

CHAPTER 3 – PROVISION OF FS OVERSIGHT, FEEDBACK AND ADVICE

INTRODUCTION

1. It is a fundamental responsibility of personnel at all levels to make their concerns known to their leadership with respect to FS issues. The success of the FS culture can be measured in the willingness and active participation of personnel to voluntarily report FS concerns and hazards.

PROVISION OF AIRWORTHINESS PROGRAM OVERSIGHT AND ADVICE

GENERAL

2. One of the primary responsibilities of the AIA is to monitor airworthiness activities and functions to ensure they comply with established regulations, standards and orders and to identify any deficiencies in the DND/CAF Airworthiness Program. The AIA is responsible to report this information to the AA.
3. One of the means that the AIA employs to accomplish part of this task is the process of monitoring and annual review of the information that is compiled in support of the Airworthiness Review Board (ARB) and the Airworthiness Advisory Board (AAB). Both of these review actions require that DFS/AIA and the support staff review various aspects of DND/CAF air operations in order to provide input to the boards. Additionally, the AIA and his staff provide input to the Annual Airworthiness Report.

ANNUAL AIRWORTHINESS BOARDS

4. An integral part of the oversight requirement is accomplished through the AAB chaired by the AA and the ARB chaired jointly by the OAA and the TAA. The AAB provides a forum at which the AA receives updates on the Airworthiness Program and addresses issues of concern raised by the members. The discussions that take place in the AAB form the basis for the Annual Airworthiness Report from the AA to the CDS and MND concerning the Airworthiness Program. The ARB manages the interface between operational and technical airworthiness of each aircraft type and to confirm the airworthiness status of each fleet on the DND register (and civilian aircraft performing military missions for the DND/CAF). The AIA is a member of both the AAB and the ARB and prepares inputs from the AIA perspective on the Airworthiness Program for both boards.

ARB ANNUAL AIRWORTHINESS REPORT

5. The TAA, the OAA and the AIA prepare Annual Airworthiness Reports (AAR) in support of the ARB process. The AAR outlines airworthiness activities that have occurred during the year as well as airworthiness concerns and their associated mitigation measures on each aircraft fleet in DND/CAF. During the ARB, each fleet will be reviewed by exception (i.e., only significant, contentious, or unresolved airworthiness issues will be discussed), while ensuring that an adequate level of consideration is conducted before a decision is made regarding the renewal of the Certificate of Military Aircraft Type Certification (CMATC) or Airworthiness Clearance.

6. The objective of the AARs prepared by the AIA is to provide a summary of the significant FS issues that have to be considered for the renewal of the CMATC or Airworthiness Clearance. AARs (Technical) prepared by the WSMs/AEOs and AARs (Operational) prepared by 1 Cdn Air Div A3 staff normally address the FS issues raised in the AIA AARs. They are forwarded to the AIA for review prior to ARB.

AAB ANNUAL AIRWORTHINESS REPORT

7. The AAB meets at least once per year to advise the AA on the state of the Airworthiness Program and to brief the future plans, accomplishments and milestones achieved in the previous year. In support of this activity, all of the Airworthiness Authorities (OAA, TAA and AIA), the AA support staff and the airworthiness advisors (i.e. the Aerospace Medical Authority and the Flight Test Authority) present annual reports and brief the AAB on updates for outstanding airworthiness issues.

8. The general concept for the AAB is that each airworthiness authority will produce an AAR. The chosen structure for the AAR follows the items of delegation stipulated in the Letter of Delegation to the AA. Under the leadership of the AA, the Airworthiness Coordination Cell will collect these reports and, combined with the discussions at the AAB, will produce an executive summary and cover letter for submission to the MND.

OTHER AIA PROGRAM MONITORING ROLES

9. Of note, the production of ARB/AAB reports does not limit the AIA in the means chosen to monitor the DND/CAF Airworthiness program; it merely documents this particular monitoring action. Several other activities that the DFS/AIA and support staff undertake play important roles in the Airworthiness Program and will continue to grow in importance as the support and operational relationships for DND/CAF grow within the private sector. These include but are not limited to:

- a. monitoring the risk management process;
- b. issuance of airworthiness investigative clearances (see AIM, Chapter 17);
- c. FS assurance visits (FSAV) of contractors (see Chapter 4);
- d. monitoring of Technical Assistance Visit reports by TAA staff;
- e. monitoring of DND/CAF contracts and aviation projects;
- f. AIA visits to private sector contractors; and
- g. investigation of matters of safety brought to the AIA's attention.

