



Aviation Safety Dashboards

Safety intelligence

Seeing what matters

A Future Sky Safety White Paper

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all those organisations who participated to the Future Sky Safety strand of work on safety dashboards:

AUSTROCONTROL

AVINOR

BELGOCONTROL

ENAIRE

ENAV

FerroNATS

IAA

LPS

MUAC

NATS

Skyguide

DISCLAIMER

The interpretations of the material gathered together from the interviewees and workshop contributions in this White Paper are those of the Project Team, and not necessarily those of the interviewees, their organisations, or affiliated organisations.

Executive Summary

In this digital age, there is no shortage of data and an increasing number of tools and approaches to analyse, visualise and learn from this data, including learning how to be safer. But at the end of the day, someone has to make a decision, to decide how to act upon such data. These decision-makers, usually at the top of organisations, do not wish to be deluged with data and myriad business intelligence graphics. They need the information to be boiled down to its essentials, so they can understand the heart of the issue, and make the right decisions based on clear information. Safety Intelligence does not only refer to information about safety, it implies smart presentation of such data, tailored to the decision-makers. Safety intelligence needs to be user-centred.

The safety intelligence research within the Future Sky Safety project therefore started at the top, examining ‘safety wisdom’, namely how chief executives and other leaders at the helm of their organisations understood and managed safety, so they could get a sound night’s sleep. We then visited a number of Air Navigation Service Providers (ANSPs) who were already engaged in safety intelligence, in particular using safety dashboards to present information to their Executive Boards. A defining moment in the research was when six ANSPs came together and shared their dashboards. Everyone realised they had something to learn from each other.

This led to a prototype safety dashboard, but we wanted to take it one step further, from research into application and industrialisation. Working initially with a number of new ANSPs in order to gain more detailed safety dashboard requirements, we then worked with a single large European ANSP to develop a bespoke safety dashboard for their Executive Board, which was unveiled in early 2019, receiving strong positive feedback from the Board.

Although this marks the end of the research project, it will not be the end of the story – safety dashboards will continue to evolve – their development is a continuing journey. What this White Paper does is show what we have learned along the way, including what to do and what not to do, and how to show the best visualisations that appear to map well onto the executive-level mindset. Although the context of this White Paper is ANSPs and air traffic management, the insights should be relevant and adaptable to other aviation organisations, and perhaps even other industries. It is therefore hoped that the contents in this White Paper will help other organisations navigate through the wealth of safety data and analytic techniques to a safer operational future. This should enable those at the top to keep a finger on the pulse of safety and make course corrections when needed, and to providing a glimpse at what safety issues, threats and opportunities might be just around the corner.

Intended audience

This document is aimed at the following audiences in the aviation sector:



Executive Board

This is a chance to appreciate how a safety dashboard can support your decision making and become aware of the most common issues that can affect your understanding of safety data.



Safety Management Team

This is a chance to see what are the most common pitfalls in safety dashboard, how to design it right for the Executive Board of your organization, and appreciate an example of a prototype dashboard addressing all the main areas of interest for safety.

What we did – an overview

Does your organization have a safety dashboard? Who is it designed for? What kind of information does it provide? What story does it tell? Is it a tool to show compliance or to start a conversation about the adequacy of safety? Is the Executive Board happy with it?

Those are just some of the questions used to investigate the state of the play of safety dashboard in ATM. Starting from the last quarter of 2016 we approached a number of European ANSPs. We visited them, interviewed key people in safety departments, and shared the outcomes of our research in workshops. Our goal was to understand what tools and data those organisations used to support their safety intelligence – with a focus on experienced issues and unmet needs. This helped identify a direction for evolving the dashboards in a way that fosters the safety intelligence of executive boards. It also enabled the building of a number of prototypes to turn the research into something more practical, to be used as the basis for design and development of a next generation of dashboards.

The work went through five steps:

- **March - April 2016** Interviews with safety managers and directors from 6 different ANSPs to collect preliminary data about their safety dashboards and how they use them;
- **October 2016** A workshop where the interviewees were invited to share their experience and make a collective effort for designing an optimized ATM dashboard;
- **November 2016 – December 2017** A phase of visual prototyping, in which we iterated the design on the basis of ANSPs' feedback, which ultimately delivered a first mock-up for a static dashboard;
- **January 2018 – October 2018** A series of three workshops endorsed by EUROCONTROL, in which the work on safety dashboard was presented to an audience of ANSP safety managers and directors not previously involved. In these sessions we collected feedback on the visual prototype and we extended the collection of needs and requirements;
- **January 2019** Collaboration with a major European ANSP to design and develop a digital interactive dashboard. The work adopted a User Centered Design approach, with an early involvement of the end users and frequent validation of intermediate mock-ups. The work culminated in a fully working prototype, fed by real safety data and tested during an Executive Board meeting.

