



ICAO

Doc 9137

Airport Services Manual

Part 3 — Wildlife Hazard Management
Fifth Edition, 2020



Approved by and published under the authority of the Secretary General

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION



| ICAO

Doc 9137

Airport Services Manual

Part 3 — Wildlife Hazard Management
Fifth Edition, 2020

Approved by and published under the authority of the Secretary General

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

Published in separate English, Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian
and Spanish editions by the
INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION
999 Robert-Bourassa Boulevard, Montréal, Quebec, Canada H3C 5H7

For ordering information and for a complete listing of sales agents
and booksellers, please go to the ICAO website at www.icao.int

Fifth edition 2020

Doc 9137, *Airport Services Manual, Part 3 — Wildlife Hazard Management*

Order Number: 9137P3

ISBN 978-92-9258-972-1

© ICAO 2020

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a
retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, without prior
permission in writing from the International Civil Aviation Organization.

FOREWORD

Previous editions of this manual focused on the control of birds on, and in the vicinity of, aerodromes. With the recognition that other forms of wildlife may also present a hazard to the operation of aircraft, the provisions on bird hazard reduction in the fifth edition of Annex 14 — *Aerodromes*, Volume I — *Aerodrome Design and Operations* were expanded to include a broader focus on wildlife strike hazard reduction. The eighth edition of Annex 14, Volume I requires that action be taken to decrease the risk to aircraft operations by adopting measures to minimize the likelihood of collisions between wildlife and aircraft. Thus, the guidance provided in the fourth edition of this manual was expanded to include both bird and other wildlife control for the purpose of reducing the hazard of bird/wildlife strikes to aircraft.

Amendment 3 to the *Procedures for Air Navigation Services — Aerodromes* (PANS-Aerodromes, Doc 9981) will include provisions and procedures to mitigate the risk posed by wildlife to aviation safety, through the proactive management and control of wildlife at aerodromes and their vicinities. PANS-Aerodromes, Part II, Chapter 6 contains provisions on the establishment of a Wildlife Hazard Management Programme (WHMP) at aerodromes, including guidance on habitat and land use management, reporting and recording wildlife incidents, expelling and deterring wildlife, and personnel training. This fifth edition of the *Airport Services Manual*, Part 3 — *Wildlife Hazard Management* (Doc 9137) (formerly titled Wildlife Control and Reduction) contains revised guidance, consistent with the aforementioned Part II, Chapter 6 and highlights the importance of developing a WHMP specific to each aerodrome.

This document was written on the assumption that birds and other wildlife are a serious hazard to aircraft, and outlines what can and should be done to address this hazard. It is not the purpose of this document to discuss the relative importance of various hazards but to stress the importance of good organization and planning in the creation of a successful WHMP.

The primary purpose of this manual is to provide aerodrome personnel with the information necessary to develop and implement an effective wildlife control group for their aerodrome. The management structure may differ at each aerodrome, however all structure types should be in accordance with the threat. The seriousness of a wildlife hazard problem is affected by geographic location, attractiveness of the aerodrome habitat to wildlife and air traffic density.

This manual suggests organizational structures that may effectively manage wildlife hazard control. A brief history in Chapter 1 describes the evolution of the wildlife hazard and provides examples of significant wildlife strikes. This manual explains why wildlife hazards occur at an aerodrome, the roles and responsibilities of all the stakeholders involved in wildlife hazard control, and the modifications to be carried out at an aerodrome to remove the features which attract wildlife. The content of this fifth edition was reviewed by the wildlife hazard management subject matter experts from the ICAO Wildlife Hazard Management Expert Group (WHMEG), supported by Airports Council International (ACI).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Glossary	(ix)
Chapter 1. Introduction	1-1
1.1 What is a wildlife hazard?.....	1-1
1.2 Historical background.....	1-1
1.3 Fundamentals of wildlife hazard management.....	1-2
Chapter 2. Stakeholders	2-1
2.1 Introduction.....	2-1
2.2 Aerodrome operators.....	2-1
2.3 Stakeholders within the aerodrome.....	2-4
2.4 Identifying external stakeholders in the community.....	2-5
2.5 Civil aviation authorities (CAAs).....	2-8
2.6 Methods of communication.....	2-9
2.7 Establishment of a national committee or forum.....	2-11
Chapter 3. Aerodrome wildlife safety risk assessment	3-1
3.1 Introduction to safety risk management.....	3-1
3.2 Estimating the probability of a strike.....	3-2
3.3 Estimating the severity of a strike.....	3-3
3.4 Estimating the safety risk of wildlife species.....	3-6
Chapter 4. Habitat management	4-1
4.1 General.....	4-1
4.2 Attractants.....	4-1
4.3 On-aerodrome management.....	4-4
4.4 Off-aerodrome management.....	4-7
Chapter 5. Management of hazardous wildlife	5-1
5.1 The importance of understanding animal behaviour.....	5-1
5.2 Patrols and observations.....	5-2
5.3 Repellents.....	5-3
Chapter 6. Advancements in technology	6-1
6.1 General.....	6-1
6.2 Satellites for land use monitoring.....	6-1
6.3 Geographical information system (GIS).....	6-1
6.4 Detection systems.....	6-1

6.5	Remotely piloted aircraft systems (RPAS) and drones.....	6-2
6.6	Pulse lights on aircraft and aerodrome use of flashing light patterns	6-3
6.7	Database.....	6-3
Chapter 7.	Training.....	7-1
7.1	Training requirements.....	7-1
7.2	Content of a training plan	7-1
Chapter 8.	Operational notifications.....	8-1
8.1	General.....	8-1
8.2	Automatic terminal information service (ATIS)	8-2
8.3	Notice to airmen (NOTAM).....	8-2
8.4	Pilot report.....	8-3
8.5	Aeronautical information publication (AIP).....	8-3
Chapter 9.	Wildlife hazard management programme.....	9-1
9.1	Aerodrome wildlife hazard management programme (WHMP)	9-1
9.2	Wildlife hazard management programme evaluation	9-6
9.3	CAA evaluation of wildlife hazard management programme effectiveness	9-8
9.4	CAA evaluation of their safety oversight system for wildlife hazard.....	9-8

GLOSSARY

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AIP	Aeronautical information publication
ANSP	Air navigation services provider
ATC	Air traffic control
ATIS	Automatic terminal information service
CAA	Civil Aviation Authority
FOD	Foreign object debris
GIS	Geographical Information System
IBIS	ICAO Bird Strike Information System
LRAD	Long range acoustic device
MRO	Maintenance, repair and overhaul
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NOTAM	Notice to airmen
RADAR	Radio detection and ranging
RPAS	Remotely Piloted Aircraft System
SMS	Safety management system
WHMP	Wildlife Hazard Management Programme

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 WHAT IS A WILDLIFE HAZARD?

