, and therefore, assess risk more accurately. For example, the type of aircraft using the aerodrome will influence the level of risk; larger, faster aircraft will increase the risk of a damaging wildlife strike. When considering the probability of a wildlife strike, components of each species behaviour can also be considered. This is especially valuable when detailed records of historical wildlife strikes are not available. Such factors as variations in a species annual abundance around the aerodrome, the animal's propensity to engage in "hazardous" behaviour, and its relative ability to avoid aircraft can be considered

SECTION 6

26. HABITAT MANAGEMENT

26.1 The WHMP should provide details on the actions and procedures necessary to manage both habitat and wildlife given the specific local conditions and considerations. In broad terms, habitat management is a long-term issue and may involve capital investment to deal with land, vegetation and water bodies both on and off the aerodrome site. Shorter term activities include the upkeep of the vegetation such as grass cutting and tree trimming.

26.2 Actions to deal with wildlife on a daily basis starts with patrols and inspections, observation of wildlife and other conditions, making interventions and assessing the response to interventions. It is also crucial to record all actions and observations in order to be able to review the effectiveness of the WHMP and development improvements.

26.3 Reporting to be established, monthly or a similar period and equipment should also be checked and reviewed on a similar basis. It is generally difficult to provide definitive guidelines, because best practice depends greatly on the local conditions at an aerodrome, the different key wildlife species and their particular behaviours.

26.4 Aerodromes should systematically review features on, and in the vicinity of, the aerodrome that attract wildlife. The WHMP should include a plan to reduce the attractiveness of these features and to decrease the number of hazardous wildlife present or to deny them physical access to these areas.

26.5 Aerodrome development should be designed such that it will not be attractive to hazardous wildlife and no attraction will be created during construction. This may include denying resting, roosting and feeding opportunities for hazardous wildlife. A complete perimeter fence of adequate height is the prime method of preventing hazardous wildlife, other than birds, from gaining access to the airfield areas. Fences and gates should be left closed and regularly checked. No food sources should be available to animals on the aerodrome.

26.6 Vegetation composition (grass) should be kept at a height that is considered unattractive to hazardous wildlife, while accepting that this may not be applicable in arid locations. The attractiveness of vegetation is a balance between food presence, food accessibility and protection against predators:

27.6.1 Earthworms, insects, rodents and other animals are present in and on the soil and in the vegetation.

27.6.2 The vegetation itself and its seed are food for plant and seed eaters.

27.6.3 Food accessibility depends on vegetation height and density. Long, dense vegetation will inhibit most hazardous wildlife from moving around, detecting and accessing the food

27.6.4 wildlife safeguards themselves from predators by hiding and/or fleeing. Long, dense vegetation is preferred as a hiding place by agoraphobia species. These species avoid the open space of the runway and short vegetation. On the other hand, claustrophobic species avoid long, dense vegetation and prefer to stay in the open space of the runway and short vegetation where they have a wide view to see predators well in advance to enable them to flee on time; and

27.6.5 wildlife feeding on seeds will avoid the aerodrome if its vegetation is mowed during the flowering season. When these flowers attract insects that are attracting aerial feeders (for example swallows, swifts and bee-eaters), the vegetation should be cut before the flowering season in order to maximize deterrence of local wildlife species, and the height and species composition of the vegetation should be managed to minimize food sources.

27.7 Agricultural crops, where possible, should be discouraged from the airfield environment since agricultural crops and related activities (ploughing, mowing) will provide food for hazardous wildlife.

27.8 Water bodies in many parts of the world can be a particular hazard because they can be very attractive to birds. It may be possible for these to be modified by netting them to exclude birds, fencing them to deny access to birds that walk in, have the sides steepened or made less attractive in other ways. Refuse/garbage dumps can also be very attractive to birds and can cause bird flyways to cross the aerodrome. Preventing food sources from being available either through management or netting/fencing of the facility can be effective to deter birds and other wildlife

27.9 Habitat management can be the most effective method to reduce wildlife hazard at an aerodrome. This section outlines some general concepts and considerations. The management of habitats on the aerodrome will be quite different from that on land adjacent and near to the aerodrome. Some considerations are part of the long-term development of the aerodrome and should be included in the Aerodrome Master plan. Other issues are more related to regular maintenance and upkeep of aerodrome landsite key to habitat management is avoiding conditions that attract wildlife such as food, water, shelter, and resting and breeding are to be conducted on a regular basis.

28. ON AERODROME HABITAT MANAGEMENT

28.1 Wildlife can be attracted to particular sites for feeding, breeding, roosting, resting or access to water. Efforts put into reducing the attractiveness of the airfield can be the most productive way to reduce the risk of wildlife strikes. The large expanse of grass, low vegetation or even the lack of vegetation present at aerodromes is attractive to wildlife that prefer open country habitats partly because they rely on being able to observe predators at long distances. When combined with food resources, aerodromes can be very attractive habitats for open-country wildlife. The presence of numerous buildings and hangars along with trees and bushes adjacent to the airfield can also provide suitable habitat for many species.

28.2 Therefore, it is necessary to identify and evaluate the attractants present on the aerodrome so that they can be reduced, eliminated, or effectively managed, thereby achieving a long-term solution to the problem of wildlife strikes.

25.3 If the aerodrome environment is made less attractive to the wildlife species present, they will seek their needs elsewhere and the resident wildlife population will decline significantly, along with the number of wildlife strikes. By modifying the habitat, it is possible to modify both the quantity and the type of wildlife species active on the airfield.

28.4 There are a number of habitats on an airfield to which wildlife may be attracted. These are listed below with an explanation of what features can be attractive and what steps can be taken to counter this.

28.5 Buildings provide sites for nesting, roosting and perching.

28.6 Open water access to water, breeding and roosting sites.

28.7 Trees, shrubs, berries perching, nesting and feeding.

28.8 Grass see details below on how to manage airfield grass.

28.9 Controlling the attractiveness of an aerodrome to birds and other wildlife is fundamental to good control. Indeed, it is probably more important than bird dispersal in terms of controlling the overall risk. If an aerodrome provides easily accessible resources to wildlife in terms of food, water, shelter or breeding sites, then they will continue to try and return despite any dispersal tactics that are used to dissuade them. Habitat management to deter wildlife involves two processes, identifying the attractive features and implementing changes to either remove the attraction or to deny access.

28.10 An aerodrome should undertake a review of the features on its property that attract hazardous wildlife. The precise nature of the resource to which birds are attracted should be identified and a management plan developed to eliminate or reduce the quantity of that resource, or to deny birds access as far as is practicable. Documentary evidence of this process, its implementation and outcomes should be kept.

28.11 Food

28.11.1 It is difficult to remove all food sources for birds and other wildlife on aerodromes. Because grass is the common vegetation on most aerodromes, grassland management has an important influence on food available to birds.

28.11.2 Wildlife may enter aerodrome lands in order to feed on seeds, vegetation, invertebrates or rodents and other small mammals in grasslands or agricultural crops; on fruits in trees and shrubs; or on exposed food waste from catering services or restaurants. These sources of food are especially attractive to a variety of birds. Agricultural measures like mowing, harvesting and ploughing will attract birds because of the disturbance and exposure of seeds, invertebrates and rodents. If the presence of birds is to be decreased substantially, it is necessary to take action mainly at the source by reducing their food supply. The use of pesticides and herbicides may be a solution in some cases. Although it is impossible to remove all food sources on aerodromes, the following are suggested measures that can be taken to mitigate the problem:

28.11.3 Agriculture. Cultivation of aerodrome lands will, no matter what the crop type, attract birds at some part of the life cycle of the crop. Therefore, it is recommended that aerodrome lands not be used for agriculture.

28.11.4 Food waste. Aerodromes should require wildlife-proof storage of food waste, prohibit wildlife feeding and promote good sanitation and litter control programmes.

28.11.5 Waste management facilities (refuse collection, landfill sites and/or garbage dumps). Refuse dumps that accept putrescible (organic) wastes are highly attractive to various bird and mammal species that are hazardous to aviation. It is important to bring about national and local legislation in order to prohibit or restrict the establishment of new sites that accept putrescible wastes close to aerodromes and, ideally, national legislation to provide for the closure of existing dumps that are attracting wildlife hazardous to aviation. However, in reality, this will be very difficult to achieve without new State legislation. Generally, it is desirable that sites be no closer than a 13 km circle centred on the ARP and, in some cases, further — where studies of flight lines of birds attracted to these sites prove them problematic for the aerodrome. If a refuse site in the vicinity of an aerodrome cannot be closed, it likely will be necessary to try to influence the operators to provide control measures at the site to reduce its attractiveness to wildlife. However, this cannot be determined unless a formal assessment of the site is carried out to establish the type of waste and the wildlife species attracted to the locale. Such control could include fencing, netting or overhead wires to prevent access to the active surface and active dispersal of birds using pyrotechnics or other dispersal techniques. Fully enclosed waste-transfer facilities and sites which take only inorganic refuse such as construction and demolition waste generally will not attract hazardous wildlife.

28.12 Water

28.12.1 As much as possible, very wet land and stagnant water on aerodromes should be drained. The presence of water is a major factor in attracting wildlife, particularly birds, aquatic mammals and amphibians and creates habitat for aquatic invertebrates that often hatch synchronously in large numbers thereby attracting large numbers of insect predators (e.g. birds, bats).

28.12.2 It is often difficult and costly to eliminate all wet areas from an aerodrome. Where construction measures, such as drainage, cannot be undertaken, aerodrome operators should identify water bodies that are used by significant numbers of hazardous wildlife and undertake action to limit

28.12.3 The access of wildlife to these bodies: Placing floating balls, netting or overhead wires, can be excellent solutions, depending on the species present. Surface water is often highly attractive to birds. Exposed water should be eliminated or minimized to the greatest extent possible on aerodrome property as follows:

28.12.4 Depressions and water bodies: Pits or depressions that fill with water after rains should be levelled and drained. Larger water bodies, such as storm-water retention lagoons, can be covered with wires or netting to inhibit birds from landing. Larger water bodies that cannot be eliminated should have a perimeter road so that wildlife-control personnel can quickly access all parts of the water body to disperse birds. Water bodies and ditches should have steep slopes to discourage wading birds from feeding in shallow water.