Fifty Shades of Safety



Running a safe business in aviation is a challenge: on the one hand, aviation is an ‘ultra-safe’ industry, with a very low accident rate, supported by a wealth of experience and safety ‘know-how’ that keeps us all safe. On the other hand, accidents, though rare, can and still do happen, and so leaders of aviation organisations have to keep an eye on safety. But how do leaders see through the forest of safety-related data to what really matters? How do we pick out the real signals that need to be acted upon, from all the other ‘noise’? After an accident, with the benefit of hindsight, everything becomes black and white, and the signals stick out a mile. Before an accident, however, everything seems to be in shades of grey. How can leaders stay ahead of emerging safety threats, containing and resolving them before

they manifest into circumstances that allow an accident to happen? Staying ahead of safety threats requires **three conversations.**

The **first** is at the so-called sharp end: the pilots, cabin crew, controllers, ground staff and services – the people who are closest to the accident ‘surface’. They are usually the first to see

Staying ahead of safety threats requires three conversations.

something going wrong, whether new problems arising due to system design or operating changes, safe procedures being compromised due to commercial pressures on productivity, or other

issues. They have their hand on the wheel and are the first to feel the bumps in the road. If they report such issues, and can report their own mistakes without being punished, then this information can be fed up to the next layer. If not, the organization is running blind.

The **second conversation** about safety is with the safety unit or department. Whilst everyone is responsible for safety, the safety people in particular are the ones gathering all the data together and making sense of it. These are the people evaluating the threats from a range of sources, including investigations and reports, but also a raft of safety performance metrics (key performance indicators or KPIs). The safety people have their fingers on the safety pulse of the organization, and take the key issues via their Director to the Executive Board for support and resolution.

In some organisations, key safety decisions are taken outside the Board room. This White Paper challenges this approach.

The **third conversation** is one that is less often talked about. It is the safety conversation in the Executive Board. In some cases, there is very little discussion of safety at this level. Safety is not normally on the agenda, and safety issues are dealt with outside the Board room, e.g. in discussions

between the safety director or safety vice president and the CEO. This White Paper challenges this view for the simple reason that other Board members, including those responsible for Operations, Finance, Human Resources, and Technology/Innovation, should be part of the conversation process, because often the roots of emerging safety threats, and their resolution, touches their domains. The entire Board has a stake in safety. It is often said that in aviation, without safety there is no business.

We are data rich yet information poor.

Therefore, safety needs to be part of the business decision-making at the very top, not something handled separately. A limited conversation about safety at Board level means a limited approach to safety, and putting the business at risk.

Bridging the Three Safety Conversations

A former CEO of a major low cost airline was asked how she stayed on top of safety. She replied that she didn't entirely trust all the statistics, though she of course looked at them. What she did was ask each of her post-holders once a month where the problems were. This was a simple way of going to the heart of what really matters, and is still one of the best ways to keep track of safety issues. Similarly, in a recent study of senior managers in ten European aviation organisations including airlines, airports, air traffic organisations and airframe manufacturers, most favoured an equal split between reviewing safety statistics and talking to other post-holders or those at the front line.

What we did

Data, data everywhere...

In talking to various aviation organisations, a problem emerged. There are so many safety statistics that it is hard to see what matters, to condense them down to the essentials, and to then present a coherent picture to the Executive Board in a meaningful way so they can understand the issues and take effective decisions to improve or restore safety, and overcome developing issues before they impact on operations.

In this era of Big Data, continuous real-time data, and even 'fake' and 'shallow' data, we are data rich yet information poor. However, advances are appearing that can let the data tell a story, aided by powerful Business Intelligence (BI) software. But as we obtain more and more data, and more powerful and diverse ways to analyse them, the challenge remains of how to sift through the data sets and decide what matters – where do we need to act, where do we need to watch closely, and what might be coming around the corner?

No organization felt it had the 'magic mix'.

At the outset of the three-year study which has led to this White Paper, a number of organisations were contacted who had safety dashboards, as well as some others who did not.

The dashboards we reviewed all dealt with safety, but differed in style, in content, and in the intended use by the Board. What everyone admitted, however, was that it was difficult to keep the Board engaged on safety issues with dashboards. No organization we spoke to felt it had achieved the 'magic mix' of format, style and content for an Executive-level Safety Dashboard. This project, funded by the European Commission's Horizon 2020 Future Sky Safety programme, therefore worked in three phases:

Phase 1 – Talking to senior leaders (CEOs etc.) in aviation organisations to find out how they ran their organisations safely¹;

Phase 2 – Working with six Air Navigation Service Providers (ANSPs) who already had mature safety dashboards used at Executive Board level to develop a generic prototype²;

Phase 3 – Working with another seven ANSPs who wanted to develop new safety dashboard approaches, culminating in a new safety dashboard for a major European ANSP, which was successfully implemented at Executive Board level.