1.1.1 A wildlife hazard is the presence of wildlife (i.e. birds and other animals, both wild and domestic) that could result in damage to aircraft.

1.1.2 The risk of a wildlife hazard depends on the size, behaviour and number of wildlife and their proximity to aircraft during different phases of flight. Wildlife hazards on the aerodrome or while passing through critical airspace are likely to increase the probability of negative effects.

1.1.3 Wildlife risks fluctuate with the daily and seasonal cycles of wildlife activity. The species and number of wildlife at and around aerodromes may vary over the years due to land use and environmental changes (e.g. agricultural practices, urbanization, conservation and climate change). Aerodromes have site-specific characteristics regarding their habitat, climate and surroundings that should be reflected in their respective Wildlife Hazard Management Programmes (WHMP). Increased air traffic and the development of quieter aircraft engines may increase the likelihood of a wildlife strike. Wildlife hazard management methods and techniques should therefore be reviewed annually and updated regularly to ensure that effective control methods are implemented.

1.2 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

1.2.1 Many wildlife incidents and accidents have occurred since the dawn of aviation. While piloting his airplane on 7 September 1905, Orville Wright had what is believed to be the first collision between an aircraft and a bird, an event now known as a bird strike. Less than seven years later, on 3 April 1912, in Long Beach, California, Calbraith Perry Rodgers, the first man to make a transcontinental flight across the United States, became the first person to die as the result of a bird strike. His Wright Flyer flew into a flock of gulls that jammed the aircraft's controls, causing it to plunge out of control into the ocean.

1.2.2 The frail structures of early aircraft made them susceptible to wildlife strike damage. However, their slow speed gave pilots and wildlife more time to take evasive action. The development of aircraft over the past 100 years has progressed to produce aircraft that are more resistant to wildlife strikes. Nevertheless, significant strikes continue to occur regularly worldwide.

1.2.3 The deadliest bird strike to date occurred on 4 October 1960 at the Boston Logan International Airport, when a Lockheed Electra L188 struck a flock of European starlings (*Sturnus vulgaris*) just as it became airborne. The birds were ingested into three of the aircraft's four engines, causing the aircraft to lose power, stall and crash into the harbour. Sixty-two people died out of the seventy-two passengers and crew members on board.

1.2.4 Wildlife strikes have also impacted changes to aircraft design. On 23 November 1962, a Vickers Viscount struck a flock of whistling swans (*Cygnus columbianus*) over the State of Maryland in the United States while flying at 6 000 ft. One of the horizontal stabilizers was penetrated by a swan, weakening the structure and causing it to separate from the aircraft which subsequently crashed and killed all crew members and passengers on board. This crash resulted in the design criteria for horizontal stabilizers being raised to withstand eight pounds (3.6 kg).

1.2.5 Perhaps the most famous bird strike in recent years took place on 15 January 2009, when an Airbus A320 hit a flock of Canada geese (*Branta canadensis*) just after taking off from LaGuardia Airport, New York City. The ingestion of multiple geese into both engines resulted in a forced emergency landing on the Hudson River. All 150 passengers and five crew members survived.

1.2.6 A more recent wildlife strike resulting in fatality was on 28 September 2012, when a Dornier Do-228 with sixteen passengers and three crew members was on initial climb out of Kathmandu Airport. The crew reported a bird strike, resulting in a fatal crash that killed all on board. The bird was identified as a black kite (*Milvus migrans*).

1.2.7 Although the majority of wildlife strikes involve birds, those involving other animals may also have a severe outcome. For example, on 4 December 2015, a Spicejet landing at Jabalpur Airport collided with a herd of wild boars that were crossing the runway. The aircraft went off the runway and the left main and nose gear of the aircraft collapsed. No passenger or crew member was injured.

1.3 FUNDAMENTALS OF WILDLIFE HAZARD MANAGEMENT

1.3.1 The objective of wildlife hazard management at aerodromes is to reduce the risk of a wildlife strike by implementing appropriate mitigation measures.

1.3.2 A strike is a collision between wildlife and an aircraft; a “near miss” is the potential of a wildlife strike.

1.3.3 To manage wildlife hazards, one must first assess the level of risk for each species present. Recording wildlife presence (at a species level) on, and in the vicinity of, the aerodrome, wildlife strikes and near misses is therefore necessary.

1.3.4 The following events should be recorded and used for assessing and mitigating the risk of wildlife hazards:

- a) any reported collision between wildlife and an aircraft for which evidence in the form of a carcass, feathers, any other remains, or damage to the aircraft is found;
- b) any reported collision between wildlife and an aircraft for which no physical evidence is found, but an indication of a collision exists (e.g. visual observation of the collision or acoustic perception of the impact);
- c) any wildlife found dead on an aerodrome without any other obvious cause of death; and
- d) incidents or observations where the presence of wildlife on or in the vicinity of the aerodrome could have an effect on a flight (e.g. missed approach, aborted take-off, etc.).

1.3.5 Measures to manage wildlife hazards at aerodromes may include, but are not limited to: manipulating habitats (see Chapter 4, Habitat management), harassment and repellent techniques and removal of wildlife (see Chapter 5, Management of hazardous wildlife). Emerging technology such as bird detection RADAR or remotely piloted aircraft systems (RPAS), may also enhance the detection, monitoring and control of hazardous wildlife (see Chapter 6, Advancements in technology).

1.3.6 In addition to managing the land use on aerodrome property, off-site land use in its vicinity must also be assessed and mitigated, as it can affect wildlife presence or activity. Land use suggestions can be offered to owners around aerodrome property to aid in wildlife management (see Chapter 4, 4.4).

1.3.7 The strategy for assessing wildlife at aerodromes and the control measures for reducing wildlife risk should be outlined in the aerodrome’s WHMP.

1.3.8 This manual applies to both existing and new aerodromes, including expansion projects. More information can be found in the *Airport Planning Manual*, Part 1 — *Master Planning* and Part 2 — *Land Use and Environmental Management* (Doc 9184)

1.3.9 State authorities should analyse and approve the location of new aerodromes, to ensure that issues with high potential for wildlife attraction are considered and mitigated where necessary.

Chapter 2

STAKEHOLDERS

2.1 INTRODUCTION

2.1.1 A variety of stakeholders should contribute to wildlife hazard management at the aerodrome. These include, but are not limited to, the aerodrome operator, airside personnel, air navigation services providers (ANSPs), pilots, airlines, environmental authorities, local and regional authorities, civil aviation authorities (CAAs), security forces, police, local community groups, the air force and wildlife experts and scientific and academic communities.