28.12.5 Drainage ditches: When drainage ditches clog up with vegetation or eroded soil and the flow of water is impeded, insects and other aquatic life flourish, thereby attracting birds if it is not netted. In order to address such issues, installing culverts in the ditches is recommended. Clearing the ditches at regular intervals is important. They should be graded so that the water will run off as rapidly as possible. Grass and other vegetation should be cut on the sloping banks. Where practicable, the water attractant can be eliminated by replacing ditches with buried drainpipes.

28.13 Shelter

28.14.1 Birds and other wildlife often seek shelter and breeding sites on aerodrome property in such places as the structural beams of hangars and bridges, in nooks of jet ways and other structures, and in trees and shrubs. Some birds, such as gulls and waterfowl, seek the open spaces on aerodrome property for safety while resting. These areas give the birds a clear view of their surroundings in all directions. Dogs and other mammals will seek shelter in dense stands of trees, shrubs and drains.

28.15.2 Analysis of buildings can identify places that can be used by wildlife. The elimination of these potential shelters will decrease the numbers of animals present. All dilapidated or ruined buildings, on or in the direct vicinity of the aerodrome, should either be repaired or demolished. Those structures are often colonized by wildlife that uses them as shelters and for breeding purposes.

28.16.3 Signs and lights along runways and taxiways are ideal perches for birds, and particularly raptors, which use them as observation posts when hunting. Limiting their use as perches can be an excellent solution to reduce the presence of birds. The installation of metal spikes, preferably the 'Rotating 3-spike version', prevents birds from landing on them.

28.17.4 Other measures can be taken to deter birds and other wildlife from seeking shelter and breeding sites on aerodrome property:

28.14 Structures

28.14.1 Architects should consult biologists during the design phase of buildings, hangars, bridges and other structures at aerodromes to minimize exposed areas that birds can use for perching and nesting. When perching sites are present in older structures (such as rafter and girded areas in hangars, warehouses and under bridges) access to these sites can often be eliminated with netting. Anti-perching devices, such as spikes, can be installed on ledges, roof peaks, rafters, signs, posts and other roosting and perching areas to keep certain birds from using them. Changing the angle of building ledges to 45 degrees or more will deter birds. However, it is emphasized that incorporating bird exclusion or deterrence into the design of structures is the most effective, long-term solution

28.14.2 Abandoned structures. All unnecessary or abandoned posts, fences and other structures that can be used as perches by raptors and other birds should be removed from aerodrome property. Piles of construction debris and discarded equipment, unmoved fence rows and other unmanaged areas are not only aesthetically unpleasing but typically provide excellent cover for rodents and other wildlife. These areas should be eliminated at aerodromes.

28.14.3 Trees and shrubs. Much care must be taken when selecting and spacing plants for aerodrome landscaping. Avoid plants that produce fruits and seeds desired by wildlife. Also avoid the creation of areas of dense cover for roosting by flocking species of birds. Thinning the canopy of trees or selectively removing trees to increase their spacing can help eliminate bird roosts that form in trees on aerodromes.

28.14.4 Ground vegetation. Because vegetative ground cover (typically grass) is usually the dominant habitat on an aerodrome, the management of an aerodrome's airside ground cover to minimize its attractiveness to wildlife is a critical activity. However, management of ground vegetation requires expert knowledge about the local ecological conditions because of variations in soil types, rainfall patterns, temperature profiles and wildlife, resulting in site-specific vegetation. The following are suggested methods of reducing wildlife attraction to aerodrome ground cover:

28.14.5 Some studies have shown that maintaining a monoculture of tall or long (150 mm to 200 m high) dense grass can discourage gulls, lapwings and similar birds from landing and feeding on soil invertebrates. However, other studies and observations indicate that tall grass does not discourage certain large birds such as geese, herons and egrets. Tall, dense grass interferes with visibility and locomotion of the smaller birds. Although rodent populations may increase in tall grass, the density and height of the grass may be managed by effective cutting and clearing methods (also known as "bottoming out") in order to discourage raptors and rodents from feeding. Maintenance of tall, dense stands of grass may require special mowing equipment and other activities to prevent thatch build-up and to keep the grass uniformly tall and free of weeds.

28.14.6 When seeds are the most important food source, the vegetation should be mowed during the flowering season. In case these flowers attract insects that, when airborne, attract swallows and other aerial feeders, the vegetation should be mowed before the flowering season.

28.14.7 Short grass (less than 150 mm) may result in fewer rodents compared to tall grass because of reduced cover and increased disturbance caused by frequency of mowing. Mowing activities may attract birds to feed by exposing invertebrates and rodents. The height of the vegetation and the timing and frequency of mowing on an aerodrome should be oriented to minimizing hazardous wildlife and not to any other horticultural benefits which may arise from the ground cover.

28.14.8 A promising approach to reducing wildlife attraction to aerodrome ground cover, regardless of the height, is the use of vegetation that is undesirable or mildly toxic to wildlife.

28.14.9 It is advisable that aerodrome operators consult with professional biologists and horticulturists to develop a vegetation type and mowing regime appropriate for the growing conditions and wildlife at the location. The main principles to follow are to use a vegetation cover and mowing regime that do not result in a build-up of rodent numbers or the production of seeds, forage or invertebrates desired by wildlife.

28.14.10 Grass management has to be adapted for each aerodrome. General guidelines are difficult to establish. Therefore, according to the type of vegetation, growing conditions and wildlife at the location, an appropriate mowing regime must be determined. Aerodromes which do not have vegetation covering the soil do not offer much food to birds, but may attract certain species to nest or roost directly on the soil. At aerodromes where sparse or no vegetation attracts hazardous species, studies could be conducted to determine possibilities for plant coverage that prevents nesting and roosting without increasing food sources. It is not automatically the best choice to provide a grass covered airfield. If the surrounding areas are arid desert then the green grass may well attract birds.

28.14.11 Depending on the type of grass used and the local climate, grass coverage needs to be maintained. Depending on the type of grass, the machinery used to mow will have to be adapted to pick up maximum amounts of grass after mowing, and must not create ruts, which may offer wildlife a favourable environment. For example, if they become filled with water. The continual collection of grass may also lead to reduced soil fertility and may require periodic added fertilization, preferably in the form of low-nutrient organic fertilizer.

28.14.12 The period during which grass is cut is a determining factor in wildlife hazard management. It is essential to be able to carry out this work under dry weather conditions and be sure that it can be completed as rapidly as possible. Consideration should also be given to conducting grass cutting at night-time. Night cutting eliminates the risk of attracting birds to the mowers to feed. The period after mowing should allow for grass to grow to its optimal height before the next mowing is carried out.

28.14.13 The grass that is cut must be sufficiently mulched, or preferably collected and removed from the aerodrome. The presence on the ground of decomposing grass creates a thatch layer that favors an increase in invertebrate numbers which will in turn attract birds. Clumps of grass also provide ideal nesting habitat for field rodents and can contribute to high rodent populations which can attract raptors.

28.14.14 This may mean an airfield should have grass cut to a particular length such that local bird species cannot find food and cannot rest because their sight is interrupted by the grass. At other locations it may be more important to not provide perching opportunities on structures or, in dry areas not to provide

access to surface water. A study of the aerodrome environment should lead to the implementation of a Habitat Management Plan that describes the management needed for the different areas and habitats of the aerodrome perimeter.

28.14.15 Where grass does grow naturally in the environment it can be managed as described elsewhere. In terms of operational procedures this will mean a plan to achieve the following:

28.14.16.1 Soil sampling to ensure there are no insects and larvae that will attract birds to feed.

28.14.16.2 Weedkiller to reduce weeds upon which birds may feed.

28.14.16.3 Insecticide to remove insects upon which birds may feed.

28.14.16.4 Fertilizer application to ensure the grass can grow to the required length.

28.14.16 Bottoming out - cutting the grass very short in spring; -to ensure fresh vigorous growth and to remove grass cuttings or thatch that can build up and harbor insects and attract birds.

28.14.17 Regular topping cuts to maintain upright grass of the required height. In warm wet periods the grass may grow more quickly and in hot dry periods it may cease to grow these variations in the weather will need to be taken into account so as not to strictly follow a time -based plan for cutting.

29. OFF AERODROME HABITAT MANAGEMENT

29.1 Birds that are not present on the aerodrome but overfly the aerodrome or its approaches and climb-out areas may also come into conflict with aircraft. Off-airfield monitoring of bird species and behaviour should occur and should include species, flight lines, seasonal patterns, time of day, etc.

29.2 Any significant wildlife attractants within a defined radius centred on the aerodrome reference point (ARP) should be assessed and a management plan developed to reduce their attractiveness to wildlife. While it is understood by leading wildlife experts that an ARP might not always be centred exactly on the geographic centre of an aerodrome, typically a 13 km (or 7 NM) circle is considered a large enough area for an effective wildlife management plan. However, as necessary, action should also be taken when the wildlife attractants are outside the 13 km circle if the aerodrome operator has any influence on planning and development issues.

29.3 In accordance with the recommendations of Annex 14, Volume I Aerodrome Design and Operations, Chapter 9, 9.4.5, for any new off-aerodrome developments being proposed that may attract birds or flight lines across the aerodrome, it is important that the aerodrome operator be consulted and involved in the planning process to ensure that its interests are represented. Generally, the aerodrome does not have the opportunity to directly manage habitats outside of the aerodrome. Therefore, it is necessary for the aerodrome to develop good relationships with the adjacent landowners and the local government to be able to influence land uses that affect hazardous wildlife distribution, movements and abundance.

29.4 Gathering specific data on wildlife outside the physical boundaries of the aerodrome is important. While it is critical to know the seasonal abundance of each hazardous species on and near the aerodrome, it is also important to know how those species interact with the aerodrome. For example, knowledge of movement routes makes it possible to provide pilots with reliable information on potential hazards within approach and departure paths. Knowing where species nest/den etc. can be very important in determining control strategies for young animals that are frequently most at risk of causing a strike.