PROVISION OF ADVICE BY WING/FORMATION/UNIT FSO

GENERAL

10. As stated in Chapter 2, the FSO has a specific duty to provide specialist feedback and advice to the Comd/CO/Accountable Executive on all matters concerning FS. This feedback/advice can be provided in many forms including formal FS Council / FS Committee meetings, formal / informal briefings, briefing notes, and/or informal discussions. This Chapter provides

additional guidance to FS personnel regarding the provision of specialist FS feedback and advice.

INTENT

11. In order to act on FS issues, the chain of command must be made aware of the concerns of their FS professionals. The intent of FS feedback is to provide an assessment to the applicable Comd/CO/Accountable Executive, in as objective a manner as possible, of the degree of safety regarding flight-related activities with the aim of making this information useful and relevant to the Comd/CO/Accountable Executive. Ideally, feedback should highlight the areas upon which the Comd/CO/Accountable Executive must focus to improve the safety of flying operations, and include specialist advice on measures that can be taken to improve safety.

METHODOLOGY

12. Reporting to a Comd/CO/Accountable Executive may be done verbally or in writing. The latter is preferred in that it is more formal and provides the Comd/CO/Accountable Executive with documented examples that can be acted upon. This also allows the Comd/CO/Accountable Executive to acknowledge the report and indicate his/her intentions, if any, to address problematic issues.

13. It is the duty of the FSO to question, to warn and to suggest alternatives. As champions of FS, the FSO cannot shrink away from making subjective assessments, but we must recognize the need to more clearly quantify our assessments wherever possible. A careful balance must be achieved between the requirement to inform the chain of command and unnecessarily overstating the level of concern. By continually stating that there will be dire consequences if a particular measure is not taken, there is a risk that leadership will become inured to these warnings.

14. Similarly, operations must be periodically reviewed to ensure that more risk has not gradually been assumed over time due to the absence of occurrences. Judicious use of warnings and regular assessment of risk levels are required to prevent the gradual increase of risk.

15. The FSO will, at times, be in the position of advising non-Air Force COs. In these instances, it must be remembered that the Comd/CO/Accountable Executive may not be aware of the requirements of this manual or of their responsibilities under the *Aeronautics Act*. A tactful explanation of these requirements will be necessary in such situations. By raising the Comd/CO/Accountable Executive awareness of the basic principles of FS, these situations should be overcome. However, as these are valid, legal, regulatory requirements, the FSO must ensure that the Comd/CO/Accountable Executive is made aware of their responsibilities and, if required, must enlist the assistance of other FS personnel to ensure that these requirements are not violated.

FS PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

GENERAL

16. FS performance indicators should be developed and used to quantify to the chain of command the degree of safety of the unit/formation aviation activities and to highlight the level of risk at which operations are being conducted. FS indicators in a unit/formation should include, at a minimum, an assessment of the following areas:

- a. FSP documentation;
- b. FSP implementation;
- c. FS culture within the unit/formation;
- d. resources dedicated to the FSP; and
- e. ability to complete the various FS tasks in a timely manner.

17. The following paragraphs provide additional guidance for assessing the performance of selected elements of the FSP.

FS INDICATORS - DEDICATED RESOURCES

18. In order to run an effective flight safety program, appropriate personnel, technical, administrative and physical resources must be provided to carry out the full range of prevention and investigation activities. Some key indicators to consider include:

- a. the existence of a succession plan to ensure continuity in unit FS positions;
- b. whether the incumbents have the proper qualifications, the appropriate background, the opportunity to build and effectively use FS experience, and any additional secondary duties are assigned in accordance with this order;
- c. adequate infrastructure and equipment (ex. offices, equipment storage, classrooms (if applicable), IT/IM hardware and software, crash kits);
- d. basic transportation (when required) and communication equipment (including IT resources);
- e. business plan incorporating FS priorities and objectives with a suitable budget to deliver or the commitment of the Comd/CO/Accountable Executive to support these initiatives; and
- f. budget allocation matching the business plan intent.

FS INDICATORS - ABILITY TO COMPLETE FS TASKS/DUTIES

19. Other indicators that could assess whether the established FS positions are adequate to meet the mission and tempo of the organization are the extent to which FS tasks are being completed in a timely manner, with an assessment of:

- a. the status of occurrence investigations and reports;
- b. regularity of Safety Council meetings and the publishing of meeting minutes;

- c. degree of completion of safety measures recommended from FS investigations, surveys and follow-up actions from FS meetings;
- d. frequency and conduct of informal flight safety surveys and tours of facilities;
- e. frequency of review of unit and fleet FS occurrences;
- f. currency and relevance of promotional material posted on FS bulletin boards and made available to personnel via different media; and
- g. frequency of submission of nominations of suitable candidates for FS awards and suitable public and private recognition of deserving individuals.