2.1.2 The aerodrome operator is the primary stakeholder and the common link among all other stakeholders at the aerodrome. The safety management system (SMS) of the aerodrome should be coordinated with those of other stakeholders, where applicable, to be successful in wildlife risk management. Aerodrome operators should also have an open line of communication between various stakeholders, for example with the formation of a local aerodrome wildlife committee (see 2.6).

2.2 AERODROME OPERATORS

2.2.1 General

2.2.1.1 The primary responsibility of the aerodrome operator is to maintain aerodrome safety and ensure that action is taken to reduce the risk of wildlife strikes.

2.2.1.2 To achieve this goal, each aerodrome operator should develop, implement and demonstrate an effective WHMP (see Chapter 9, Wildlife Hazard Management Programme). The programme should represent the size and level of complexity of the aerodrome, taking into consideration hazardous species, the level of risk associated with them and the volume of flight operations (see Chapter 3, Aerodrome wildlife safety risk assessment). The aerodrome operator should ensure that all wildlife hazard control personnel and managers demonstrate competency, are adequately trained and are provided with the appropriate resources and equipment to carry out their tasks (See Chapter 7, Training).

2.2.1.3 The aerodrome operator should provide pilots and aircraft operators with recurrent wildlife behaviour and habits that may impact aircraft safety (see Chapter 8, Operational notifications).

2.2.1.4 The aerodrome operator should ensure that, where applicable, agreements with tenants of leased land contain specific wildlife hazard management control information. The aerodrome operator may choose to include enforcement language within their leases or concession agreements.

2.2.2 Aerodrome wildlife coordinator or manager

The aerodrome operator should appoint a wildlife coordinator or manager who is responsible and accountable for wildlife hazard management and personnel engaged in wildlife hazard control.

2.2.3 Aerodrome wildlife control personnel

A wildlife controller performs the front line role and may be any suitably trained and qualified member of aerodrome staff. This role will involve key duties such as, but not limited to:

- a) maintaining surveillance of wildlife activity on, and in the vicinity of, an aerodrome;
- b) implementing active wildlife control measures and interventions in accordance with the WHMP to counter any detected wildlife hazards;
- c) providing, where applicable, the details of potential wildlife hazards to ATS units;
- d) recording all wildlife observed (on- and off-site);
- e) recording wildlife control activity and the effect of the control actions;
- f) recording actual, potential or suspected wildlife strikes;
- g) advising senior personnel on improvements to the wildlife control tasks or WHMP; and
- h) assisting with surveys.

2.2.4 Collecting, reporting and recording data on wildlife incidents and observed wildlife

2.2.4.1 The aerodrome operator should have policies and procedures in place on how to obtain data related to hazardous wildlife species and their use of the aerodrome and its vicinity, to further assess such related hazards to aviation. For best results, data collection should begin at the planning and design phase of an aerodrome and continue throughout its lifecycle.

2.2.4.2 This data will mainly contain records of:

- a) wildlife observed at the aerodrome and its vicinity;
- b) wildlife control activities;
- c) incidents with wildlife;
- d) wildlife strikes and near misses;
- e) areas of high wildlife activity on the aerodrome and in its surroundings; and
- f) wildlife observations or surveys from the aerodrome's vicinity taken periodically, at least seasonally and noting migratory activities.

Note.— Procedures for the establishment of a wildlife log are described in the PANS-Aerodromes (Doc 9981).

Wildlife observations and control activities records

2.2.4.3 A record of all observed wildlife activity on an aerodrome and in its vicinity should be maintained. Aerodrome personnel involved in wildlife control should record these observations and include, at a minimum (See Chapter 5.2, Patrols and observations):

- a) the type of wildlife activity and movements (for example: direction and altitude);
- b) control action taken and effect;
- c) the preferred areas frequented by wildlife; and
- d) the frequency of presence of hazardous species detected.

2.2.4.4 These records should be written using the standardized templates prepared by the aerodrome and made available to wildlife control personnel. It is recommended that the records be accompanied by maps of the aerodrome, indicating the location of observations or control activities.

2.2.4.5 These observations should be followed up by periodic surveys and/or studies.

Periodic wildlife surveys

2.2.4.6 Appropriate data on the presence and behaviour of wildlife on, and in the vicinity of, the aerodrome may also be obtained by means of periodic surveys. Wildlife surveys should cover the entire year to account for seasonal changes and should also consider different phases of the day. The survey should also consider aircraft movements, runways in use and wildlife behaviour. The greater the presence of hazardous wildlife, the greater the need to conduct surveys to gather information.

2.2.4.7 The sampling method should be consistent, systematic and replicable, for the data to be comparable over time. This sampling method should also be aligned with the data collected in observation records.

2.2.4.8 The possibility of using different data sources and methodologies to carry out the surveys will depend on the material and human resources of the aerodrome.

2.2.4.9 The periodic surveys should be carried out by personnel with the knowledge and experience of studying wildlife.

2.2.4.10 There are many methods to conduct wildlife surveys. For example, wildlife observation points can be used to record the species seen and their behaviour during a clearly defined period of time. There are also sampling methods using paths of a specific length in which the wildlife observed along a route is recorded (referred to as transects), carried out on foot or by vehicle.

Wildlife incidents records and reporting

2.2.4.11 All stakeholders must report wildlife-related incidents defined in Chapter 1, 1.3.4, to the aerodrome operator.

2.2.4.12 The aerodrome operator should have well-defined reporting procedures in place for wildlife-related incidents with different stakeholders and should ensure the appropriate and meaningful review of data, while considering all circumstances. All stakeholders should be made aware of the procedures described in the aerodrome manual or any associated aerodrome documentation.

2.2.4.13 A wildlife incident reporting form should be included in the procedure and made available to all stakeholders. The forms used by the aerodrome operator or other stakeholders at the aerodrome should contain, at minimum, the information in the PANS-Aerodromes, Part II, Chapter 6, Appendix 2. More detailed information results in a more accurate risk assessment of wildlife data.

2.2.4.14 The aerodrome operator should report wildlife incidents to the CAA in accordance with national regulations on incident reporting.

2.2.4.15 All incidents, regardless of damage or evidence, should be reported, collected and entered into a database as mentioned in the PANS-Aerodromes, Part II, Chapter 6.

2.2.4.16 Wildlife species identification should be as accurate as possible. It is therefore essential for wildlife personnel to be adequately trained.