29.5 The areas surrounding the aerodrome have a direct impact on the presence of wildlife on the aerodrome. Their physical location may also result in animals crossing the aerodrome regularly. It may be necessary to gain an understanding of wildlife behaviour outside the aerodrome.

29.6 The types of environments in the vicinity of an aerodrome have a direct impact on the presence of wildlife are described below (The list is not exhaustive).

29.7 Local Agricultural Practices

29.7.1 In general, experts advise against growing agricultural crops on the aerodrome. Outside the aerodrome site, it is difficult to influence the choice of crops, unless national legislation has been adopted on this subject. Whatever the situation, it may be necessary to engage with local farmers in the vicinity of the aerodrome to influence their activities.

29.7.2 Many countries already regulate the use of agricultural land in the vicinity of aerodromes to minimize the attraction of wildlife. The planning of crops around the aerodrome may take the form of crop plans, recommendations for farming methods, or even the adoption of legislation.

29.7.3 In all cases, it is extremely essential for the aerodrome operator to establish coordination with the local authorities and to ensure that they are aware of the risks to aviation which may arise from wildlife.

29.8. Landfill/Garbage Disposal Sites

29.8.1 Landfills and garbage dumps are a significant source of food for birds. Certain species will travel several kilometres to reach a dump. Birds flying to and from these sites may cross over aerodrome or aircraft flight paths. It is not uncommon to observe birds, in particular gulls, soaring over dump sites in the thermals created by composting garbage. The greater presence of birds may give rise to problems for approaching aircraft. The presence of garbage dumps on aerodromes must be totally prohibited. In accordance with various national recommendations for the prevention of bird hazards, best practice calls for the elimination of garbage dumps within a radius of up to 13 kilometres of the aerodrome. Even this regulation may be inadequate to prevent hazards if the aerodrome is located between the landfill and the roosting site of the birds using the landfill.

29.9 Sewage Treatment and Wastewater Plants

29.9.1 These plants and their settling ponds often attract large numbers of birds. The closer the plant to the aerodrome, the greater the potential hazard is likely to be. It is necessary for aerodrome operators to develop agreements with those responsible for the plants to ensure that bird's hazards that result from sewage ponds are suitably mitigated. New plants should not be constructed near an aerodrome or where movements to and from the plant bird may affect aircraft movements.

29.10 Reservoirs, lakes, Ponds, Rivers and Salt Marshes

29.10.1 Wetlands are often used by significant numbers of water birds, which tend to be among the higher hazard species due to their size and flocking behavior. If possible, changes to these water bodies should be undertaken to reduce their attractiveness to birds if the birds are known to present a flight safety risk.

29.10.2 The existence of several bodies of water may result in bird movements from one to another, thereby increasing the risk of bird strikes especially if the aerodrome lies between those water

bodies. Particular attention has to be paid to the risk of bird strikes at aerodromes situated in coastal areas or near estuaries.

29.11 Gravel Pits and Quarries

29.11.1 Areas from which raw materials and stone are extracted are often filled with water. It is common for these areas to be left without being restored, thereby attracting birds. In the case of any new excavations, it is important to ensure that, following its exploitation, the site is restored to its initial state. In some cases, old extraction pits are being enhanced to increase the biodiversity of an area which, if near an aerodrome, may increase the bird hazard.

29.12 Nature Reserves

29.12.1 The establishment of nature reserves in the vicinity of aerodromes can attract wildlife. In general, nature reserves are formed where unique, diverse or remnant habitats exist. They may or may not harbor hazardous species. Aerodromes should develop a solid relationship with reserve management, so that if habitat enhancement is conducted on the reserves' wildlife hazards to aircraft are a primary consideration.

29.13 Possible Future Hazards in the Vicinity of the Aerodrome Safeguarding

29.13.1 Aerodrome operators should take steps to prevent new or increased hazards caused by developments in the vicinity of the aerodrome and should also encourage developments that reduce wildlife hazards. ICAO quotes a distance of 13km from the aerodrome reference point (ARP). However, developments beyond 13km can still create a hazard if animals move past the aerodrome or runway ends, to and from the newly developed land use. Information needs to be collected by the appropriate State authority and/or the aerodrome operator about the local wildlife species, their abundance and their movements to and from feeding and roosting areas at different times of the year.

29.13.2 Where such developments are likely to increase the hazard, the aerodrome operator should communicate those concerns to the developer, municipal planners and the national aviation authority.

29.14 Landscaping of Aerodromes

29.14.1 In many projects for the revitalization, extension or construction of new aerodromes, external landscaping is given importance in the project in order to welcome aerodrome users in an agreeable manner. The planting of trees, bushes and other plants has the undesired effect of attracting wildlife, and particularly birds. The management of the wildlife hazard should be considered part of the project planning from the very beginning. Care should be taken with the selection of sites for planting and the varieties used which can have a significant impact on the presence of wildlife. In all cases, plants which produce food such as berries and fruit should be avoided. Also, continuous stands of vegetation should be avoided. Preferably, trees should be spaced so that they do not form a continuous canopy and shrubs should not be planted under the canopy of trees and should also be spaced so as to not touch each other. Open form trees and shrubs should be selected, avoiding coniferous trees and shrubs which provide year-round shelter.

29.14.2 Aerodromes should conduct an inventory of bird attracting sites within the ICAO defined 13km bird circle, paying particular attention to sites close to the airfield and the approach and departure corridors. A basic risk assessment should be carried out to determine whether the

movement patterns of wildlife attracted to these sites means that they cause, or may cause, a risk to air traffic. If this is the case, options for bird management at the site(s) concerned should be developed and a more detailed risk assessment performed to determine if it is possible and/ or cost effective to implement management processes at the site(s) concerned. This process should be repeated annually to identify new sites or changes in the risk levels produced by existing sites.

29.14.3 Once sites that support wildlife that are, or might, cause a flight safety problem are identified, management options can be developed. These can range from minor habitat modification, changing cropping or other agricultural practices, major drainage operations or large-scale removal of wildlife populations. Again, the choice of technique will depend on the particular situation encountered and expert advice should be sought if necessary. Larger scale off-aerodrome wildlife management may also involve liaising with local conservation interests, especially if the sites that need to be managed are nature reserves. In some cases, it may be impossible to resolve the conflicting interests of flight safety and conservation, but in trying to do so the aerodrome will be in a better position to show due diligence in the event of an accident or legal claim .

29.14.4 Major earthwork considerations on aerodromes are usually required to manage storm-water runoff, and drainage channels and settling ponds can become water bodies that attract wildlife. Such work is usually done at the time of runway and taxiway development and future developments would be included in an Aerodrome Master plan. Wildlife hazard issues must be taken into account at the aerodrome infrastructure planning stages. Landscaping then usually involves seeding open areas for grass or other appropriate plant coverage to avoid soil erosion. Grass and plant species must be selected taking into account maintenance and watering needs, seeds and fruit, and shelter and nesting for wildlife. Shotgun Aerodrome

29.14.5 A perimeter fence around the aerodrome airside areas is often required for safety and security reasons. The ability to exclude local wildlife will be a key consideration with designing and constructing a boundary fence.

29.14.6 The need to protect the habitat of certain native animal and plant species might be a part of the aerodrome's land management and biodiversity plans or obligations. This might in fact conflict with the need to reduce wildlife hazard and aerodrome senior management may need to work closely with the government wildlife or conservation department to develop appropriate local regulation. Careful consideration of wildlife hazards will be required when planning such conservation habitats.

30. OFF - AERODROME HABITATS

30.1 The land use and habitat management on areas near an aerodrome are also an important consideration, although an aerodrome operator may have limited ability to control off-site land use and will need to work in partnership with local landowners and stakeholders. In principle, the habitats off-site should be more attractive to wildlife than the aerodrome site itself. However extreme cases such as a landfill or garbage dump might attract so much wildlife that it may pose an increased hazard on aerodrome land.

30.2 Off-site land uses and activities that can affect wildlife and might need careful consideration might include the following:

30.2.1 Nature conservation and recreational areas.

- 30.2.2 Local agricultural practices.
- 30.2.3 Landfill and solid waste management.
- 30.2.4 Storm water and wastewater treatment plans.
- 30.2.5 Water bodies including reservoirs, lakes, rivers and the sea.
- 30.2.6 Wetlands including marshes; and
- 30.2.7 Gravel pits and quarries.

31. ROUTINE PATROLLING

31.1 Routine patrolling is the core of the WHMP and should include site tours or inspections, observations, interventions and record keeping. Regular surveillance of the aerodrome is necessary to spot hazardous wildlife. The use of binoculars, spotting scopes and possibly night vision equipment by trained staff allows for optimum observation.

31.2 The wildlife control operators should determine high-risk areas and spend disproportionately more time in those areas.

31.3 The frequency of patrols will be highly dependent on local conditions and the behaviour of wildlife. In some locations or during some seasons, daily patrols may suffice. Under certain situations patrols may be required every 30 minutes or even more frequently. Runway safety inspections may be incorporated or performed in parallel with wildlife hazard management patrols. Patrols should be carried out in a random pattern rather than a regular route so that wildlife do not 'learn' or become accustomed to the timing of patrols.

32. PATROLS AND INSPECTION

32.1 During a patrol, a wildlife control operator should be on the lookout for a range of activities and situations, including the following:

32.1.1 Observe wildlife in an area, how many, what species, what activity, what it appears to be attracted to.

32.1.2 Observe signs of occupancy by wildlife such as feeding, nesting, resting, droppings, or carcasses.

32.1.3 Observe conditions of the habitat such as grass, surface water, trees, fences, FOD (Foreign Object Debris).

32.1.4 Inspect specific features such as traps or visual deterrents.

32.1.5 Observe and report any other safety issues associated with the operation of the aerodrome, whether it related to wildlife hazard management.