Although the detail of the safety dashboard discussions has been in the context of air traffic organisations

(ANSPs), it is believed it will still be of interest to other aviation organisations, and has already been used to develop a safety dashboard that is being implemented across all organisations at a UK London airport. The more general principles and examples of how a safety dashboard can be developed has also been published on the SAFEORG website³.

What was very clear, was how not to do it.

1. https://safeorg.eu/beta/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/1_Safety-Wisdom.pdf

2. https://safeorg.eu/beta/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/3_Safety-Dashboard.pdf

3. <https://safeorg.eu/safety-dashboard/>

Who is the Board, exactly?



Executive Board structures vary, but typically they include the following functions (some of these may be amalgamated into one Board member):

- **CEO or Director General or Chairman of the Board** – the boss – accountable to external agencies, regulatory authorities, business partners and shareholders as applicable, and also, should the unthinkable happen, the general public.
- **Directors / Vice Presidents**
 - Chief Operating Officer (COO)
 - Dir. Operations
 - Dir. Design / Development / Innovation / Engineering
 - Chief Financial Officer (CFO)
 - Dir. Human Resources
 - Dir. Strategy
 - Dir. Business Development
 - Dir. Safety (these days often Safety, Quality & Security)
 - Other

Many organizations have two Boards, an internal (Executive) Board who run the organization, and an external one which is more ‘public’, in which non-executive directors participate. The focus of this White Paper is on Executive Boards, though the information may also be useful for other types of Board.

How to get it wrong

By the end of Phase II, what was clearest was how not to do safety dashboards, as a number of ANSPs already had experience of what did and did not work. There are certain pitfalls with safety dashboards. The ‘Dirty Dozen’ are shown in the inset table.

Some of these were lessons given by several organisations, and counter-measures are available. Others, such as Black Swans and Data Silos are still works in progress in terms of determining how to get it right, and reinforce the fact that a safety dashboard is there to trigger and reinforce a conversation, and not replace it.

The Dirty Dozen Pitfalls with Safety Dashboards

1. Forever green

Some indicators retain a status that is always looking “good”, i.e. in which targets are achieved and thresholds never trespassed. There are two problems with this. The first is simply that the Board will stop looking at it. The second is that it can lead to complacency, or a failure to look deeper behind the numbers to know what is really going on.

2. Knee-jerk reactions

Any performance indicator that becomes red does however need careful analysis, and careful reflection by the Safety people before presenting to the Board. Often the root causes may not be the most obvious ones. In one organization, issues would first appear ‘Orange’ for a short time before turning red, by which time more intelligence had been gathered to better understand the problem and the required resolution action.

3. Targetology

This happens when there is such a strong focus to reduce risk to achieve a particular target, that risk information is distorted to give the appearance of reducing the risk. Often this takes the form of suppressing reporting, manipulating the way in which the safety stats are compiled, or exporting the risk to another KPI. Overall, safety may not improve and may actually worsen, whilst giving the Board or external stakeholders (e.g. regulators) the false impression they are on top of things.

4. Frozen indicators

Indicators that never change are probably insensitive to actual changes, i.e. they are not defined at the right level of granularity. Another variant of indicators that never appear to change, or do so at a glacial rate, is improvement plans intended to improve over a long period. Again, the solution is to change the granularity, perhaps by breaking down such actions into steps. Conversely, an indicator that remains stable despite the increase of traffic should be considered a positive sign of safety, and this can be reflected on the SDB visualisation.

5. No Perspective

The importance of safety events needs to be considered in relation to other factors, in particular the amount of traffic that was handled during the period over which the events occurred.

This is known as normalization of data. Other ‘normalising’ factors might include seasonal effects, such as whether it was the summer period (the busiest for air traffic) or the onset of winter (often key for airports).

6. The New Normal

Whilst normalization of data is necessary, it should not enable normalization of risk, wherein safety standards are allowed to slowly decline, as everyone adapts to ‘the new normal’. This usually happens because of resource cuts in one or more areas, so that people ‘have to make do.’ This is yet another reason why Board members such as CFO and Director of Resources need to be aware of safety decision-making, because they influence resource availability and resource allocation.

7. Quantity is King, Quality is Queen

Some indicators look at process status (e.g. whether a process is in place). However, this says little about the quality of the activity carried out (is the process delivering?) For example an indicator can tell that an assessment is completed on time, or that a certain percentage of planned activities has been completed, but these numbers do not say anything about the value or effectiveness of the safety case or activities. This is a common fault when addressing safety improvements and tackling Top 5 Risks.

8. Black Swans

The confirmation bias is a well-known human trait in which we look for reassurance that whatever we are doing is going well. We don’t look for disconfirming evidence. Statistics often mask individual events or ‘black swans’ that show something is wrong. It is up to the safety people to ensure no such masking occurs, and to highlight specific events which ‘go against the grain.’ Talking to post-holders or asking people at the front line is also a good way to detect black swans.

9. Data silos

It is often difficult to see the relationships between the various pieces of information displayed on dashboards. For example, being able to show the link between indicators or incident hot-spots, the causes in terms of new developments in the organization, and corrective actions in the safety plan. This area is still a work-in-progress, but is another reason for

engaging the entire Board, as the links may touch on several Board Member’s areas of responsibility.

10. The ‘Other Top 5’

Every organization has its top 5 risks, such as midair collision, runway incursion or excursion etc. These are the big headline events, and have to be monitored, but are very rare. Usually there is another top 5, linked to ‘smaller’ (i.e. less consequential) risks such as falls from an aircraft at an airport, or occupational injuries in maintenance and engineering, and other internal risks such as fatigue, loss of morale, chronic pressure of work, etc. Such internal risks are ‘messy’ and not easily described in neat KPI format, but they may well be the risks that really do need to be controlled. Otherwise they prepare the ground for the larger risks to happen.

11. Mirror, mirror, on the wall

In certain cultures, including organizational cultures, there is pressure to only pass good news upwards. The safety people may feel it is their job to look after safety, either because they want to be seen to be doing their job, or to protect the Board, or because they firmly believe the Board has no time for safety. Such reasons are understandable, but they are not optimal for safety. It is up to the Board, and the CEO in particular, to cultivate a more open relationship where bad news is not only tolerated but welcomed. This can even be done for self-interest at Board level, since if an accident occurs, the media and investigators will focus on the top tier of the organization.

12. Safety Myopia

Many safety dashboards are like rear-view mirrors in cars. They show what is behind. This is important, because they contain key learning points. But safe driving also requires looking ahead, beyond the ‘now’ issues to those coming up. There is a tendency for safety to be reactive, to wait until there is evidence of a problem. Safety needs to also look forward, to upcoming projects that will ultimately improve matters, but which might create safety ‘pinch points’ along the way. Safety therefore needs to highlight, in advance, where the business strategy might put the overall business temporarily at risk. This is what we mean by saying safety must be part of the business. It is not just words, it is meant in a very practical sense.

How to get it right

At a basic level, the safety dashboard is supporting the discussion of three fundamental questions:

- 1. Are we safe?**
- 2. Is there anything we should worry about?**
- 3. Is there any action we should take?**

These questions can be answered by looking at different types of data. The conversation with the ANSPs during Phase III helped to identify the main areas in which safety data can be grouped. It was understood that there will never be a one-size-fits-all version, but an over-arching structure was agreed, including the following areas:

I. Operational safety and risk

- What are the hard statistics telling us?
- What are the top causes?
- Where are the key safety vulnerabilities?

II. People & culture

- How is the reporting culture?
- Is there positive energy for safety in the organisation?

III. Technical system

- How is the reliability of equipment?
- Do technical issues force people to do workarounds?

IV. Change management

- Are all changes safe when combined?
- Are corrective actions done on time?

The ANSPs involved in both Phase 2 and 3 do not use all the above areas in their current dashboards; however, those were identified as the ideal elements featuring in a well-balanced safety dashboard. Moreover, no rigid indication of specific KPIs emerged as the best one possible; rather we collected lists of “good candidates” for populating each area, which includes both reactive and proactive indicators.

The specific indicators to be used would then vary depending on the specific ANSP characteristics (e.g. size, safety department “history”, available manpower for data analysis and others) and on the type of conversation on safety established with the Executive Board. A number of ANSPs reported how their dashboards changed over time, by means of a gradual tuning between Board requests and expectations, and

Safety department concerns and proposals. Changing and adapting the content of the dashboard is a natural outcome of a proactive safety mindset and it is an important defence against pitfalls like “Frozen indicators” and “Targetology”. A good dashboard is an ongoing conversation on safety rather than a fixed set of indicators.

Last, the importance of a User-Centred Design (UCD) approach stood out. A safety dashboard is generally a tool designed and owned by the Safety department but used mainly by the Board. This requires a careful understanding of the Board’s needs. For example, Board members are unlikely to need data drilling and navigation functionalities, which could risk to become pure clutter.

The iterative approach - the other component of a UCD – would then be addressed by the continuous fine-tuning of the dashboard.

Four take-away messages for designing the right dashboard:

- 1. Think in terms of areas of interest rather than specific indicators. Ideally, all the four main areas should be covered;**
- 2. Keep a balance between reactive and proactive indicators;**
- 3. Do not be afraid of proposing changes to the dashboard content visualizations should the conversation with the Board be “stuck”;**
- 4. Embrace a User Centered Design approach and explore the needs of the end users.**

A digital dashboard, not a data deluge

While the source of data is obviously digital, we observed how most ANSP involved in the project were using “static” dashboards, i.e. collages of spreadsheet graphs on slides. The trend definitely indicates a will to move towards full digital solutions, which ideally should be integrated within the normal software ecosystem, meaning that they should require no effort from the user to enable the tool (e.g. installation of additional software).