2.2.4.17 The aerodrome operator should have a procedure in place for the collection, management, conservation and identification of animal remains to identify a species after a strike as well as any remaining organic material using DNA analysis.

Inventory of attractive areas for wildlife

2.2.4.18 The aerodrome should keep a record of areas with wildlife attraction or concentration in the aerodrome and its vicinity. This inventory should lead to an analysis of the existing habitat and include reasons why wildlife species may be attracted. Certain habitats attract species for food, water or shelter. Examples include: fruits on aerodrome property that attract small flocking birds; large bodies of water that attract shorebirds and waterfowl; and forests that attract large birds of prey and mammals (See Chapter 4, 4.2, Attractants).

2.3 STAKEHOLDERS WITHIN THE AERODROME

2.3.1 Airside personnel

2.3.1.1 The aerodrome operator's reporting system should ensure that there is a requirement for all relevant third parties and all aerodrome personnel to report wildlife incidents, wildlife remains and any other relevant identified hazards, to the aerodrome operator.

2.3.1.2 Aerodrome personnel not directly involved in wildlife control measures should be made aware of hazardous wildlife attractants and understand the importance of both not creating foreign object debris (FOD) but also picking up or reporting FOD that could attract wildlife. The aerodrome operator should ensure this detail is included in information briefings and during airside induction and familiarization programmes.

2.3.2 Air traffic control (ATC)

2.3.2.1 ATC is the link between the airside personnel on the ground and pilots; they provide pilots with updated information concerning observations of wildlife activity on or near the aerodrome.

2.3.2.2 ATC should report all aerodrome wildlife incidents through the established procedures (for more examples, see Chapter 8, Operational notifications). In addition, ATC should maintain a continuous liaison with the aerodrome wildlife hazard control personnel.

2.3.2.3 Depending on the circumstances, ATC may take action or advise in response to potential wildlife strike hazards not limited to: take-off delay, use of alternative runways for landing and take-off, or different routes and altitudes according to established procedures.

2.3.2.4 ATC should attend and participate in both local aerodrome and national wildlife committees.

2.3.3 Pilots

2.3.3.1 All pilots should report wildlife strikes through the established procedures (see Chapter 8). They should also report wildlife activity or remains near or on the movement areas to ATC to advise other pilots and so the wildlife control unit can assess the situation and take action if necessarily.

2.3.3.2 If hazardous wildlife is observed prior to take-off or landing, pilots may choose to delay the departure or to initiate a missed approach.

2.3.3.3 The attendance of pilots in local aerodrome wildlife committees is highly recommended since due to their unique vantage point, they can provide pertinent information regarding wildlife movements and activity during approach, landing and take-off operations.

2.3.4 Aircraft operators

2.3.4.1 The aircraft operator should report all wildlife strikes to the aerodrome operator. Wildlife hazards observed (both in the air and on the ground) by the aircraft operator should also be reported. The aircraft operator may investigate a high strike frequency at a certain aerodrome; this may be done in conjunction with the aerodrome operator.

2.3.4.2 As part of the risk assessment or airfield audit of an aerodrome, the aircraft operator may request the WHMP for assessment, and provide input to the aerodrome operator.

2.3.4.3 The aircraft operator should provide training on wildlife hazards in relation to flight operations (see specific examples in Chapter 7, 7.2.1) and reporting requirements to pilots and ground personnel.

2.3.5 Others

Other stakeholders may include: aircraft manufacturers aiming to improve materials, airframe and engine resistance to bird impact; or aeronautical authorities with tasks such as developing protective legislation, exchanging information and knowledge, disseminating best practices, keeping a wildlife strike database, etc.

2.4 IDENTIFYING EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS IN THE COMMUNITY

2.4.1 The importance of identifying external stakeholders

2.4.1.1 Different habitats, land uses and human activities developed near an aerodrome can shelter and attract wildlife that is hazardous to aircraft. Since these areas are owned or managed by external stakeholders to the aerodrome, they should be made aware of the potential hazard and briefed on how, due to their activities or land uses, they can contribute to minimizing the attraction of wildlife.

2.4.1.2 A good working relationship with neighbouring stakeholders is an essential first step in protecting the interests of an aerodrome and its clients, since many community land use planners are unfamiliar with the potential impact of off-aerodrome land use activities on aircraft safety. Awareness programmes for key community stakeholders are particularly effective as they highlight the potential flight-safety issues associated with different land uses.

2.4.2 Land owners

2.4.2.1 The aerodrome does not have the authority to directly manage habitats outside of the aerodrome. Therefore, it is necessary to develop good relationships with the landowners in the vicinity. Landowners should be aware of the possible attractants of the land use activities on their grounds and the construction of their buildings. Aerodromes have the best understanding of the impact of wildlife on aviation safety and should initiate conversations and working groups with land owners who may not otherwise be aware of the risks (see 2.6, Methods of communication). Land uses that should be considered by aerodrome operators are outlined in Chapter 4, Habitat management.

2.4.3 State authorities

2.4.3.1 State authorities and other public bodies responsible for territorial planning should collaborate with one another. For example, laying down restrictive legal requirements (establishing safeguarding areas) or, at least, raising awareness about what land uses or human activities should not be developed within the 13-km circle¹ in the vicinity of the aerodromes because they may be attractive for wildlife, may be a helpful starting point.

2.4.3.2 The collaboration among different State authorities (e.g. aviation-environmental) may lead to the development of environmental legislation or regulation that promotes the control of, or even the elimination of, wildlife attraction areas located near aircraft flight routes.

2.4.3.3 State authorities should publish information that ensures landowners in the vicinity of the aerodrome are aware of the laws and regulations that apply to their lands. These laws and regulations may impact building design and land use (e.g. crop choices and harvesting methods).

2.4.4 Environmental authorities

2.4.4.1 Since environmental authorities may be responsible for protected and non-protected areas, they can collaborate with other stakeholders by facilitating procedures, authorization or permission necessary for the management or capture of hazardous wildlife species, especially those protected by environmental legislation.

2.4.4.2 Environmental authorities may develop legislation that requires an environmental impact assessment of certain projects (e.g. new aerodromes or facilities and infrastructures to be built near aerodromes). Wildlife hazards should be adequately evaluated and monitored. Consequently, environmental impact statements issued by these authorities should avoid promoting environmental restoration projects that may attract wildlife near aerodromes.

2.4.4.3 Coordination and collaboration between environmental authorities, the aerodrome operator and CAAs include the sharing of information related to wildlife species, population trends, habitats and wildlife concentration areas, biological characteristics, human-wildlife conflict management procedures, etc.

1. The 13-km circle was based on a statistic that 95% of bird strikes occur below 2 000 ft, and that an aircraft on a normal approach would descend into this zone at approximately 13 km from the runway. An assumption was made that birds would remain overhead the attraction (at up to 2 000 ft) and that overflying aircraft would be at risk.

2.4.4.4 Environmental authorities can also collaborate by implementing plans for newly protected areas, or by appropriately managing the existing ones, to ensure their compatibility with the aeronautical operations on the nearby aerodromes.

2.4.5 Local and regional authorities

2.4.5.1 Depending on the scope of their competences, local and regional authorities should collaborate with other stakeholders on territorial planning issues. If the authorities have decision-making capacity, they can assess the types of land uses or activities to be developed in the vicinity of an aerodrome and decide whether to authorize them or not. For this purpose, local and regional authorities can use easement regulations, safeguarding areas, wildlife hazard risk assessments, etc.

2.4.5.2 Although it depends on the State, the authorities are usually responsible for some facilities or activities known to be wildlife attractants, such as landfills. In this case, they can collaborate by properly managing the sites, minimizing as much as possible the wildlife presence and attraction.

2.4.5.3 In the case that an aerodrome lies close to an international border, aerodrome operators may need to reach out to local authorities in neighbouring countries to ensure that wildlife risks are considered.

2.4.6 Security forces and police

Security forces or police competences may vary depending on the State. Normally, they can contribute to the detection and even the prohibition of certain human activities that may involve wildlife hazards in the vicinity of the aerodrome, especially if those activities are illegal (e.g. inappropriate use of laser beam, unauthorized (or furtive) pigeon racing or training, etc.).

2.4.7 Local community groups and aerodrome neighbour organizations

2.4.7.1 When referring to local community groups or aerodrome neighbour organizations, farmers, land owners, hunter associations, pigeon racing associations, etc. should be included.

2.4.7.2 The activities of these groups may have negative effects on aerodrome safety. Proper coordination between the aerodrome operator and members of these groups is therefore essential. If these groups or organizations are adequately informed and made aware of the hazards caused by the presence of wildlife in the vicinity of the aerodrome, collaborative efforts may proceed more effectively and easily.

2.4.7.3 Good collaboration amongst local community groups may have the following effects:

- a) Farmers may try to choose crops less attractive for wildlife (especially birds) and may adapt or modify the growing cycle, harvesting techniques, harvesting period, etc. to attract less wildlife.
- b) Hunters can coordinate with the aerodrome operator concerning how and when they may conduct hunting, so as not to accidentally move animals towards the aerodrome. They can also be asked to assist in decreasing the population of hazardous wildlife.
- c) Pigeon racing organizations may control the locations of pigeon lofts and pigeon release areas; they may also coordinate pigeon release schedules together with the aerodrome operator.

- d) Agreements with farmers or shepherds may be reached, in terms of collaboration in vegetation management, animal care and property maintenance.
- e) Fishing groups and organizations may change the time they handle fish so as not to attract birds.

2.4.8 The Air Forces (military)

2.4.8.1 Although military operations are quite different from those of civil operations, there are still opportunities for the exchange of information and knowledge between them.

2.4.8.2 Some States have joint-use civil-military aerodromes, at which both military and civilian aircraft have shared use of the airfield. In these cases, there must be coordination between civil and military aviation authorities, and the aerodrome operator. It is recommended to have a coordination procedure for wildlife hazard management.

2.4.9 Industry

2.4.9.1 The aviation industry dedicates time and effort to the research of new technologies and materials for airframes and engines to better withstand wildlife strikes.

2.4.9.2 The wildlife control industry is constantly investigating and adapting new technologies for innovative wildlife, rodent, invertebrate and vegetation control measures and equipment.

2.4.10 Wildlife subject matter experts and the scientific and academic community

2.4.10.1 Wildlife experts, through bird strike committees, associations, wildlife management companies, government agencies, etc., often exchange knowledge on how to manage wildlife. They can also collaborate by disseminating the issue of wildlife risk for aviation, raising awareness among other stakeholders, etc.

2.4.10.2 Scientists and universities may conduct research regarding wildlife hazard management, wildlife attractants, and the new technologies that can improve wildlife knowledge. This can be useful for other stakeholders to ultimately improve aviation safety.

2.4.11 Environmental non-governmental organizations (NGOs), ecological associations, and conservations agencies

Environmental NGOs and ecological associations should work with aerodromes and wildlife specialists to reduce the attractiveness of habitats to hazardous species on or near the aerodrome. Aerodromes should engage with these groups to raise awareness and understanding of the impacts of wildlife on aviation safety. Environmental associations may also have useful information about the biology and ecology of wildlife populations that may be used.

2.5 CIVIL AVIATION AUTHORITIES (CAAs)

2.5.1 Annex 14 — *Aerodromes*, Volume I — *Aerodrome Design and Operations*, requires States to certify all aerodromes used for international operations. As part of the certification process, the State CAA shall ensure that aerodrome operators have developed and documented procedures relating to wildlife hazard management.

2.5.2 CAAs are responsible for the regulation, oversight and enforcement of the WHMP and are also an important stakeholder in supporting and facilitating engagement across all aerodrome stakeholders, external agencies and other government agencies, as applicable.

2.5.3 The role of the CAA is to provide regulations, recommendations and best management practices as well as procedures for the enforcement and evaluation of compliance. CAAs may also collect data, provide outreach and information, partnerships and research opportunities.

2.5.4 The CAA should ensure that:

- a) wildlife strike hazards are assessed through;
 - 1) reports of wildlife strikes to aircraft;
 - 2) information collected from aircraft operators, aerodrome personnel and other sources documenting the presence of wildlife which pose a potential hazard to aircraft operations; and
 - 3) evaluation of wildlife hazards by competent personnel;
- b) aerodrome operators have developed and implemented mitigating measures to manage wildlife hazard risks and minimize the likelihood of wildlife strikes with aircraft;
- c) wildlife strike reports are collected and forwarded to ICAO for inclusion in the ICAO Bird Strike Information System (IBIS) database;
- d) the personnel involved in wildlife hazard oversight activities are properly trained;
- e) they manage their own national reporting systems for wildlife events; and
- f) that they properly plan and manage airspace to reduce interactions of wildlife with aeronautical operations.

2.5.5 As necessary, the CAA may wish to engage wildlife specialists to assist in reviewing the appropriateness and effectiveness of an aerodrome operator's WHMP or other wildlife hazard management issues of concern.

2.5.6 The CAA should carry out awareness-raising activities, encouraging concern and collaboration among different stakeholders with regard to wildlife hazard management.

2.5.7 The CAA may also work with CAAs from other countries to exchange information and to promote a global reporting culture.

