

WHAT DO YOU DO AFTER SOMETHING GOES WRONG?

Posted on 27.02.2024 by Steve Forward



Category: [General Aviation](#)

Edition GAFB 99

Editorial

Report to CHIRP to share lessons – knowledge is power!

We all know what should happen after dealing with the initial aftermath of an incident or close call, you should report it to your organisation, club, association, the CAA or AAIB as appropriate but all too often that doesn't happen in all cases. The upshot is that important lessons are then not learned, or only learned locally, meaning others continue to get in harm's way. To help address this, the CAA recently published their latest [Safety Sense Leaflet 32 'Occurrence Reporting for General Aviation'](#) (SSL32) which contains a wealth of good information and advice on what occurrences must be reported (including definitions of accident, serious injuries and serious incidents), and how (through the AAIB 24-hr hotline 01252 512299 and the ECCAIRS2 [occurrence reporting portal](#)).

However, submitting reports about incidents can be scary, and there are plenty of rational reasons to be worried about doing it. At *CHIRP*, we know all about those fears. We call them 'the four Rs': fear of **revealing** your identity; **reprisals** from those in authority; **ridicule** for speaking out; and

rejection if your reports are ignored or suppressed. That's why, over 40 years ago, we founded our independent confidential programme and, with thousands of reports since, we've never knowingly compromised a source.

A lot has changed in those 40 years. New technologies, airspace and ways of operating have all evolved but one thing that has not changed is the need to focus on and improve safety. At *CHIRP* we work hard to ensure that pilots, cabin crew, air traffic controllers, ground handlers, drone operators and engineers can all report safety incidents and close calls easily and quickly. That being said, while *CHIRP* is a safeguard for those worried about the risk of speaking out, it's important to stress that reporting to *CHIRP* does not replace the formal channels for those serious or reportable incidents noted in SSL32. However, sometimes people also just want to publicise events that might not reach the threshold for formal reporting or which might not have been their finest hour.

Knowledge is power, and the more reports we receive the more lessons we can share. Also, if we see the same kinds of safety issues being repeated across the sector, we can raise this with regulators and highlight the need for improvements to current procedures and safety regulations. In this respect, *CHIRP* provides a vital safety net as another route to promote change when the normal channels of reporting aren't delivering results, you don't feel able to report through formal Occurrence Reporting systems, or for collecting reports with safety concerns that did not meet the threshold for normal reporting and would otherwise have gone unwritten. We rely on you to report Human Factors aviation-related safety concerns to us so that we can help both in their resolution and highlight relevant issues to others.

Our reporting process is simple and quick using either our [website](#) portal or our App (scan the appropriate QR code shown or search for '*CHIRP* Aviation' – avoiding the birdsong apps that come up!). In our reporting portal you'll be presented with a series of fields to complete, of which you fill in as much as you feel is relevant – not every field is mandatory, but the more information you can give us the better. Although you'll need to enter your email address to get access to the portal so that we can screen out bots etc, none of your details are shared outside *CHIRP*, and we have our own independent secure database and IT systems to ensure confidentiality. That way you can help to improve safety by sharing important lessons without worrying about possible consequences. Anything that could identify a reporter is removed from our reports before progressing or publishing them, and we liaise with the reporter in every step of the process. Each report plays its part in raising awareness of important safety issues and wider trends and provides lessons for all to learn from. Report-by-report we can make aviation safer – as our strapline says, "you report it, we help sort it."



Finally, if you haven't done so already, act quickly to get the rebate for [Electronic Conspicuity \(EC\)](#) equipment before the scheme closes on 31st March 2024. The scheme aims to improve airspace safety by encouraging the adoption of EC devices that enhance situational awareness for pilots. Eligible applicants still have an opportunity to claim a 50% rebate on the purchase cost of an EC device, up to a maximum of £250.

Stay safe!

Steve Forward, Director Aviation

In Memoriam - David Cockburn

It was with great sadness that *CHIRP* learned that David Cockburn, a *CHIRP* General Aviation Advisory Board member for many years, sadly passed away in January 2024. David was a great advocate, champion and mentor for many in the GA community, and an immensely valued member of *CHIRP*. He will be sadly missed and we offer his family our deepest and most sincere condolences.

Comments on previous GAFB Editions

Comment No 1: Regarding GA FEEDBACK Ed 98, I would like to comment on report GA1348 [Change of Circuit Direction to Suit Straight-in Landing Business Jet]. I can't help but feel that you let the bizjet pilot off too easily. Perhaps the reporter should have landed earlier to sort out his less-than-clear radio, but is entirely blameless in this incident. The A/G had no authority to change the runway direction and should have told the bizjet this. The bizjet calling 4 mile final is meaningless as it had not joined the circuit, or even the ATZ. Please make this point more strongly in CHIRP! The 'Straight in' approach is a dubious practice which usually engenders avoiding action by other parties and unless strictly controlled will end up causing a serious accident. The only time it can be justified is when there is an emergency, or no circuit traffic whatsoever.

CHIRP Response: We're always cautious about what we print in our FEEDBACK newsletters because we rarely have all of the facts, just one person's commentary, and so we don't judge, apportion blame or pronounce on the wisdom of others' actions for that reason. We did highlight the problems of straight-in approaches, especially in the opposite direction, but, given that it was an A/G operator, it's quite possible there was no ATZ and so the bizjet pilot was probably entitled to call for the other runway provided they integrated with the existing pattern of traffic. That was

where things fell down, and the bizjet pilot seemed to assume they had priority. But we don't know that for sure, neither do we know that the A/G operator changed the runway direction (the reporter says his radio was unclear at that point and that was just what he thought was said).

Whilst we absolutely don't want to give the impression that bizjets can do what they want and assume that they have priority over others, it may be in your best interests to let them land from their straight-in approach whilst you either orbit or go-around yourself so that they can be out of the way as soon as possible. If the bizjet pilot had gone around and attempted to join the other direction circuit in the situation described in GA1348, then that might have caused more angst than just letting them land from their straight-in approach. Circumstances will dictate what might or might not be suitable at the time, especially if there are students in the circuit who should expect to get a degree of priority, and so bizjet pilots should have a Plan B for what they will do if they are joining a busy circuit where a straight-in approach in the opposite direction might cause problems. Pragmatism and a little give-and-take often eases such situations, having 'fast' bizjets trying to conduct overhead joins and integrate (likely much wider) into a visual circuit at 100+kts may be more troublesome than just accepting them doing a straight-in approach.

Whilst on the topic of A/G operators, although they are not normally allowed to give anything other than information to pilots in the circuit, and noting that the safe conduct of the flight remains the pilot's responsibility, CAA Safety Notice [SN-2024/001](#) has recently been published clarifying that if holders of a Radio Operator's Certificate of Competence (ROCC) become aware of a hazard that poses an immediate danger to flights operating on and in the vicinity of the aerodrome (such as an immediate risk of collision), they should inform affected pilots of the hazard. Ultimately, as highlighted in the [Supplementary Amendment to CAP452](#) 'Aeronautical Radio Station Operator's Guide' Appendix E, Para 1.2:

"ROCC holders are reminded of the requirement to consider 'Duty of care' to aircraft whilst operating on the AGCS/OCS frequency, and the importance of passing Flight Safety messages, and additional safety information for the purpose of alerting aircraft to hazards and avoiding immediate danger."

CHIRP FEEDBACK Survey

We value your opinion about our FEEDBACK newsletters and associated engagement methods, please spend a few minutes responding to [10 short questions about CHIRP Aviation FEEDBACK](#).



CHIRP
Confidential Human Factors Incident Reporting Programme