While this change will surely open a range of new opportunities for designing dashboards that are more and more exploiting the data living inside the organisation, the risk is to be overwhelmed by the sheer availability of indicators and visualization that can be created with just a mouse-click. Such a risk can be avoided by not forgetting to put end users first, especially when it comes to Board members, who need to use the information to make decision rather than deep diving into data exploration and sense-making.

Making it real: content and safety indicators

1. Operational Safety

The first area, used by all safety dashboards reviewed, is performance against targets on key risk categories.

2. People and Culture

The second area is about understanding the reporting culture, and the attitude of people towards safety.

This usually shows the following:

- A graph of monthly incidents for the top 3 or 5 risk event categories (e.g. severe loss of separation between aircraft), normalized for traffic, but where it is possible to also see the absolute number of events each month at different severity levels. Often ‘thresholds’ are shown on such graphs.
- The top contributory factors ‘driving’ those events – this is where risk reduction effort can be targeted.
- A geographic representation so the Board can see which units are most affected, and where the ‘hotspots’ are.
- Top highlights focusing on events and changes of strategic impact (e.g. temporary closure of a major airport, large modification to routes due to a conflict in a neighboring country etc.).

Usual indicators include:

- Trend of reporting rate for safety occurrences – distinguished according to their risk – across comparable timeframe (e.g. set of 12 months).
- Trends of reports on fatigue and overload situations.
- Rate of participation to training initiatives which are in connection with safety, like Human Factors courses, CISM training and the like.
- Progress on safety culture initiatives, i.e. if there is enough “energy” spent in them or if they are dragging.

A normalized measure of the reporting rate is by far the most popular indicator. This is an area of safety dashboard design where more research or innovation is needed, to properly capture and visualize effectively the state of the safety culture in the organization.

3. Technical system

The third area is about understanding the health status of the equipment.

4. Change management

The fourth area is about monitoring how change is potentially affecting the safety level of the organization.

Usual indicators include:

- Normalized trend, distribution and severity of ATM- specific occurrences.
- Number of technical issues identified in the context of safety surveys by Unit.
- Number of workarounds put in place by personnel to overcome technical issues.
- Ratio between planned/unplanned maintenance interventions.
- Trends and thresholds referred to cumulated duration of technical failures with operational impact over time.

Some typical indicators include the following:


- Trend of corrective actions, their number and their timeliness.
- Status of ongoing change projects, to identify combined risk and pinch points.
- Top change recommendations - in terms of importance - coming from external bodies (e.g. NSA, EASA) and their implementation status (e.g. on time, delayed with indication of the deadline, etc...).
- Safe Change Management – an overview of the most notable forthcoming changes and their potential impact on safety.

The Critical ‘Safety Real-Estate’ on a Safety Dashboard: an example

The work done in Phase 3 culminated in designing and developing a prototype of a new digital and interactive safety dashboard for a major European ANSP. This prototype was successfully presented at the Executive Board.


This ultimately led to developing a last visualization of the dashboard which proposes a selection of safety data and visualization, laid out according to the four main areas of interest. The full dashboard is presented on pages 22 and 23 and is intended to be a single-page static representation of a digital tool. Therefore, not all the possible data display options are represented, but indications of points of interaction are given. The single areas of the dashboard are presented hereafter together with explanatory information.

Operational Risk Overview




This map displays the top risks as perceived and expressed by first line operators (e.g. air traffic controllers or ATCOs) in each Unit. The perspective is very sharp-end-oriented. The top three risks are shown in a dedicated space below the map. Risk severity is represented by using color coding (decreasing from red to orange to yellow). The map can be seen as the output of a Unit Safety Survey. In the digital version, it is possible to ‘zoom in’ to particular areas, for example where there may be several airports in close proximity.

Operational Risk Trend



The graph represents the trend over a moving window of the last 12 months of A and B (the two top risk levels according to ECTL RAT) safety occurrences normalized by 100k flight hours. The trend line is a weighting of A and B events (with A considered as “2 times B”), and it is compared against a threshold set by the same ANSP. The tab allows visualization of the trend and occurrences on the base of either “Global” or “Ground” risk classification, i.e. whether the combined ground and airborne contribution to risk is considered, or only the ATM part. This graph answers the need of immediately getting an understanding of the safety performance during the last period of time. This is the main “rear-view mirror” in terms of safety performance, as it is a very much traditional lagging indicator.

Top contributing factors




This section, displayed immediately below the Occurrences trend graph, provides a list of the top risk factors, categorized in three areas: “Human”, “Technical”, and “Other”. The adopted criterion is to show the most frequent contributing factors identified during the investigation of safety occurrences. A further sorting of the risk factors according to the type of occurrence (e.g. Separation Minima Infringement, Runway Incursion, and Airspace Infringement etc.) can also be provided.

Safety barriers performance



This section compares two moving windows of 12 months by showing the distribution of safety occurrences according to the number of barriers infringed. It uses the ‘Swiss Cheese’ metaphor, showing the safety performance of the principal barriers against an accident. Different stages/barriers schemes can be elaborated, but the goal is the same: show what proportion of barriers was infringed and if any notable changes has occurred between the two periods. This section of the safety dashboard was developed following the finalization of the dynamic dashboard for the ANSP, so it has not been ‘validated’ by the Board. However, received feedback identified that as a useful segment of the dashboard, giving a clear picture to the Board of how close to an accident they may come, and where to invest in safety ‘upstream’.

Reporting health



This section shows the trend of ATCO reports normalized by 100k flight hours, over a rolling window of 12 months. Two rolling periods are shown (e.g. 2018 vs 2017 vs 2016), updated depending on the quarter. The reports are differentiated by risk level (A and B vs C: an increase of C reports should be taken as a sign of good reporting culture considering the smaller safety-relevance of these events).

Human Factors “Most wanted”




Human Factors most wanted

- 1** **Blind spot:**
Slight but constant increase since Q2 2018 of occurrences in APP-TGH in which blind spot played a role.
[\[Read more...\]](#)
- 2** **Coordination issues:**
Misunderstanding and cumbersome procedures in the LoA between APP-HKL and neighboring Unit of other ANSP led to SMI increase.
[\[Read more...\]](#)
- 3** **Fatigue:**
Reports increased since Q1 2019 after procedure change in ACC-STATE, despite traffic level far from peak.
[\[Read more...\]](#)

This section shows the most important Human Factors issues as identified by the organisation. Their importance is related to the contribution the issues have in safety occurrences but also in perceived risks. Examples include topics such as events due to the so-called ‘blind spot’ phenomenon (wherein an aircraft is over-looked, leading to a loss of separation with another aircraft), coordination issues due to misunderstanding, and fatigue. Such issues are commonly raised by the safety manager, the incident investigators, the Human Factors people if the organization has them, or by controllers and supervisors themselves.

Safety Headlines



Safety headlines

20/06/2019
Plans for new airport across the East border presented
Expected increase of East-West flows and need to revise approach procedures to anticipate descents.
[\[Read more...\]](#)

14/05/2019
Agreement with NSA on information sharing requirements for safety reports.
[\[Read more...\]](#)

29/04/2019
Recent massive re-organisation of ATC system vendor impacting on provision of software updates.
[\[Read more...\]](#)

This section lists the most important “news” related to safety. Examples include items such as plans for building a new airport in a neighbouring country; a major agreement with the NSA on safety matters; or changes occurring in external organisations such as a key supplier that may have an impact on safety. The goal is to provide an overview of the most notable things “around” safety that should be known, particularly in case the CEO or other directors are involved in discussions with regulators, external stakeholders and other partners.

Safe Change Management

Safe change management

PROJECT NAME	Timeframe: July w27-w30
JHB airpot closure in July (w27-30)	Impact on Ops: Traffic moved to HKL. Temporary approach procedures in force. Closer coordination with MIL needed for more dynamic TSA management.
New missed approach procedure for HKL airport	
New handover procedure for ACC-STATE with West feeder	
CPDLC integration - Phase II	
FPL server upgrade	
Integrated CWP label	Risks: Misapplication of temporary procedures and capacity overload. Connection with MIL.
Pinch points: July-August due to simultaneous projects and peak traffic.	

This section provides an outlook on the next two quarters, by listing the major projects and changes that can have an impact on safety. More information about the timeframe, impact on operations and associated risk can be displayed. The goal is to provide a chance for warning the Board about potential ‘pinch points’ and dysfunctional interactions between activities.

Safety action lines

Safety action lines

ACTIONS	DEADLINE	STATUS
(EASA) Just Culture improvement stream following results last survey	21/12/2019	●
(NSA) Automated safety monitoring implementation plan - Phase I	31/01/2020	●
(NSA) Safety survey data sharing	27/03/2020	●
(SAF) Safety Nets performance monitoring study roll-out	15/11/2019	●
(SAF) Safety Audit in APP TGH	07/06/2020	●
(SAF) Local KPIs and thresholds review for 2020 - Phase III	15/07/2020	●


On time
 Delayed
 On hold/blocked
 Achieving safety impact

This section lists i) the most important strands of activities in the Safety Plan together, and ii) the top recommendations and corrective actions provided by external organizations (e.g. NSA, EASA) that must be put in place by the ANSP, both of them with their respective deadlines and current status (on time, delayed, not yet started, etc.). The goal is to provide an overview of how well the various agreed actions are progressing, and if there are any obstacles hindering their implementation, and to avoid surprises for the Board in terms of compliance with requests coming from the regulator.