2.5.9 State authorities may collaborate by trying to establish or modify air traffic routes over geographical areas where the risk of wildlife strike is lower (e.g. avoid flying at certain altitudes over certain geographical areas, protected areas, wildlife refuges, etc.).

2.6 METHODS OF COMMUNICATION

2.6.1 General

2.6.1.1 Proper communication and the dissemination of information between the aerodrome operator and stakeholders are essential to raise awareness about everyone's role and responsibility and ensure that stakeholders

address wildlife challenges. Such methods of communication between external stakeholders and the aerodrome could include awareness campaigns, or the dissemination of information (information leaflets or maps to be distributed to municipalities listing safety areas, land uses, etc.). This may be useful to educate external stakeholders about wildlife hazards.

2.6.1.2 Internal stakeholders can also benefit from awareness campaigns and internal information leaflets about the importance of occurrence reporting, bird identification, etc. In addition, a briefing at the beginning of each shift with the wildlife coordinator or manager is an occasion to communicate about possible hazardous wildlife activity.

2.6.2 The local aerodrome wildlife committee

2.6.2.1 The establishment of an Aerodrome Wildlife Committee is required to facilitate the communication, cooperation and coordination of hazardous wildlife management at and around the aerodrome. This committee might be included within the safety management committee. In place of a dedicated local wildlife committee, the topic may be discussed in an airside or runway safety committee.

2.6.2.2 Members of the committee may include, but are not limited to:

- a) accountable manager;
- b) senior safety or compliance manager;
- c) wildlife coordinator or manager;
- d) wildlife controller representative;
- e) aircraft operator representative;
- f) airport planning manager;
- g) aerodrome maintenance and operation manager;
- h) ATC representative;
- i) active aircrew representative familiar with the aerodrome;
- j) local runway safety team representative; and
- k) local authorities.

2.6.2.3 Depending on the organizational structure of the airport, other representatives can also be included, such as the rescue and firefighting department or the airside operations.

2.6.2.4 The success in the communication and coordination from a local perspective (on and in the vicinity of the aerodrome), is reliant to a large extent on the effective communication of the wildlife threat and recognized control measures adopted and agreed to by the local aerodrome wildlife committee.

2.6.2.5 Communication between internal stakeholders and users of the aerodrome should go both ways, i.e. the users should have a forum for expressing concerns, raising issues or submitting proposals. This forum may also increase the awareness of stakeholders in reporting wildlife-related incidents and convey the need to include wildlife hazard management in their SMS.

2.6.2.6 For external stakeholders, the local aerodrome wildlife committee will be mostly advisory, with the opportunity to share input, feedback, and, in some cases, take action aimed to reduce the presence of wildlife in the surroundings of the aerodrome.

2.6.2.7 The committee should inform and review the strike data collected and its observations of wildlife, assess wildlife risks and summarize any trend in order to mitigate any emerging issues. This may be as an appropriate aspect for follow-up for the implementation and maintenance of the WHMP.

2.7 ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL COMMITTEE OR FORUM

2.7.1 Annex 14, Volume I, requires the wildlife strike hazards on, or in the vicinity of, an aerodrome to be assessed through, among others, the establishment of national procedures and an ongoing evaluation of wildlife hazards by competent personnel.

2.7.2 The establishment of a national wildlife committee or forum has proven to be effective to gain and exchange information on research and development in aerodrome wildlife control. This committee or forum is an ideal way to connect different stakeholders with wildlife concerns within the aviation community and national aerodromes.

2.7.3 Although the composition of a national wildlife committee or forum may vary from State to State, it should include all stakeholders associated with or interested in the problem. A national committee or forum should include, but not be limited to, representatives from:

- a) the State authority;
- b) national departments (defence, agriculture, environment, planning);
- c) aerodrome operators;
- d) ANSPs;
- e) aircraft operators' association;
- f) pilots' association;
- g) environmental authorities;
- h) wildlife subject matter experts and the scientific community;
- i) NGOs, ecological associations, conservation agencies;
- j) regional authorities;
- k) general aviation associations;
- l) accident investigation board;
- m) maintenance, repair and overhaul (MRO) organization; and
- n) airframe and engine manufacturers.

2.7.4 The establishment of a national wildlife committee or forum will promote wildlife hazard management awareness and allow for the exchange of:

- a) actual wildlife hazard management experiences,
 - b) new techniques and equipment,
 - c) new research and investigation studies,
 - d) national, environmental, and aeronautical legislation related to wildlife hazard management,
 - e) information about hazardous wildlife biology, behaviour, population trends, wildlife attraction points, etc.,
 - f) information on training standards for and/or emerging technologies; and
 - g) national wildlife strikes information and trends.
-

Chapter 3

AERODROME WILDLIFE SAFETY RISK ASSESSMENT

3.1 INTRODUCTION TO SAFETY RISK MANAGEMENT

3.1.1 Safety risk assessments can take many forms including enabling the aerodrome operator to understand the very real risk of catastrophic outcomes from wildlife strikes. More frequently, however, such processes are used to allow potentially scarce wildlife control resources to be targeted at the most important areas.

3.1.2 The first step in a safety risk assessment of wildlife hazards is to define the area that will be assessed. This should include the entire aerodrome and its vicinity, in particular aircraft approach and take-off.

3.1.3 Knowledge of the wildlife living in the aerodrome and its vicinity, their movements and to which areas they are attracted, is essential. This can be achieved with an adequate wildlife monitoring programme and by keeping historical records. Further information regarding the use of databases is provided in Chapter 6, Advancements in technology.

3.1.4 An important element of the safety risk assessment is understanding the definitions used for aerodrome wildlife management:

- a) *a hazard* is a condition or object with the potential to cause or contribute to an aircraft incident or accident. In this context, a hazard is the presence of certain wildlife on or near an aerodrome; and
- b) *a safety risk* is the predicted probability and severity of the consequences or outcomes of a hazard. In this context, safety risk is the probability of a wildlife strike by a particular species multiplied by the severity of damage to the aircraft that might reasonably occur.

$$\text{**safety risk = (probability of a strike) × (severity of damage caused)**}$$

3.1.5 Any assessment of risk needs to estimate the probability that a strike will occur and the likely level of harm that may result. Estimation of harm is relatively straightforward because the analysis of various wildlife strike databases around the world show that there is a consistent relationship between wildlife mass and the percentage of damage to aircraft. Strikes involving flocks of a given species of bird are more likely to result in damage to the aircraft than strikes with single birds of the same species. The larger the bird and the greater its tendency to be struck in groups, the greater the risk.

3.1.6 It is more difficult to estimate the likely strike frequency of a particular population of birds or other wildlife because their behaviour cannot be predicted with certainty. There are a number of possible approaches to estimating strike probability which vary in sophistication, skill level, experience and input data needed to apply them.

3.1.7 The most common form of safety risk assessment involves the categorization of both strike probability and severity into a number of levels, usually very low, low, moderate, high and very high. These levels would apply in a double entry matrix in which wildlife species would be classified according to a determined level of risk.

3.1.8 The results of a risk assessment matrix should be used to prioritize wildlife management techniques and methods. These actions should be documented in the WHMP (see Chapter 9). Further examples of wildlife management techniques and methods can be found in Chapters 4 and 5.

3.2 ESTIMATING THE PROBABILITY OF A STRIKE

3.2.1 The probability of a wildlife strike should be calculated using wildlife incident data (as defined in Chapter 1, 1.3.4) and current data on the presence, location and behaviour of wildlife in the aerodrome and its vicinity. Strike records also allow the determination of daily and seasonal trends to determine the likelihood of future strike events.

3.2.2 Using wildlife strikes to calculate probability depends on the number of strikes and the reporting culture. Aerodromes with fewer operations may generate fewer collisions; therefore, the limited data may not allow accurate or useful predictability on strike probability.

3.2.3 Where good quality strike data is not available, it is important to consider the potential risk of collision determined by the existence of wildlife and their movements on and in the vicinity of the aerodrome.

3.2.4 Based on the above, the probability of a wildlife strike is defined for diverse variables which are not exclusive. The more knowledge about the presence and behaviour of wildlife on, and in the vicinity of, the aerodrome, the stronger the estimation of wildlife strike probability and the final safety risk assessment for each relevant species.

3.2.5 The aerodrome should have records of wildlife incidents, as well as information about observed wildlife, its habits, preferred areas, etc. This information can provide an input for wildlife probability calculation.

3.2.6 Due to the differences in resources available depending on the aerodrome, the data to be used in the safety risk assessment can be quantitative and qualitative. Best practice is to use quantitative data.

3.2.7 Both quantitative and qualitative measurements of abundances of wildlife and number of strikes are used to rank probabilities of a species being involved in a strike at a particular aerodrome since aerodromes differ in the quality and quantity of information that they hold. This is useful to take into account different levels of knowledge and available statistics for different aerodromes.

3.2.8 An example is shown in Table 3-1 regarding the values of some descriptive variables of a specific species, in order to be categorized (quantitatively and qualitatively) for probability of impact:

Table 3-1. Example of impact probability categorization

	<i>Probability category</i>				
	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Moderate</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very low</i>
QUANTITATIVE APPROACH Presence of wildlife (<i>number of days per year a species is observed on the aerodrome and its surroundings</i>)	> 200	100-200	50-100	50	10
QUALITATIVE APPROACH Presence of wildlife (<i>subjective evaluation</i>)	Permanent	Most	Some	Few	Occasional
QUANTITATIVE APPROACH Average number of strikes per year (5 years)	>10	3-10	1 - 2.9	0.3 - 0.9	0 - 0.2
QUALITATIVE APPROACH Strikes per year (<i>subjective evaluation</i>)	Very often	Often	Some	Occasional	Rare/None

3.2.9 Different biological and behavioural characteristics of wildlife species can help classify them in specific risk levels. For instance:

- a) species that shy away from aircraft noise or that learn to avoid aircraft could be rated as low probability;
- b) birds that flock in large numbers to certain habitats in the flight path could be rated a high or very high probability;
- c) solitary animals might be rated as moderate probability;
- d) species with low or erratic flights could be rated as high or very high probability; and
- e) species with nocturnal activity on aerodromes with nocturnal flights should have a higher probability of impact.

3.2.10 Other behavioural factors should also be considered. The probability might also vary with the season, age or gender of the creatures, or other conditions such as grass length or rain and other weather conditions.

3.2.11 Other variables to assess the risk more accurately include: flight activity on the aerodrome (the higher number of air operations, the higher the probability of wildlife strike), the type of aircraft using the aerodrome (larger, faster aircraft are likely to increase the risk of wildlife strike). Relating the number of impacts with the number of flight operations may help better understand if an increasing frequency of impacts can be related to a greater number of operations, to a greater wildlife presence, or both.

3.3 ESTIMATING THE SEVERITY OF A STRIKE

3.3.1 The next step is to rank the expected severity of the impact or damage resulting from a strike event. A scale similar to the strike probability scale can be used.

3.3.2 Wildlife strikes have a directly associated severity, defined by the damage that the animal has caused to the aircraft after the impact. For observed wildlife, the severity scale will depend essentially on the size of the animal and its tendency to flock or congregate. Generally, heavier wildlife and greater flock size increases the probability of damaging an aircraft and impacting its flight performance. Flocking behaviour could include multiple impacts or increase the probability of a strike.

3.3.3 Severity can be rated, among other approaches, in terms of aircraft damage and human casualty, wildlife strikes with a consequence of damage to the aircraft, and number of events with an adverse effect on flights (for example missed approach or aborted take-off).

3.3.4 Table 3-2 describes how to categorize, in two different approaches, the severity related to a determined species according to the damage this species has caused in the strikes recorded by an airport. In this example, the severity of the common kestrel to aviation in a theoretical airport is analysed:

Table 3-2. Example of severity categorization (common kestrel)

	<i>Severity category</i>				
	<i>Very High</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Moderate</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very Low</i>
Percentage of strikes with common kestrel causing damage (compared with the total amount of wildlife strikes at the airport)	>20%	10-20%	6-10%	2-6%	0-2%
Type of aircraft damage and/or human casualty (in strikes with common kestrel)	Catastrophic	Hazardous	Major	Minor	Negligible

Note.— Descriptions of damage category terms used above are shown below in Table 3-3.

Table 3-3. Example of safety risk severity

Catastrophic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Equipment destroyed; and — multiple deaths.
Hazardous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — A large reduction in safety margins, physical distress or a workload such that the operators cannot be relied upon to perform their tasks accurately or completely; — serious injury; and — major equipment damage.
Major	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — A significant reduction in safety margins, a reduction in the ability of the operators to cope with adverse operating conditions as a result of an increase in workload or as a result of conditions impairing their efficiency; — serious incident; and — injury to persons.
Minor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Nuisance; — operating limitations; — use of emergency procedures; and — minor incident.
Negligible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — No safety consequences; — no aircraft damage; and — near miss.

3.3.5 In case of species for which no data about the severity of the damage they can cause is available, the severity could be calculated by the mass multiplied by the type of flock (see 3.3.7, flock size).