FS INDICATORS - STRESS POINTS

20. Another indicator of the relative safety of a flying operation is the presence or absence of stress points. The presence of stress points that, in the opinion of the FSO, have significant impact on the safety of the unit's flying operation, must be quantified as accurately as possible and reported when observed. Care must be taken to ensure that the stress points reported actually do affect FS.

FS PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT / FEEDBACK MATRIX

21. Performance measurement of the flight safety program may be reported through a balanced scorecard system or a matrix using a "traffic light" system (i.e. RED, YELLOW, GREEN) to indicate performance on the FS indicators assessed. As a minimum, a brief factual justification for items rated unsatisfactory or RED must be included in order to fully explain the situation leading to the RED assessment. Such a matrix shows at a glance where the FS staff believes there are concerns and where attention should be focused. The matrix should include objective criteria where possible, but given the nature of some of the issues within the matrix (culture, stress points), a subjective assessment is also required. Wherever possible, subjective assessments should be backed up with facts (statistics, trend analysis, statements from personnel) in order to lend more credence to the assessment. However, it is acknowledged that sometimes the best professional judgement of the FS staff and their "gut feel" will be all that is available. A suggested example of the FS Feedback matrix format is provided in Annex A.

FS COUNCIL

PURPOSE

22. The FS Council is a primary formal FS feedback tool to enable Chain of Command oversight of current and emerging FS trends, developing concerns, "issues identified", to provide accountability to the PM implementation processes and to ensure the FSP remains relevant, visible and adaptable to changes.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FS COUNCIL

23. A FS Council shall be established either independently, or as part of an existing safety council. FS Council requirements will be met as follows:

- a. Comd RCAF – this function is satisfied by the Airworthiness Advisory Board (AAB);
- b. 1 CAD/CANR Headquarters – this function is satisfied by attendance at the Comd's senior staff meetings; and
- c. flying units, detachments, or long-term deployments associated with flying operations, both domestic and abroad - regular, formal FS Council meetings are to be carried out.

GENERAL MEMBERSHIP

24. The FS Council will be chaired by an individual who has executive authority (Comd/CO/Accountable Executive) since it is expected to inaugurate and delegate concrete PMs and to ensure tasks are completed in a timely manner. A FS Council shall include a qualified representative from each major agency involved in the control, conduct or support of air operations. It should normally include:

- a. the Comd, CO or manager of the formation responsible for flying operations, who shall be the Council chairperson;
- b. representatives of FS (WFSO, UFSO), operations, technical, support and medical services; and
- c. other representatives as required whenever the agenda for a meeting includes items relating to their specialties.

WING FS COUNCIL COMPOSITION

25. The Wing FS Council includes the following, or their equivalent:

- a. the WComd, who acts as the chairperson;
- b. the CO of each unit involved in flying operations, including lodger units;
- c. the Wing Logistics Officer (WLogO) or his equivalent;
- d. the CO AMS;
- e. the Wing Surgeon or Flight Surgeon;
- f. the Wing Air Traffic Control Officer (WATCO);
- g. the FOD Committee chairperson;
- h. the WFSO;
- i. the D/WFSO;
- j. staff specialists (i.e. Air Weapons Officer and/or Air Weapons Safety Technical Member) whenever an agenda item requires their presence; and
- k. additional members as deemed appropriate by the WComd (i.e. contracted support agencies, contracted maintenance groups, air traffic control services, co-located airport authority, airport managers, etc...especially in such cases as a particular military capability has been contracted out to civil organizations).

26. The WComd will designate who will act as the secretary.

FREQUENCY OF MEETING

27. The unit/formation FSP must be periodically reviewed and reassessed to ensure it remains relevant and visible. Ideally, the FS Council should meet several times a year, but shall form not less than twice per year.

CONDUCT OF MEETING

28. The council should focus on the three pillars of the FS Program: promotion, education and analysis. The Council should examine and consider:

- a. action items from previous minutes;
- b. FSAV observations and recommendations;
- c. recommendations and PMs from FS and AWS occurrences;
- d. necessary corrective action;
- e. topical items related to present and upcoming operations;
- f. emerging trends, open hazard reports (HAZREPs), and local concerns;
- g. points derived from comparative statistical analysis (i.e. what happened last year over the same period);
- h. items for the next FS Council meeting;
- i. reports of subcommittees;
- j. awareness programs or remedial training on relevant safety issues; and
- k. clarifying and amending existing policies, orders, and/or procedures - or the establishment of new policies, orders and/or procedures - to permanently capture best practices and ways forward decided upon or directed during Council meetings; or associated follow on discussions and deliberations.

ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

29. The FS Council should also:

- a. monitor implementation of PMs within their authority; and
- b. recommend to higher authority measures beyond local capability and monitor the progress of such recommendations.

RECORDING AND DISTRIBUTION OF MINUTES

30. Minutes of FS Council meetings shall be officially recorded. The WFSO is responsible for tracking the progress of action items. In addition, the Council should use the minutes of their meetings to direct necessary changes to the FSP and to track action items.

31. Distribution of the minutes shall include one copy each for Comd RCAF/ DFS 3, 1 CAD or 2 CAD FSO (as applicable), and the WFSO (if the minutes are from a unit). These copies

should be sent simultaneously to the above addressees, so that there is minimum delay. The comments of each level may still be sent through normal channels. Distribution of the minutes to common users should also be considered. Minutes shall be transmitted electronically to accelerate delivery. Minutes shall be posted on FS boards.

FLIGHT SAFETY COMMITTEE

PURPOSE

32. In order to effectively advise the chain of command, information regarding FS, armament and explosive safety, foreign object debris/damage (FOD), FS trends, stress points, awareness, promotion, etc., should be shared among Unit and WG FS personnel. It is the intent of the unit/formation FS Committee meeting that the information gathered from it be used to brief the chain of command at the previously described FS Council meeting. The following information is to be considered as guidance only, as the composition, frequency and conduct of these meetings will depend on the size of the unit/formation in question, and the impact of their operations on Flight Safety.

COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

33. The FS Committee should be chaired by the senior FS qualified member of the unit/formation (WFSO, UFSO). The meeting should include a FS qualified representative from each unit/section of the WG/Base, including any contractor FS Rep or affiliate FS officer trained and acting as a UFSO equivalent. The FS Committee should also normally include representatives from:

- a. FOD program;
- b. Bird strike prevention program;
- c. armament and explosive safety; and
- d. other representatives as required, as they relate to FS (i.e. Canadian Army UAS operations, base support units, ship's Flight Deck supervisors, etc...).

FREQUENCY OF MEETING

34. The FS Committee should meet with equal frequency as, and just prior to, the FS Council meeting. Ideally, the timing of the FS Committee meeting should be such that it allows adequate time to prepare the information gathered from it, including the minutes, to be presented at the FS Council.

CONDUCT OF MEETING

35. The Committee should examine and consider the following items, from all the applicable representatives:

- a. action items from previous minutes;
- b. FS statistics;
- c. FS trends;

- d. significant incidents since the last committee, including cause factors and recommended preventive measures;
- e. unit/section stress points (previously approved by unit/section commanders);
- f. awards and other promotional items;
- g. educational information from the committee chair;
- h. awareness training on relevant safety issues; and
- i. items for the next FS committee meeting.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Annex A
 Chapter 3
 A-GA-135-001/AA-001

ANNEX A – EXAMPLE FS FEEDBACK MATRIX

FACTOR ¹	DESCRIPTION	REMARKS
MANNING	FS POSITIONS FULLY MANNED AND TRAINED?	
PROGRAM	AIR WEAPONS SAFETY PROGRAM FULLY DOCUMENTED IN FS PROGRAM?	
FS RESOURCES	FS STAFF AND OFFICES FULLY RESOURCED INCLUDING FUNDING FOR PD COURSES / SEMINARS?	
CULTURE	CLEAR EVIDENCE OF A FAIR AND FLEXIBLE REPORTING AND LEARNING CULTURE IN THE UNIT?	
TASKS	PREVENTIVE MEASURES TRACKED UNTIL COMPLETION?	
STRESS POINTS ²	STRESS POINTS PRESENT?	
OVERALL ASSESSMENT	OVERALL ASSESSMENT ON HOW SAFE THE UNIT IS OPERATING	

¹ Assessments factors may be added as required by the FSO, but they must include an explanation as to their intent.

² Any individual or overall factors assessed as RED must be accompanied by a suitable explanation and supporting documentation.

³ Colour code

 Satisfactory

 Cautious, should be resolved to return to a satisfactory state

 Unsatisfactory, should be risk mitigated and resolved as soon as possible

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK