



Agenda Item 9: Data Collection/Sharing Programmes Models

PREVENTION OF INCIDENTS AT CDM

(Submitted by IPI CDM COMMITTEE BOGOTA)

SUMMARY Taking as a tool this study note, The Civil Aeronautics Administrative Unit establishes the parameters for the establishment of the incident prevention committees at the national level
References: ▪ CDM Manual, RAC part Eighth ▪ Annex 13 ▪ Doc 9426, Quality Assurance Guide Manual ▪ Doc9422 ▪ Doc9683

1. Introduction

1.1 As it's of common knowledge the increase in air operations has exceeded that projected in the last few years, reason why it was expected that the incidental risks had increased because the airspace in which these operations had evolved was already fully defined even though it was redistributed.

1.2 In view that proportional to the operational increase the risk of incidents would be affected directly, it is needed to establish strategies to reduce to a minimum the hazards generated by these congested spaces.

1.3 Due to the complex and strategic position of our nation's aerospace we must commit to establishing mechanisms to mitigate the various errors in which due to human nature and / or technology we are involved in.

1.4 Due to everything mentioned above that is formalized, the creation of the Incident Prevention Initiatives (IPI) Collaborative Decision Making (CDM) BOGOTA Group where to look for different tactics to the ones already-established that engage all stakeholders in the aeronautics to evolve with an open mind and accept the change that enable release the successful behaviors based on experiences gained over the years in the aeronautics.

2. Analysis

2.1 After a thorough investigation we found the need to implement direct mechanisms with the ones involved where the free expression of the Ideas and disagreements with the system be permitted, with the commitment of addresses them to whom it may concern for the efficient management and proper follow up.

2.2 Without doubt the major challenge for aviation has been and will continue to be to avoid human error and to control its incidence, reason why we determined that the systems should not only contribute to their minimization but becoming aware of our actions we can contribute to the security all the users deserve.

2.3 In like manner it is necessary to standardize the methodology of sensitization so that indifferent to the state and internal regulations, denoting that the target is pointing in the same direction as air safety.

3. Considerations

3.1 In order to carry it out to a successful conclusion as proposed it should be taken into account internally in order to adapt it to the same field in prevention of incidents through what we will later renamed as suggested action.

3.2 Also it should be taken into account the available staff and their continuity for the proper execution of this kind of task that must be considered to be permanent.

3.3 Standardization in the CAR / SAM Regions, becomes necessary so that there is support for the development of these type of tasks.

4. Suggested Action

4.1 To provide a direct link between the different States so that the communication mechanism is periodically through videoconferences, establishing the actions taken by the different stakeholders to undesired events in such a way that will serve as the backbone to make the relevant recommendations before this type of events important for all.

4.2 Establishment of a regional IPI committee unveiling the needs of each State in terms of air safety.

4.3 Creating of digital international bulletins that allow the participation of all States outlining what they consider the most relevant cases.