**Executive Board
Dashboard Prototype**
at a glance

Early signals

Outcome of Q1 safety survey. Risk as average evaluation by Unit and Safety Dept.



TOP 3 OPERATIONAL RISKS

- TWR-HKL**
Risk still with high frequency in Q4 due to exceptionally good weather.
- APP-HKL**
Due to rising traffic on HKL, severity likely to escalate for next year.
- TWR-JHB**
Occurred RIN were quite severe due to runway and taxiways geometry.

Operational risk trend and Top contributing factors

A+B (Ground) occurrences / Trend and threshold weighted and normalised by 100k flight hours.



Human Factors

- 43% Late instruction to conflicting aircraft
- 21% Fatigue
- 17% Call signs similarity

Equipment


- 32% Split tracks due to SSR tuning
- 19% Safety Nets missed alerts
- 9% Flight Data Processing glitches

Other

- 36% Clarity of procedures
- 16% Complexity of ops procedures
- 11% Use of out-of-date charts (VFR pilots)

Safety barriers performance

Q3 2018 - Q2 2019 SMI distribution of working (or not-needed) vs. not-working barriers.



Reporting health

Number of reports/100k flight hours



Human Factors most wanted

- Blind spot:**
Slight but constant increase since Q2 2018 of occurrences in APP-TGH in which blind spot played a role. [\[Read more...\]](#)
- Coordination issues:**
Misunderstanding and cumbersome procedures in the LoA between APP-HKL and neighboring Unit of other ANSP led to SMI increase. [\[Read more...\]](#)
- Fatigue:**
Reports increased since Q1 2019 after procedure change in ACC-STATE, despite traffic level far from peak. [\[Read more...\]](#)

Safety headlines

- 20/06/2019
Plans for new airport across the East border presented. Expected increase of East-West flows and need to revise approach procedures to anticipate descents. [\[Read more...\]](#)
- 14/05/2019
Agreement with NSA on information sharing requirements for safety reports. [\[Read more...\]](#)
- 29/04/2019
Recent massive re-organisation of ATC system vendor impacting on provision of software updates. [\[Read more...\]](#)

Safe change management

PROJECT NAME
JHB airpot closure in July (w27-30)

Timeframe:
July w27-w30

New missed approach procedure for HKL airport

Impact on Ops:
Traffic moved to HKL. Temporary approach procedures in force. Closer coordination with MIL needed for more dynamic TSA management.

Risks:
Misapplication of temporary procedures and capacity overload. Connection with MIL.

Pinch points: July-August due to simultaneous projects and peak traffic.

Safety action lines

ACTIONS	DEADLINE	STATUS
(EASA) Just Culture improvement stream following results last survey	21/12/2019	On time
(NSA) Automated safety monitoring implementation plan - Phase I	31/01/2020	On time
(NSA) Safety survey data sharing	27/03/2020	Delayed
(SAF) Safety Nets performance monitoring study roll-out	15/11/2019	On hold/blocked
(SAF) Safety Audit in APP TGH	07/06/2020	On time
(SAF) Local KPIs and thresholds review for 2020 - Phase III	15/07/2020	Achieving safety impact

On time | Delayed | On hold/blocked | Achieving safety impact

A way forward for safety dashboards: the Stack concept


Although the delivery of a full-working digital prototype to a major European ANSP marked the end of the research activity on safety dashboards in the context of Future Sky Safety, it will not be the end of the story, as safety dashboards are getting more and more traction not only in the ATM community but in the entire aviation domain, and they will continue to evolve as the demand for their implementation is soaring.

While working on the dashboard prototypes, we collected many requests from the users. While most of them are of a technical nature, including for example more advanced predictive metrics and database-dashboard software integration, one was about creating a shared dashboard for a community of organisations, something that would be useful in those contexts in which safe operations critically hinge on smooth collaboration between many different actors.

An example of such a context is the airport; in here the safety actors include airlines, air traffic control, ground handlers, de-icers, fuel services, baggage handlers, caterers and cleaning services. All of them are so tightly connected that if one of them has a safety problem, then they all do.

To some it made sense to start working together on safety, and the work on the so-called Safety Stack began in late 2016 at London Luton Airport (LLA). The Stack members meet regularly, share information, keep mutually up to date on safety matters and collaborate to streamline operations, for example by harmonising all ground-handling procedures.

The Stack identified a shared safety dashboard as a powerful tool for rapid sharing of information and mutual awareness on top risks and forthcoming changes which can affect operations. The Dashboard for LLA is currently under implementation, but an example layout is shown below. One aim of the Safety Stack is to have a version of the dashboard that can be viewed on smart-phones and tablets (e.g. showing one dashboard segment at a time). Such usage is more intended for staff and managers than senior executives, as a way of keeping staff up to date on daily safety issues.




