



International Civil Aviation Organization Regional Aviation Safety Group - Pan America (RASG-PA)

WORKING PAPER

RASG-PA ESC/28 — WP/10 20/04/17

Twenty - Eighth Regional Aviation Safety Group — Pan America Executive Steering Committee Meeting (RASG-PA ESC/28)

ICAO SAM Regional Office, Lima, Peru, 4 to 5 May 2017

Agenda Item 9: Items/Briefings of Interest to the RASG-PA ESC

GO AROUND DECISION MAKING & EXECUTION PROJECT

(Presented by Flight Safety Foundation)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Flight Safety Foundation engaged The Presage Group to undertake a study of research and analysis relating to the psychology of factors contributing to intentional non-compliance with stable approach policies. The final report released to the industry seeks consideration and feedback of the recommendations from the report, especially from those airlines and aircraft operators considering amendments to their stable approach policies.

Action:	Download a copy of the report from the Flight Safety Foundation website for review of findings and recommendations. Assist in providing feedback to the Foundation as part of a industry validation process.
Strategic Objectives:	Safety
References:	Safety (Runway Safety, Approach and Landing, Runway Excursion Mitigations)

1. Introduction

1.1 Approach and landing is the most common phase of flight for aviation accidents, accounting for approximately 65% of all accidents. A Flight Safety Foundation study of 16 years of runway excursions determined that 83% could have been avoided with a decision to go-around. It was generally believed that an unstable approach is the primary cause of landing excursions, however within this 16-year period just over half of the excursions followed a stable approach. In these instances, the flight became unstable only during the landing phase.

- 1.2 A critical industry policy designed to help prevent such accidents is the go-around policy, however the collective industry performance of complying with go-around policies is poor with approximately 3% of unstable approaches resulting in a go-around.
- 1.3 The go-around itself is not without risk with an increased risk of LOC-I events occurring during this phase compared to other phases of flight. The Go-Around Decision-Making and Execution project was designed to answer the question, "why are we so poor at complying with go-around policies".

2. Discussion

- 2.1 Amongst the findings within the report, it found that: pilot awareness of ALA risk is generally low; management is generally disengaged from go-around non-compliance; pilots do not see the current go-around criteria as realistic; effective go-around decision-making in flight deck communication is low; go-arounds, although considered a normal flight manoeuvre, are rare.
- 2.2. Although not part of the scope of the report, the study also found that touchdown zone awareness amongst pilots is generally poor. This can lead to an increased risk of runway excursions. Safe landing guidelines have been produced as part of this report for industry review and validation.
- 2.3 The report concludes with a total of 20 go-around decision-making recommendations and 21 go-around execution recommendations. These recommendations are made for industry industry consideration and comment.

3. Action by the Meeting

- 3.1 The Meeting is invited to:
 - a) Download and review a copy of the report;
 - b) review the findings and recommendations of the report; and
 - c) after considering the report and its recommendations, provide feedback and comment to the Foundation as a part of an industry validation process.