32.1.6 Remote Detection Systems

32.2 Some aerodromes might employ remote detection systems such as radar or video monitoring systems. Such technology will probably never replace the need for manned patrols and interventions but could assist with reducing the frequency of patrols. Coordination between the remote monitoring centre and operators that might respond to wildlife sightings is required.

33. INTERVENTION TECHNIQUES

33.1 Intervention techniques are actions taken by a wildlife control operator to remove wildlife from areas of high risk. One of the intentions of intervention techniques is to train the wildlife not to occupy areas where they are not wanted. If an animal learns that the effort to occupy a place and get chased away is greater than the benefit provided by the food or opportunity to rest in that area, it may stop returning. Most intervention techniques rely on scaring wildlife with an audible or visual threat. This can include the following:

33.1.1 Movement of the patrol vehicle and the human pressure associated with the wildlife control operator. (Care must be taken that the patrol itself does not become a hazard to aircraft operations.)

33.1.2 Noise to scare wildlife such as sound generators, pistol or gun shots, and pyrotechnics or firecrackers. (Care must be taken that wildlife are moved away from aircraft operations.)

33.1.3 Noise to deter wildlife such as recorded distress or alarm calls. (Care must be taken that such calls do not attract curious or predatory species.)

33.1.4 Visual repellents including lasers, kites, balloons, scarecrows and small models. Trained predators such as falcons and dogs used to chase wildlife.

33.1.5 Trapping, tagging and relocation, especially for larger animals and protected species.

33.1.6 Culling or killing. (This is generally a last resort, as a dead animal is not a trained animal. It is not an option for certain species such as endangered or protected species.)

33.2 In some situations chemical repellents and pesticides might have a role to play, although the use of poisons and environmental pollutants should be discouraged.

33.3 Care must be exercised to avoid any intervention from accidentally flushing birds at ill-timed moments into the path of aircraft. Care must also be taken that patrol vehicles or personnel do not become air safety hazards. Wildlife training discussed in Chapter 7 of Airport Services Manual (Doc 9137), Part 3 – Wildlife Hazard Management and in Section 34 of this document is a crucial requirement to reduce this risk. Mobile patrols should be more persistent than the wildlife. Simply moving wildlife and then driving away is seldom effective wildlife control. It often is necessary to remain in the area following control to prevent the immediate return of wildlife or to repeatedly return to the area at frequent intervals to ensure that the controlled wildlife have not returned and to reinforce control if necessary. The aim is to achieve a bird free aerodrome and the control needs to be thorough to ensure the birds leave the airfield.

SECTION 7

34. RECORDING AND REPORTING

34.1 Recording All Daily Activities

34.1.1 Keeping records of all activity related to wildlife hazard management is fundamental to the WHMP. Data is required in order to be able to assess the effectiveness of the Programme as a whole, as well as specific trends such as habituation.

34.1.2 There is an increased tendency towards airlines and/or their insurers to pursue legal action to recover the costs of wildlife strike damage from aerodromes at which they occur. It is important that aerodromes record the wildlife control actions that they take in order to be able to demonstrate that they had an adequate WHMP in place at the time of an incident and that the programme was functioning properly. Data gathered as part of the programme is also important in assessing the effectiveness of the actions taken.

34.1.3 It is highly recommended that Aerodromes use smart technology such as smart tablets or phones including laptops, tablet PCs or other electronic devices to record activity while monitoring. Use of technology saves time and effort, especially if the data is to be subsequently entered into a computer for further analysis. Paper forms must be avoided at all costs and use of excel sheets and forms must be avoided. The important issue is that a comprehensive record of the wildlife control activities is kept in order to demonstrate that the aerodrome is following its own policies and procedures. Records need to include the time, location and nature of the following:

34.1.4 Each patrol or inspection and the route taken.

34.1.1.1 Observation of any unusual condition of the habitat or site such as the state of the vegetation, trees, water bodies or perimeter fence.

34.1.1.2 Species of wildlife sightings including any particular activity such as feeding or resting, and the discovery of any carcasses, dropping or other signs of activity.

34.1.1.3 Interventions that are made.


34.1.1.4 The outcome of any intervention, the response of the wildlife and the effectiveness of the hazard elimination.

34.1.1.5 Incidents such as wildlife strikes on aircraft and near misses. (Systems will also be in place for such reporting by pilots, airlines and ground staff.). Use of smart devices and technology is recommended to capture data.


34.2 Monthly Reporting

34.2.1 Daily records can be summarized into monthly reports, which aid in the evaluation of trends in wildlife numbers, control actions, and wildlife strikes. Monthly reports should be reviewed by the Aerodrome Wildlife Hazard Management Committee of stakeholders to assess performance of the WHMP. The Committee should be involved in the creation of Performance Indicators for managing wildlife at the aerodrome. Performance indicators can encompass any metric associated with reducing risk to aircraft operations, including reducing the number of wildlife strikes, reducing the total mass of wildlife strikes, reducing the average mass of wildlife strikes, or reducing the number of hazardous wildlife around the aerodrome

34.3 Daily Activity Report



34.4 Daily/Monthly Analysis Report



34.5 Equipment

34.5.1 The wildlife control officer should be equipped with devices appropriate to the wildlife species encountered, the numbers present, and to the area that they need to control. Staff should

have access to appropriate devices for removal of wildlife, such as firearms or traps, or the means of calling on expert support to supply these interventions techniques when required.

34.5.2 Portable equipment, that requires a staff member on the airfield to operate it, is generally regarded as offering the best control, providing that the staff members involved are properly trained and motivated. Devices such as pyrotechnic, pistols, or vehicle mounted distress call generators produce an impression of a direct threat which can be continuously varied in time and location by the operator in a manner not available to static systems. This is to prevent wildlife habituating to a static device as they learn that it is not a serious threat.

34.5.3 Static equipment; In general, static wildlife scaring devices, such as gas cannons or other sound generators, gradually lose their effectiveness over time. Although some of the more sophisticated devices, which generate a variety of sounds in random or pre-programmed order, may delay this habituation. They are generally more suitable for providing short-term wildlife deterrence from limited areas (e.g. ground being reinstated after building works).

34.5.4 Various new methods for either habitat management at aerodromes, detection systems or new dispersal techniques have been developed in the past years. There are many methods of wildlife dispersal available. Aerodrome operators should assess the need before purchasing equipment. Habituation

34.5.5 The classic challenge for wildlife hazard management is that most animals will become accustomed to certain dispersal interventions or find new ways to settle themselves safely in the aerodrome environment. Therefore, it is vital for aerodrome operators to continuously adjust and vary the measures taken. An aerodrome should proactively seek different or new ways to reduce the wildlife hazard.

SECTION 8

35. TRAINING

35.1 The significance of wildlife and habitat management plans/programs must be recognized as a major safety priority of all aerodromes regardless of size, aircraft movements or the lack of a perceived threat.

35.2 Aerodromes should have specific comprehensive wildlife and habitat management training programs. Staff tasked for wildlife and habitat management should be trained and assessed as fully competent to perform their duties. It is important that the role is comprehensively explained to staff and that they fully understand their roles and responsibilities.

35.3 Objectives of the Training programme

35.3.1 It is important for aerodromes to outline the objectives of a tailored wildlife and habitat management plan/programs. It is not sufficient for staff to undertake any role within the aerodrome wildlife team without appropriate wildlife and habitat training.

35.3.2 Training Plan Objectives

35.3.2.1 Ensure training plan meets international, national and local standards as applicable

35.3.2.2 To deliver appropriate wildlife/habitat management training to staff that are tasked with managing and implementing the plan

35.3.2.3 Ensure local aerodrome conditions and effective control measure are included

35.3.2.4 Ensure staff have a full understanding of procedures and practices required to deliver on objectives of the WHMP

35.3.2.5 Provide practical training that ensures competency on wildlife control

35.4 Outline of Training Program

35.4.1 Aerodromes with well managed and researched programs that are delivered by fully qualified and trained staff are better prepared and positioned to deal with wildlife threats at aerodromes. The guide on the next page will help plan training content.

35.4.2 Aerodrome Location: aerodrome location will dictate much of the content of the training programme and the procedures that are best suited to each aerodrome. Aerodromes located at the coast or close to forests will require a different set of control measures than other aerodromes in urban locations. Aerodromes developing WHM programs must take their local wildlife management into consideration.

35.4.3 Standardisation of Training: training should be conducted professionally by appropriately qualified personnel using approved material drawn from appropriate standards and guidance material. Training content and programs should be approved by a wildlife manager with guidance from a subject matter expert to ensure that the programme content is sufficient, and all mandatory safety and operational requirements are met.

35.4.4 Blended Learning Approach: aerodromes should have a targeted WHMP that supports the roles of each person responsible for managing or implementing the programme. Training should be delivered from a theoretical, practical, and procedural aspect and include a Familiarisation programme by a recognised ICAO authorised organisation. Liaison Plan; the wildlife team will require training on the importance and significance of coordination in respect of all wildlife stakeholders.

35.5 Additional Training

35.5.1 Airside Training: all employees operating airside at aerodromes will have received appropriate airside training to ensure that they can perform their airside duties in a safe and efficient manner. Airfield training will include radio telephony procedures and practical assessments.

35.5.2 Environmental Training: awareness of environmental factors is very important for aerodromes and are an ever-increasing influence on aerodrome procedures. Wildlife teams must be fully aware of all environmental issues and how they can contribute to the sustainability policy at aerodromes. The following guidelines should apply at aerodromes:

35.5.2.1 Understanding of environmental sustainability.

35.5.2.1 Environmental evaluation and analysis of wildlife plan.

35.5.2.1 Use of best practice environmental techniques.

35.5.3 Practical/on the Job Training: it is not sufficient to provide theoretical training for this role as much knowledge will be gained from carrying out the task under a proficient and competent person. The programme should be sufficiently enough to ensure effective delivery and should have a sign off process on the proficiency of the person across all the practical, procedural and skills required to manage and implement the plan/programme. It is critical that each aspect of the procedures required for wildlife habitat and management are well practiced and understood by the wildlife team.