Top 3 most serious events 3 most recent events

LLA	AIRLINES	ATM
01/01/18 0900		
Contamination – aircraft fuel		
During fuelling of an Abacus Air A320 Neo GABCD on stand 8, fuel vented from the starboard wing. Spillage size		
[Read more...]		
03/02/18 1835		
Hold Point Bust		
Departing Abacus Air A320 GABCC crossed the stop bar at Delta 1. There was a risk of collision with outbound		
[Read more...]		
27/09/17 0030		
Ground collision		
An aircraft pushing off stand 8 rolled forward and ran over the aircraft towbar that had just been used to push the aircraft back. Taxiway was blocked abeam of stand 10 for just under 2 hours.		
[Read more...]		

Safety Performance Q1 2018



Joint Risk Improvement Actions



Ongoing projects Next 6 months

PROJECT NAME	Timeframe	Impact on Ops	Risk
Construction of Mass Passenger Transit system	Nov 2017-Jul 2018	Renaming of Taxiway Bravo to Hotel, introduction of new taxiway Bravo; old Taxiway Bravo unavailable during period 0030 to 0500 between 01/04/18 and 16/04/18	Live works on airfield; Potential confusion for aircraft and staff on the airfield
Construction of new taxiway			
Stand 60 dedicated gate			
Redesign and lowering of inbound belts			
Arrivals hall redevelopment			
East apron remark to bring stands into their final position			
Final completion of Pier B			
Phase 2 equipment pooling			

Pinch points May and June likely to be most challenging months due to the number of simultaneous projects

Luton Stack action lines

ACTIONS	%	STATUS
Harmonisation of Ground Handling process through the adoption of the IGOM	80	●
Standardised emails for safety communication	90	●
Shared safety dashboard	25	●
Just Culture	15	●
LTN "A day in the life"	80	●
LTN Safety Stack "how safety works at LTN"	0	●
Recognition and appreciation	30	●
Don't panic	5	●
Safety Leaders Training Programme	30	●

● Progressing, on time | ● Progressing, delayed | ● On hold / blocked | ● Not started

LTN Safety Stack Agenda Next 6 months



Concluding Comments

The safety dashboard is intended to improve the collective safety intelligence of the organisation, particularly at the top. As such, the dashboard must clarify rather than confuse, and focus on the key safety issues, threats and opportunities the organisation is facing, so that those at the top can safely navigate through them.

The principles, ideas and detailed visualisations in this paper are intended to point the way, rather than constitute an off-the-shelf 'here is your dashboard' solution, because each organisation's requirements will differ, and every Executive Board will also differ in their safety understanding and their approach to safety. Developing and implementing a safety dashboard is therefore an ongoing journey, and there will be many safety conversations along the way, which is a good thing.

Nevertheless, it is hoped that the dashboard images, and the experiences behind them, can help organisations develop effective safety dashboards that are seen as useful by the Board, and are used by them for safety.

As a final comment, it should be noted that a safety dashboard is only one component of safety intelligence. The Board should still seek to consult with staff and post-holders to obtain a richer picture of the true status of safety, seeing behind and beyond the statistics and graphs. This will give a deeper understanding of the context around the dashboard, and lead to better and safer decisions in aviation organisations. As noted earlier, in safety intelligence, quantity is king, but quality is queen, and both are needed to stay on top of safety.

Glossary

Acronym	Definition
ANSP	Air Navigation Service Provider
ATCO	Air Traffic Controller
ATM	Air Traffic Management
ATS	Air Traffic Service
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CISM	Critical Incident Stress Management
CFO	Chief Financial Officer
COO	Chief Operating Officer
EASA	European Aviation Safety Agency
ECTL	EUROCONTROL European Organization for the Safety of Air Navigation
EU	European Union
FIR	Flight Information Region
FSS	Future Sky Safety
LLA	London Luton Airport
NSA	National Supervisor Authority
RAT	Risk Analysis Tool
SDB	Safety Dashboard
SES	Single European Sky
SESAR	Single European Sky ATM Research
SRIA	Strategic Research & Innovation Agenda
TCAS	Traffic Alert and Collision Avoidance System
UCD	User-Centered Design
WP	Work Package

For further reading

ICAO Safety Intelligence web site

www.icao.int/safety/SafetyManagement/Pages/Safety-Intelligence.aspx

SAFEORG – Tools for organisational safety (Safety dashboard section)

<https://safeorg.eu/safety-dashboard/>

CONTACTS

Barry Kirwan:

barry.kirwan@eurocontrol.int

EUROCONTROL



Future Sky Safety has received funding from the EU's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme, under Grant Agreement No. 640597 but this document does not necessarily reflect the views of the European Commission.