35.5.4 Wildlife Management Control Measures: It is critical that the wildlife team receives comprehensive training on the different techniques that can be used in the wildlife management programme. This must include all procedures and practices that are at the disposal of the aerodrome. Each team member must receive full training on all aspects of the programme to include familiarization with all equipment that is available to the team.

35.5.5 Assessment of Training Process: aerodromes must be assured that the wildlife training programme is adequate to deliver trained personnel to deliver on the objectives of the programme; accordingly, each training programme will require an assessment process that will clearly demonstrate the proficiency of the programme.

35.5.6 This process will consist of the following components:

35.5.6 Theoretical assessments that demonstrate team members have the knowledge necessary to deliver the objectives of the wildlife management programme.

35.5.6.1 Familiarization with procedures, practices and techniques of wildlife management

35.5.6.2 Practical assessments that demonstrate team members have the practical knowledge necessary to operate all equipment and techniques.

35.5.6.3 General suitability, whereby team members can demonstrate a level of operational competencies to deliver on the objectives of the wildlife management programme

Note: All training programs should be reviewed prior to delivery to ensure that the programme is up to date and reflective of current best practice of wildlife management techniques.

35.5.7 Runway Incursion Prevention Training: Due to the nature of the role and the requirement to operate close to runways (never inside the runway strip unless with ATC permission) staff must have completed runway incursion prevention training.

35.5.8 Post Incident Training: where a wildlife management person is involved and found to have failed to follow procedures, the option to re- train may exist. It is important that the area of weakness is identified, and remedial action taken. All incidents on the airfield are investigated by aerodrome authorities, sometimes in cooperation with ATC.

35.5.9 Research Plan: it is very important that aerodromes employ the best possible practices available to them when developing wildlife plans. Detailed accurate information based on proven research is an important element in ensuring that best practice principles apply. Where possible, aerodromes should have a dedicated resource that will ensure that advances in the field of wildlife management and habitat management, (whether that be scientific, procedural or proven improved control techniques) are reflected in the aerodrome's wildlife and habitat management plan/programme.

35.5.10 Refresher Training: each aerodrome should have an effective refresher training programme that the wildlife team will complete on a regular basis. The training must include a dedicated wildlife management and habitat module which will reflect on statistical information, procedural reviews, staff feedback and a central piece by a subject matter expert at the aerodrome (internal or external) and by a senior manager responsible for the aerodrome management and habitat plan.

35.5.11 Training Programme for other Aerodrome Users: aerodrome operators will ensure that all operators at the aerodrome are aware of their responsibilities in respect of Wildlife control. Reference should be made to procedures that apply to all operators at the aerodrome. This plan should be included at induction for all staff and also the main points included in refresher plans. Wildlife habitat management and control should feature in any aerodrome wide safety campaign as a matter of course.

35.5.12 Training offered should cover the goals and objectives of the aerodrome wildlife management programme and the role each company and staff member can play their part in this essential programme.

35.5.13 Training awareness programme should be made available to the following groups:

35.5.13.1 Air Traffic Services

35.5.13.2 Airlines (in particular home-based pilots and companies)

35.5.13.3 Ground handlers

35.5.13.4 Food catering companies.

35.5.13.5 Waste removal companies

- 35.5.13.6 Contractor's construction projects
- 35.5.13.7 Other entities as deemed necessity

36. EVALUATION OF THE WHMP

36.1 Aerodromes should have a process to review and evaluate the wildlife habitat and wildlife management plan/programme to provide safety assurance that the plan/programme is fully effective and correctly implemented. The review should be completed on an annual basis but also must include an on-going review process to ensure that the plans/programs are always current and fully functional. A review should consider the general workings of the plans/programs with a view to efficiency and effectiveness. Reference to statistics from previous years (five) should form part of the review. Trend analysis of statistics is a key to ensuring there is an informed view as to the success and effectiveness of wildlife management plans/programs.

36.2 Evaluation Process Overview

36.2.1 Evaluation of the Aerodrome Wildlife & Habitat Management Plan/programme:-

36.2.2 Are roles clearly defined and understood by all?

36.2.3 Do aerodrome personnel understand their roles and responsibilities?

36.2.4 Do programs meet required standards in ALL respects?

36.2.5 Is the programme effectively resources managed? Are procedures efficient and effective?

36.2.6 Are programs current with all regulations and best practices?

36.2.7 Is there an effective review process in place?

36.3 Evaluation Plan

32.8.1 Evaluation Plan Report: this comprehensive annual report should be prepared and compiled by an appropriately qualified person who has full knowledge of the plan/programme and the standards required for effective delivery. The completed report along with all recommendations must be forwarded to the aerodrome wildlife hazard management committee and the senior management responsible for the delivery of the plans/programs.

36.3.2 Evaluation Inputs: The wildlife manager (or appropriate professional) tasked with performing the annual evaluation should undertake de-briefing from staff on general effectiveness and observations on all aspects of the plan/programme. The evaluation seeks non-performance or areas for improvement. Staff are often best positioned to provide valuable feedback on the plans/programs. Feedback should be sought from:

36.3.3 Aerodrome Survey: a wildlife survey is a valuable tool for aerodromes to ensure their wildlife management and habitat plans/programs are effective, meet all regulations and standards required. The survey will be completed formally on an annual basis by a qualified professional. Evaluation of all operational, practical, procedural and technical aspects of wildlife and habitat management will form part of this survey. A comparison with previous year's findings and recommendations to ensure the survey delivers on the purpose of the survey.

36.3.4 Statistical Comparisons Year on Year: it's extremely important that accurate statistics are gathered and interpreted by a competent person to ensure that aerodromes can have effective control measures in a timely fashion. Reference should be made to previous statistical data over the last five years and recommendations and action points raised accordingly. Particular attention should be placed on the quality and accuracy of aerodrome wildlife statistics and how these statistics are interpreted so that trends are measured, and mitigation measures immediately put into place.

36.3.5 Review of Procedures: a full comprehensive review of all control procedures and practices to ensure that effective control measures are in place and are correctly followed and documented. A review of seasonal migration patterns is essential.

36.3.5.1 Equipment Serviceability: a full equipment audit shall be undertaken annually to establish serviceability and effectiveness of all equipment used to support wildlife management.

36.3.5.2 Rotational Procedure: a systematic review of rotational control procedures and the perceived effectiveness of the process. Particular attention to identification of new species and control measures are required to deal with the species.

36.3.5.3 Research Review: Where possible, aerodromes should have a dedicated resource that will ensure that advances in the field of wildlife management and habitat management, whether that be scientific, procedural or proven improved control techniques are reflected in the aerodrome's wildlife and habitat management plan/programme.

36.3.5.4 Intelligence Gathering: the importance of gathering intelligence locally at the aerodrome and surrounding areas can contribute greatly to ensuring that control measures are effective. A plan for sharing information with local aerodromes or aerodromes with similar wildlife and habitat issues is a useful process of mutual benefit where control measures are compared and evaluated.

36.3.5.5 Wildlife Documentation Audit: an evaluation of all reports and records to ensure they meet appropriate standards as they must provide accurate information that can be understood and that will be of value in the evaluation process.

36.3.6 A full check of all wildlife team documentation, paying particular attention to following documentation:

36.3.6.1 Locations of wildlife, identification, patterns of movement, control measures records; what measures were used, what precise method and how effective?

36.3.6.1.1 Nuisance species reports.

36.3.6.1.2 Protected species; endangered species register; Monthly alert reports.

36.3.6.1.3 Rotational control measures records.

36.3.6.1.4 Recording aerodrome wildlife hot spots (on/off aerodrome) and potential strike danger records.

36.3.6.1.5 Analysis of wildlife strikes, removal techniques records.

36.3.6.1.6 Reported strikes on near misses (over last 5 years) records; Investigated strike and near miss reports.

36.3.6.1.7 Analysis of carcass (on site and external analysis) records.

Note: Emphasis should be placed on quality of all records in particular daily logs to ensure the best practice reporting is gathered so that this information can be fed back into the action in a timely fashion

36.4 Wildlife (birds and other animals) occur on aerodrome property for a variety of reasons, mainly food, water and shelter. Once the attraction has been identified, a plan should be developed either to remove it entirely, reduce it in quantity, or to deny access to it. It is not possible to define precisely what types of habitat management will be effective at a particular site because airfields are different and the wildlife species that frequent them will vary. Typical examples include manipulating the species and/ or height of vegetation cover on the aerodrome, removal of trees and bushes fencing off the aerodrome, netting of water bodies, excluding birds from buildings by netting or other means, selection of non-attractive amenity planting around terminals. Regardless of the techniques used, all aerodromes should be able to show that they have assessed the bird attractions on their property and developed and implemented a habitat management plan to reduce these attractions as far as is practicable.

36.5 Modifications to the aerodrome's habitat/environment to eliminate or exclude food, water and shelter can limit the attractiveness of an aerodrome to birds and other wildlife. Habitat management provides the foundation for an aerodrome's wildlife hazard management programme because it offers ecologically based, long-term measures for reducing the number of hazardous wildlife at the aerodrome. If direct action against wildlife is chronically necessary, it is usually because habitat management has not yet been fully implemented or further measures are not cost-effective.

36.6 Before undertaking activities to manage the environment, it is important to first carry out an ecological survey of the aerodrome and surrounding area to identify sources of food, water and shelter attractive to wildlife on and in the vicinity of the aerodrome. This way, the environmental management plan is able to deal with specific conditions or habitats that are attracting wildlife. A standardized reporting system that documents wildlife species, numbers and location on the aerodrome, as well as strike events, can provide the foundation for an ecological survey. From this ecological survey, prioritization of activities or projects within the plan may then occur. There are many wildlife attractants that an environment management plan can control.

36.7 Habitat management is probably the most important method of preventing or reducing wildlife strikes on and around an aerodrome. The airfield habitat should be less attractive to the animals than the surrounding areas. If there are off-aerodrome sites that attract birds these may need dealing with also these can create flight line of flight paths of birds moving from one area to another (e.g. from an overnight roost to a feeding location) then the aerodrome should, in conjunction with local regulators seek to reduce the attractiveness of these off aerodrome sites also

37. WILDLIFE REPELLENT/INTERVENTION TECHNIQUES

37.1 Repellent and harassment techniques should be used to keep hazardous wildlife away from specific areas on or near an aerodrome. The long-term cost-effectiveness of repelling hazardous wildlife does not compare favourably with habitat modification or exclusion techniques. Wildlife will return as long as the attractant is accessible. However, habitat modification and exclusion techniques will never ride an

aerodrome of all hazardous wildlife. Repellent techniques are a key ingredient of any wildlife hazard management plan.

37.2 Repellents work by affecting the animal's senses through chemical, auditory or visual means. Habituation or acclimation of birds and mammals to most mechanical repellent techniques is a major problem. When used repeatedly, without added reinforcement, wildlife soon learn that the repellents or techniques are harmless, and the repellents or techniques are ignored. When using repellents, four critical factors should be remembered:

37.2.1 There is no single solution to all problems.

37.2.2 There is no standard protocol or set of procedures that is best for all situations. Repelling wildlife is an art and a science. Motivated, trained and suitably equipped personnel who understand the wildlife on the aerodrome are critical for the successful use of repellents;

37.2.3 Each wildlife species is unique and will often respond differently to various repellent techniques. Even within a group of closely related species, such as gulls, the various species will often respond differently to various repellent techniques; and

37.2.4 To lessen habituation to repellent techniques:

37.2.4.1 use each technique sparingly and appropriately when the target wildlife is present.

37.2.4.2 use various repellent techniques in an integrated fashion; and

37.2.4.3 Reinforce repellents with occasional lethal control (only when necessary, depredation permits are in place) directed at abundant problem species.

37.3 Advances in electronics, remote sensing and computers have resulted in "intelligent" systems that can automatically dispense repellents (for example, noisemakers, chemical sprays) when targeted wildlife enter selected areas. These devices are used to reduce habituation and increase the effectiveness of other repellent techniques. It should be remembered that automated repellents are not a substitute for trained people on the ground, who can respond appropriately to incursions by various wildlife species and should be considered only when more traditional methods of control and dispersal have proved ineffective.

37.4 Wildlife patrols and runway sweeps in vehicles; Effective control requires the use of a mobile patrol, operated by trained and equipped staff who are able to disperse wildlife immediately as they are detected. This patrol should operate 24hrs or at least during aircraft operational hours. Patrols of airside areas to disperse birds and other hazardous wildlife are a critical part of an integrated programme of wildlife hazard management on aerodromes. Driving a vehicle toward the wildlife may be enough to cause the wildlife to disperse. This is especially true if the driver has been using repellent and removal techniques. Regular and continuous patrols and sweeps help wildlife control personnel to learn the behaviour, daily movement patterns and habitat preferences of wildlife on the aerodrome. This information helps identify hazardous wildlife attractants on the aerodrome (for example, low areas that gather standing water after rains) and hence future problems. All wildlife carcasses found during runway sweeps should be collected, identified as to species and documented in a wildlife strike log of carcass remains

37.5 Wildlife dispersal techniques have been in use at many aerodromes for a long time and it is important to use a variety of these techniques to remain effective. However, in-depth knowledge of the aerodrome and vicinity habitats and the distribution, movement patterns and behaviour of the wildlife present remains the determining factor in the choice of methods. The management of the hazard should involve the regular monitoring of wildlife and analysing their behaviour, rather than being limited to simply harassing wildlife.

37.6 The levels of sophistication of devices available are highly variable and can include:

37.6.1 Chemical repellents

37.6.2 The simple scarecrow, (a static visual device).

37.6.3 Complex radio-controlled sound generators (static acoustic).

37.6.4 Pyrotechnic pistols and vehicle mounted distress call apparatus (mobile acoustic), handheld lasers (mobile visual),

37.6.5 Traps (static lethal); and Shotgun (mobile lethal).

37.6.6 Visual repellents.

37.7 Most visual repellents are simply a variation on an ancient theme, the scarecrow. Predator models can exist in the form of kites, balloons, scarecrows, hawk effigies or silhouettes, flags and Mylar reflecting tapes. Experience throughout the world shows very rapid habituation by birds, and thus have only short-term effectiveness and are not suitable as long-term solutions to an aerodrome's bird problems. Most short-term success achieved with these devices is likely attributable to "new object reaction" rather than to any frightening effect produced by them. The more mobile the model, the longer it will be effective. These methods should only be used for brief periods of time, generally no more than 3-4 hours and if they can be used with other more effective methods their effectiveness can potentially be increased. Scarecrows are also only effective for very short periods of time and then only when there is action or other methods in use. The "Scary Man" scarecrow has been used in some locations, but the effectiveness is very limited both spatially and temporally.

37.8 Chemical repellents for birds; It is important to note that only chemical repellents registered and approved by the national and local authorities should be used. It should be noted at the outset that there are no chemical "solutions" for aerodrome wildlife hazards, and at best some applications may work on some species in some circumstances. Additional measures will always be necessary, and some chemical repellents may not be available or appropriate to local conditions. The following chemical repellents, listed by active ingredient, may be available for use on aerodromes:

37.9 Perches (polybutene's). Several commercial products are available in liquid or paste form. These sticky formulas make birds uncomfortable when they alight on them, encouraging the birds to look elsewhere to perch or roost. To be effective, all perching surfaces in a problem area should be treated, or the birds will move a short distance to an untreated surface. Under normal conditions, the effective life of these materials is six months to one year, but dusty environments can substantially lessen their life expectancy. Once the material loses effectiveness, it is necessary to remove it and apply a fresh coat. Applying the

material over duct tape, rather than directly to the rafter surface upon which it will be used, will simplify clean-up.

37.10 Turf feeding (anthraquinone, methyl anthranilate). These two chemicals are commonly used as bird repellents for turf (grass):

37.10.1 Anthraquinone acts as a conditioned-aversion repellent with birds. Birds eating food treated with anthraquinone become slightly ill and develop a post-ingestion aversion to the treated food source. Birds can see ultraviolet (UV) light and this enables birds to detect anthraquinone visually using UV light. They become conditioned to avoid the treated food source. Because of its conditioned-aversion properties, anthraquinone should not be applied to the entire airfield. It should be applied only in areas where birds graze or in higher risk areas, such as runway approaches.

37.10.2 Methyl anthranilate is an artificial grape flavouring commonly used as a food additive, which is registered in some States as a feeding repellent for birds on turf. Birds have a taste aversion to methyl anthranilate, seemingly reacting to it in much the same way that mammals react to concentrated ammonia (smelling salts). Both anthraquinone and methyl anthranilate are available in liquid formulations intended for foliar application. The effectiveness of these sprays in repelling grazing birds depend on growing conditions, rainfall, mowing and availability of alternate feeding areas. Repellence based on conditioned aversion is longer lasting than repellence based on taste.

37.10.3 Water (methyl anthranilate). Another formulation of methyl anthranilate may be applied to pools of standing water on aerodromes and at other locations to repel birds from drinking and bathing. This application works well on temporary pools of standing water.

37.10.4 General area (fogging with methyl anthranilate). Methyl anthranilate is also available for use in fogging machines (thermal or mechanical) to disperse birds from hangars, lawns and other areas.

37.10.5 Frightening agent (Avitrol [4-Aminopyridine]). Avitrol is used to repel pigeons, house sparrows, blackbirds, grackles, cowbirds, starlings, crows and gulls from feeding, nesting, loafing and roosting sites. Birds eating Avitrol-treated bait react with distress symptoms and calls, behaviour that frightens away other birds in the flock. Although registered as a “frightening agent” Avitrol is toxic to the birds that eat treated bait. Avitrol-treated bait should be applied in small amounts with untreated bait so most birds in the flock do not eat the treated bait. The primary use of Avitrol at aerodromes has been for pigeon control around buildings. The safe use of Avitrol requires:

37.10.5.1 Knowledge of the bird’s feeding patterns.

37.10.5.2 Proper pre-baiting procedures to ensure bait acceptance and avoidance of non-target species.

37.10.5.3 Removal of dead birds after treatment.

Note: Compliance to States and Environmental regulations must be followed while using chemical repellents. Chemicals must be handled by using personal protection gear as it is hazardous to handle.

chemical repellents. All staff must be adequately trained in handling Personal protection gear and chemical usage.

37.11 Cartridge, Cracker, shell and Pyrotechnics; Cartridges and shell crackers are the most common means used throughout the world to scare birds. The visual and auditory effect of cartridges and crackers vary but is a direct and variable method that can be taken to wherever birds are situated. Certain types produce an explosion when they are fired or when they have traversed a certain distance while others only detonate at the end of their trajectory. Some leave smoke trails, or flares and others produce a whistling sound. Pyrotechnics are fired using revolvers, pistols or shotguns.

37.12 The scarring effect of cartridges or crackers fired from firearms is well known. Cartridges and shell crackers should be used carefully. They should not be fired from within a vehicle. They should always be fired between the risk area and the birds so they will be scared away from the area where they pose a risk to the aerodrome operation. Pyrotechnics should not be launched into flocks of birds. This typically causes uncontrolled dispersal in all directions. Typically, pyrotechnics should be directed to one side of the flock opposite to the desired direction the controller wishes the birds to flush. To be really effective, the goal should always be to aim projectiles to detonate below the sight line of birds. For birds on the ground, the detonation should take place at ground level. Once the birds have taken flight, another shot fired between the ground and the birds should scare them away. For birds in flight, cartridges should be fired behind them. If the intent is to change the trajectory of a flock in flight, several cartridges could be fired in their flight line. The direction and speed of the wind should be taken into account to avoid errant shots. Care should be taken not to accidentally fire cartridges and crackers into aircraft movement areas, such as the apron. Where there is dry grass, care should be taken due to the fire hazard

37.13 Non-lethal projectiles to repel birds; paint balls and rubber or plastic projectiles, fired from paint-ball guns and twelve-gauge shotguns respectively, have been used to reinforce other dispersal techniques. A high-quality paint-ball gun should be used to ensure accuracy and velocity. Paint-ball guns are typically fired at 6 to 30 metres from the target wildlife. There are several types of rubber or plastic projectiles (slugs, buckshot, pellets, and beads) for use in a shotgun. The proper distance from the bird for firing varies by projectile and species of bird. Personnel should be trained in the safe use of firearms and the particular projectiles to be used. The objective is to shoot from a great enough distance for the projectile to cause temporary pain, but not injury, to the bird struck. However, the use and effectiveness of projectiles are largely unproven and would not be permitted by some States or aerodrome operators due to health and safety regulations.

37.14 The following are some examples of audio repellents that can be used on birds:

37.14.1 Propane cannons or Gas Cannons. Propane cannons (exploders) produce a shotgun-sounding blast. In general, birds quickly habituate to propane cannons that detonate at random or pre-set intervals throughout the day, and they can scare birds into flight paths creating extra hazard. Thus, to ensure they remain effective, cannons should be used only sparingly and when birds are in specific areas. Reinforcement by occasional shooting of a common bird species with a shotgun may improve the effectiveness of the cannons. Protected birds should be avoided unless the necessary depredation permits are in place. Some systems are designed so that cannons placed around an aerodrome may be detonated remotely, on demand by radio signal, when birds are in the area.

37.14.2 If properly equipped with remote control, the advantage of this method is that staff in the control tower can operate them when necessary. If the wildlife hazard prevention patrol is on the other side of the airfield, this method can allow them to extend their range by activating a device remotely. However, the effectiveness of each device is limited to a set range and when positioned at a fixed location, only birds within this range are exposed. Even then, without a significant negative experience associated with the noise birds very rapidly habituate and the effectiveness rapidly declines.

37.14.3 Distress-call and electronic noise-generating systems. Recorded distress calls are available for birds commonly found on aerodromes in many parts of the world, such as gulls, crows and starlings. Such calls, broadcast from speakers mounted on a vehicle, will often initially draw the birds toward the sound source to investigate the threat. These birds should be dispersed using pyrotechnics or by shooting an occasional bird with a shotgun. Distress calls routinely broadcast from stationary speakers, with no associated reinforcement to provide added fear or stress, have little utility. Birds habituate rapidly to electronic sound generators that produce various synthetic sounds from stationary speakers.

37.14.4 Distress/Alarm Calls; Birds emit distress calls when captured by a predator. The use of distress calls is therefore effective as long as the birds are correctly identified to species and the right distress calls are then used. This involves recording and emitting distress calls through high-quality loudspeakers which emit the full range of call frequencies and are then mounted on the bird hazard prevention vehicle.

37.14.5 Depending on the geographical situation of the aerodrome and the species present, the use of distress calls can be an excellent solution. Their effectiveness is well proven in the case of gulls, for example.

37.14.6 Birds normally react to distress calls in the following manner:

37.14.6.1 They are alerted and take flight.

37.14.6.2 They approach the source of the sound and circle overhead

37.14.6.3 Certain birds dive to assess the source of the threat

37.14.7 When the calls cease, the birds very often leave the area. It can be effective to combine audio methods with visual methods such as the use of cracker shells or models or effigies. When calls are associated with a dead or distressed bird, the reaction of most birds is to leave the area. According to expert opinion, when distress calls alone are used, birds cannot precisely identify the threat or the predator and the safest action for them is to disperse. In view of this, the dispersal of birds through the use of distress calls may take time.

37.14.8 It is important to mount loudspeakers on the wildlife hazard prevention vehicle. They should be mounted facing the front of the vehicle. In this way, the driver always has the birds being dispersed in sight and can monitor their response and take any necessary follow-up measures.

37.14.9 Some guidelines for the use of bird distress calls are as follows:

37.14.9.1 The vehicle should be stationary.

37.14.9.2 The vehicle should be upwind of the flock of birds.

37.14.9.3 The vehicle (and loudspeakers) should face the flock of birds.

37.14.9.4 The ideal distance between the vehicle and the birds is less than 100 meters.

37.14.9.5 The broadcasting of distress calls should last for around 90 seconds

37.14.10 The use of distress and alarm calls are one of the most challenging control methods to use. Not only is their effect somewhat subtle, the proper application of the method is challenging. As a result, few controllers use the method appropriately and effectively and as a result tend to abandon using the method altogether. Repeated training by individuals who have successfully mastered the use of alarm and distress calls and the effective use of models should be used to provide controllers with expertise in the use of this method.

37.14.11 Shell crackers and other pyrotechnics. There are various projectiles, fired from breech-loaded shotguns or from specialized launchers that provide an auditory blast or scream as well as smoke and flashing lights to frighten birds. Some of the newer cartridges have ranges of up to 275 metres. Pyrotechnics, when used skilfully in combination with other harassment techniques and limited lethal reinforcement (shooting with a shotgun), are useful in driving birds off an aerodrome. Pyrotechnic devices require that a person fire the projectile. This targeting of specific birds helps teach them to associate the pyrotechnic with a threat (person).

37.14.12 Ultrasonic devices. Ultrasonic (sound above the range detected by humans) devices are not proven to be an effective bird repellent. Bird species hazardous to aircraft are unable to hear ultrasonic frequencies, and therefore it is considered that these devices are largely ineffective as bird deterrents. Their use against mammals in aerodrome environments is also largely unproven.

37.14.13 Whip: The use of the whip can be a simple and cost-effective way to disperse the birds. Use of the whip must be used by qualified wildlife controllers and must be used in a safe and effective manner.

37.14.14 Lasers; Lasers can be used to scare birds away. Trials have been conducted with fixed devices that use laser beams to scare off birds. Fixed lasers units and handheld lasers can be useful in dusk/dawn or night-time; however, it is recommended that trials are undertaken before purchasing expensive equipment. Some bird's species react only to some colours of laser, so local testing needs to verify what works. Procedures need to be put in place to ensure lasers are used safely and do not create any hazard to users of the airfield or people off-aerodrome.

37.14.15 Hand-held laser projectors projecting a one-inch diameter red beam have been used successfully during trials in Europe to disperse birds from night-time roosting areas in reservoirs and trees. Hand-held laser projectors are effective at long ranges (over 0.4 km) and have also shown some effectiveness in dispersing birds from hangars. Based on trials in France it was decided that automated, continuous-scanning, green-laser projectors could be used, without any safety problem, on civil and military airfields. However, the use of laser equipment is not universally accepted, and to some extent its effectiveness remains unproven. During trials, daylight conditions reduced or eliminated the effectiveness of lasers. The use of lasers in an aerodrome environment requires caution. Annex 14, Volume I, Chapter 5, 5.3.1, recommends setting up a laser-beam free flight zone, a critical flight zone and a sensitive flight zone around aerodromes. Guidance on how to protect flight operations from the hazardous effects of laser emitters is contained in the Manual on Laser Emitters and Flight Safety (Doc 9815).

37.14.16 Trapping/Killing/Culling; Constructive measures should be taken to limit the presence of mammals. If removal is desired or required, experienced hunters or trappers should be called upon to assist in the trapping or removal of wildlife. If they persist despite these measures, it is likely that more permanent measures should be taken such as habitat modification or exclusion methods. The destruction of animals through the killing of individuals and removal of nests or eggs should be carried out in accordance with local legislation. In no case should the destruction of animals be used as the primary and /or sole method of wildlife management on an aerodrome. The use of limited, targeted, lethal control by trained staff may be necessary either to reinforce non-lethal control measures or to remove individual problem wildlife that cannot be controlled through any other method. Where wildlife is shot or captured, operatives should be trained in wildlife identification to ensure that the correct species is targeted and trained in proper removal methods and handling of live and dead animals. Trapping and handling of live animals takes considerable training to be successful and guarantee the safety of both the animals and the trapper and likely requires additional permitting by the government.

37.14.17 Radio-controlled model aircraft to repel birds; radio-controlled (RC) model aircraft, a relatively new technological innovation that provides both visual and auditory stimuli, have been used occasionally to harass birds on aerodromes. If used precisely by competent and trained operators, limited trials have shown that RC aircraft can be used to herd birds away from aerodrome runways, but their effectiveness remains largely unproven. Some RC aircraft, for example, have been designed to mimic the appearance of a falcon and to even fire pyrotechnics remotely.

37.14.18 Using RC aircraft in a busy aerodrome environment requires highly trained operators and a thorough risk assessment, with written procedures, in coordination with other stakeholders such as ATC. Before using RC aircraft, it is important that operators ensure that the radio frequencies used are compatible with other radio uses in the airfield environment, particularly flight crew, airfield operations and air traffic control.

38. REFERENCE & SOURCES

ICAO, Annex 14, Volume I, Aerodrome Design and Operations

ICAO Airport Service Manual (Doc 9137), Part 3- Wildlife Hazard Management

ICAO, Manual on Bird Strike Information System (IBIS) (Doc 9332)

ICAO, Airport Planning Manual (Doc 9184), Part 1, Master Planning

ICAO, Airport Planning Manual (Doc 9184), Part 2, Land Use and Environmental Control

Aerodromes Council International (ACI), Aerodrome Bird Hazard Prevention and Wildlife Management Handbook

Aerodromes Council International website

International Civil Aviation Organization: www.icao.int

Civil Aviation Authority of Fiji, GUIDANCE MATERIAL Wildlife Hazard Management (GM – WHM)

Worldbirdstrike Association Recommended Practices No.1 Standards for Aerodrome

**TERMS OF REFERENCE OF
WILDLIFE HAZARD MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP (WHM/WG)
(Proposal for amendment of TOR)**

Objective:

To assist States to establish a National Wildlife Hazard Management Committee and an ~~Airport~~ **Aerodrome** Wildlife Hazard Management Programme.

Scope of works:

To meet the above objectives the Working Group shall carry out the following tasks:

- 1) Develop a model TOR for National Wildlife Hazard Management Committee;
- 2) Monitor the establishment of a National Wildlife Hazard Management Committee by the States.
- 3) Assist in conducting workshop/seminar on Global and Regional Guidance on WHM;
- 4) Develop Asia Pacific Regional Guidance on ~~Airport~~ **Aerodrome** Wildlife Hazard Management Programme, as needed;
- 5) Share the best practices on the measures adopted by member States/Administrations to prevent wildlife strike hazards at or in the vicinity of aerodromes;
- 6) Develop a performance measurement metrics to evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of the ~~Airport~~ **Aerodrome** Wildlife Hazard Management Programme by the aerodrome operator; and
- 7) Be consistent with ICAO Annex 14, Volume I – Aerodrome Design and Operations, PANS-Aerodromes (Doc 9981), Doc 9137 Airport Services Manual, Part 3 – Wildlife ~~Control and Reduction~~ **Hazard Management**, ICAO Bird Strike Information System (Doc 9332) and other requirements where applicable.
- 8) Analysis of the regional problems/issues in wildlife hazard management fields.
- 9) **To support States with limited resources (human and financial) to enhance their capacity in Wildlife Hazard Management through workshops and technical assistance, as needed**

Composition:

The Working Group would be composed of subject matter experts nominated by APAC States / Administrations and International Organization satisfying the criteria:

- (1) Minimum 3 years of work experience in CAA Aerodrome Regulatory Department or in International Organizations or Aerodrome Operations at international airports in wildlife hazard management field;
- (2) Familiar with Annex 14 and related guidance materials; and
- (3) The nominated expert will continue to be a member for a minimum of three consecutive years.

States in other ICAO regions and industry partners with experience in wildlife hazard management may also be invited to participate in the Working Group.

Conduct of the work and timeframe:

As far as practicable, the work would be carried out through electronic correspondences and web-conferences. Minimum face-to-face meetings would be planned.

Time frame:

The Working Group would complete its work by September ~~2021~~ **2023**.

— — — — —

AP-WHM/WG TASK LIST
[Status Update – 15 21 May 2021]

	ACTION ITEM/PLANNED ACTIVITIES	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	TIME FRAME	STATUS	REMARKS
1/1	Develop a Generic Composition of National Wildlife Hazard Management Committee	AP-WHM/WG/1	AP-WHM/WG/1	Completed	AP-WHM/WG/1-WP/06
1/2	Develop a Generic Terms of Reference of National Wildlife Hazard Management Committee	AP-WHM/WG/1	AP-WHM/WG/1	Completed	AP-WHM/WG/1-WP/06
1/3	Develop survey questionnaire to analyze the State's problem/issues/deficiencies on wildlife hazards management including ICAO USOAP CMA WHM PQs	Sri Lanka, India, WBA	By the end of June 2019	Completed	
1/4	Send survey questionnaire to States/Member Administrations	Secretariat	By the end of July 2019 (giving 4 months of time for the completion of the Survey Questionnaires by States)	Completed	State Letter T 11/5.6 – AP069/19 (AGA) dated 18 July 2019
1/5	Analyze the State's problem/issues on wildlife hazards management based on completed survey questionnaires and present the report to AP-WHM/WG/2	Sri Lanka, India, WBA	AP-WHM/WG/2	Completed	AP-WHM WG/2-WP/11 Continued in Task 2/5
1/6	Present a case study on airport wildlife strike hazard assessment and implementation of mitigation measures	Thailand, India	AP-WHM/WG/2	Completed	AP-WHM WG/2 – WP/05 from Thailand

	ACTION ITEM/PLANNED ACTIVITIES	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	TIME FRAME	STATUS	REMARKS
1/7	Request papers from ACI, CANSO, IFALPA, IFATCA and IATA to present their views on wildlife strike hazards at the Second Meeting of AP-WHM/WG	Secretariat	AP-WHM/WG/2	Completed	AP-WHM WG/2 – WP/03 from ACI and WP/04 from IFALPA
1/8	Develop a Generic Composition of Airport Wildlife Hazard Management Committee and its TOR	Nepal, Bhutan, Lao PDR	By the end of July 2019	Completed	Decision AOP/SG/3-6 Posted in ICAO APAC Website under e-Documents
1/9	Develop a Regional Guidance on Development and Implementation of Airport Wildlife Hazard Management Programme	Australia, Fiji, India, WBA, AAPA	December 2020 (Initial Draft) AP-WHM WG/3 (Final Draft) AP-WHM/WG/4 (Final document)	In progress	AP-WHM WG/2 – WP/07 from Fiji AP-WHM WG/3 – WP/08 (WBA, Australia, Fiji, India and AAPA)
1/10	Encourage States to use IBIS electronic format or ECCAIRS to submit wildlife strike reports to ICAO	Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, Fiji, India, Lao PDR, Maldives, Nepal, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand Secretariat	From 1 st June 2019	Completed	State Letter T 11/5.6 – AP043/20 (AGA) dated 2 March 2020 AP-WHM WG/2-WP/02

	ACTION ITEM/PLANNED ACTIVITIES	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	TIME FRAME	STATUS	REMARKS
1/11	Develop guidance for establishment of national procedure for recording and reporting wildlife strikes to aircraft	Philippines, Sri Lanka, Nepal, WBA, IFALPA USA, Secretariat	Initial Draft by the end of December 2019 Final Draft by AP-WHM/WG/2 Review by December 2020	Completed Completed ~~In Progress~~ Completed	AP-WHM WG/2 – WP/08 from WBA AP-WHM WG/3 – WP/05 (WBA, Nepal, Philippines, Sri Lanka and IFALPA)
1/12	Develop procedures for the collection of information from aircraft operators, aerodrome personnel and other sources on the presence of wildlife on or around the aerodrome constituting a potential hazard to aircraft operations	Philippines, Sri Lanka, Nepal, WBA, IFALPA Secretariat	Initial Draft by the end of December 2019 Final Draft by AP-WHM/WG/2 Review by December 2020	Completed Completed ~~In Progress~~ Completed	AP-WHM WG/2 – WP/10 from WBA Continued in Task 2/6 for remaining work AP-WHM WG/3 – WP/05 (WBA, Nepal, Philippines, Sri Lanka and IFALPA)
1/13	Develop performance measurement indicators/metrics to evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of Airport Wildlife Hazard Management Programme	Bangladesh, India, Thailand, WBA	Initial draft by the end of December 2019 and final draft by AP-WHM/WG/2	Completed	AP-WHM WG/2 – WP/06 from India Continued in Task 2/7

	ACTION ITEM/PLANNED ACTIVITIES	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	TIME FRAME	STATUS	REMARKS
2/1	Monitor the establishment of a National Wildlife Hazard Management Committee by the States [Scope of work – 2 as per ToR]	Secretariat – Issue State Letter based on AOP/SG/3 Conclusion.	July 2020	Ongoing	State Letter Ref.: A 3/3 – AP-104/19 (AGA) dated 17 September 2019 Report of the Survey analysis (AP-WHM WG/3 – WP/04 from WBA) 11 among 23 respondent States established NWHMC.
2/2	Assist in conducting workshop/seminar on Global and Regional Guidance on WHM [Scope of work – 3 as per ToR]	Australia, ACI ICAO/ACI Regional Workshop on WHM – ACI to take the lead	TBC in 2021 AWHMP – 18 May 2021 Reporting and recording data on wildlife strikes and observed wildlife – July 2021 Wildlife safety risk assessment – 14 Sep. 2021	Ongoing Completed Planned Planned	Possible timing: Australian Aviation Wildlife Hazard Group (AAWHG) Forum in September 2021 in Adelaide, Australia ICAO/AAWHG WHM Webinar on 18 May 2021 (WHMP)

	ACTION ITEM/PLANNED ACTIVITIES	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	TIME FRAME	STATUS	REMARKS
2/3	Share the best practices on the measures adopted by member States/Administrations to prevent wildlife strike hazards at or in the vicinity of aerodromes a) Submission of best practices to Secretariat/ICAO APAC Office b) Review and select/consolidate the best practices for posting in ICAO APAC Website c) Publish the best practices in ICAO APAC Website	All States/Administrations Expert Group composed of the Chairman, Australia, Fiji, New Zealand, USA and WBA Secretariat	By December 2020 2021 Before AP-WHM/WG/3 AP-WHM/WG/4 June 2021 July 2022	Ongoing	
2/4	Re-send survey questionnaire to States/Administrations that did not provide responses in Task 1/4	Secretariat COSCAPs and PASO to assist in collection of responses	June 2020 (2 months for States/Administrations to respond)	Completed	Mark questions for responses by CAA and aerodromes State Letter Ref.: T 11 /5.6 – AP122/20 (AGA) dated 4 June 2020

	ACTION ITEM/PLANNED ACTIVITIES	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	TIME FRAME	STATUS	REMARKS
2/5	Based on the survey questionnaire responses: a) Compile the results of the survey questionnaire and the problems / issues faced by States b) Conduct needs analysis and present the recommendations on the prioritized actions to provide assistance to States as required, including future tasks for the WHM WG	WBA Australia, China, Fiji, Indonesia, Malaysia, Nepal [Lead], New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand, WBA	October 2020 AP-WHM/WG/3 AP-WHM/WG/4	Completed	Report of the Survey analysis (AP-WHM WG/3 – WP/04 from WBA)
2/6	Develop a standardised real-time reporting format for aircrew in flight for transmitting the sighting of wildlife presence.	Australia, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Nepal, WBA, IFALPA [WBA to take the lead]	AP-WHM/WG/3 AP-WHM/WG/4 (Draft format)	Partially completed	AP-WHM WG/3 – WP/05 (WBA, Nepal, Philippines, Sri Lanka and IFALPA)
2/7	Review performance measurement indicators/metrics presented in WP/06 (AP-WHM/WG/2)	Australia, USA, ACI, WBA	September 2020	Completed	AP-WHM WG/3 – WP/08 (WBA, Australia, Bangladesh, India, Thailand and ACI)
3/1	Draft a template on State's action plan for establishment and implementation of WHMP	WBA, Australia, IFALPA, ACI, Thailand	December 2021		
3/2	IBIS Webinar/Workshop (Tentative) in conjunction with AP-WHM/WG/4	ICAO WHM Expert Group Members	AP-WHM/WG/4		