3.3.6 To perform this calculation, previous categories of weights or sizes of wildlife, and flock sizes should be established by the aerodrome operator to fit each species within a category.

3.3.7 Below is an example of how to establish these categories:

Table 3-4. Example of wildlife categorization based on body mass

<i>Body Mass</i>	<i>Examples</i>	<i>Body Mass Value</i>
< 50 g	Sparrows	2
51-200 g	Starlings	4
201-1 000 g	Pigeons	8
1-5 kg	Large gulls	16
>5 kg	Big birds of prey	32

Note.— *Generic data.*

Table 3-5. Example of wildlife categorization based on flock size

<i>Flock size</i>	<i>Examples</i>	<i>Flock value</i>
Usually solitary or widely spaced	Big birds of prey, Sparrows	1
Often in loose flocks	Pigeons, Large gulls	2
Often in tight flocks	Starlings	4

3.3.8 Flock size may depend on specific aerodrome location and species involved.

3.3.9 With the example values given in 3.3.7, it is possible to locate the analysed species in one of the severity ranges that could cause a collision with an aircraft.

Table 3-6. Example of severity categorization based on severity value

	<i>Severity category</i>				
	<i>Very high</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Moderate</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Very low</i>
Severity value (mass category value x flock category value)	32-128	16	8	4	2

3.3.10 Regarding the severity categories to be established, each aerodrome should determine its own scale. Since the severity of collision also depends on the type of aircraft, the range of aircraft sizes or types of aircrafts operating at an aerodrome would also need to be taken into consideration; clearly the views of the aircraft operators should be considered.

3.4 ESTIMATING THE SAFETY RISK OF WILDLIFE SPECIES

3.4.1 A safety risk assessment matrix is completed by combining the probability and severity of each species to determine whether further action is required. A safety risk assessment should be reviewed at least annually or following a significant wildlife strike event and existing wildlife control measures adjusted to see if further action is required.

3.4.2 An example of a risk assessment matrix is shown in Table 3-7:

Table 3-7. Example of risk assessment matrix

		PROBABILITY				
		Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low
SEVERITY	Very High					
	High					
	Moderate					
	Low					
	Very Low					

3.4.3 The three risk levels are defined as follows and should be the main focus when interpreting the risk matrix:

Level 1 (Green) — *Acceptable*. The risk is acceptable as it is. No further action is required.

Level 2 (Yellow) — *Tolerable*. The risk can be tolerated based on the safety risk mitigation. Review current action undertaken, identify possible further action.

Level 3 (Red) — *Intolerable*. Take immediate action. Further action is required to reduce the risk.

3.4.4 Example of a case study.

In an aerodrome, the following data of three wildlife species were collected throughout the year:

- *A common resident species at the aerodrome, the common kestrel, produced nine impacts, causing minor damage to aircraft in two of them.*
- *The migratory barn swallow produced many impacts in spring and summer, although it was not possible to calculate the exact number of impacts. Due to the bird's size, it has never caused any damage.*
- *This year, griffon vultures appeared for the first time in the area for several days throughout the year. There are no historical records about the presence of vultures in the aerodrome, but due to the bird's size and possible formation of flocks, their possible hazard for operations must be taken into account.*

According to the tables previously shown as examples of ways to categorize the probability and severity of impacts:

- *For the common kestrel, its impact probability is HIGH. Its severity, taking into account the percentage of impacts that have caused damage, is VERY HIGH. However, knowing that the common kestrel is typically solitary, and weighs less than 300 g, its severity could be reduced to some degree, to MODERATE. This reduction would also depend on the type of damage or caused effect on flight, the type of aircraft affected, etc. As it is known from aerodrome records that the aircraft damage has always been minor, the reduction to the degree of severity is confirmed.*
- *For the barn swallow, which has produced several impacts, the probability is HIGH. However, it should be taken into account that its occurrence is seasonal, which concentrates its probability of impact to a few months per year. This could allow for reduction to some degree of the probability of impact. Its severity, according to the absence of damage, and with its small size (20 g), is VERY LOW.*

- For griffon vultures, although there have been no impacts yet, their new and persistent presence at the aerodrome should be taken into account. Its probability would be HIGH. Its severity, considering its size (more than 7 kg) and flight form, would be VERY HIGH.

Therefore, the final risk assessment matrix in this example, after categorizing the analysed species, would be the following:

Table 3-8. Example of risk assessment matrix categorizing analysed species

		PROBABILITY				
		Very high	High	Moderate	Low	Very low
SEVERITY	Very High		Griffon vulture			
	High					
	Moderate		Common kestrel			
	Low					
	Very Low		Barn swallow			

Note.— Generic data.

This could be interpreted as:

- It is necessary to apply more mitigation measures, or improve existing ones, to control the presence of the common kestrel at the aerodrome, thus decreasing the probability of impact.
- The presence of barn swallows is acceptable, although mitigation measures that are already being applied should continue to be applied in order to minimize their presence at the aerodrome as much as possible.
- Mitigation measures must be applied on the griffon vulture to minimize or eliminate its presence at the aerodrome, before impacts occur.

Chapter 4

HABITAT MANAGEMENT

4.1 GENERAL

4.1.1 Modifying the on-site habitat and environment to eliminate or exclude food, water and shelter can limit the attractiveness of an aerodrome to wildlife. Additionally, habitat management of attractive sites on, or in the vicinity of, the aerodrome is the foundation for an aerodrome's WHMP because it addresses the root cause of wildlife hazards.

4.1.2 Land use practices that attract hazardous wildlife populations on, or in the vicinity of, the aerodrome can significantly increase the potential for wildlife strikes.

4.1.3 Wildlife is attracted to habitat because of their specific requirements for food, water, breeding activities and safety. A habitat that provides these requirements increases the likelihood of their presence and the risk of a strike.

4.1.4 Before undertaking activities to manage habitats, a safety risk assessment that identifies the hazardous wildlife and the root cause of their association with specific habitats (See Chapter 3, Aerodrome wildlife safety risk assessment) must first be carried out. Understanding habitat attractants requires the study of how wildlife uses these habitats.

4.1.5 Following a safety risk assessment, any habitat used by hazardous wildlife should be identified and a habitat management strategy should be developed. This strategy should prepare for the impacts of habitat management activities on the hazardous wildlife species at the aerodrome. In some cases, management activities that decrease the risk of strikes with some species may increase the risk of strikes with others. In these cases, the risk assessment should be used to determine which species present the greatest risk and are therefore the target of habitat management efforts.

4.1.6 When considering proposed land uses, aerodrome operators, local planners and developers must consider whether the proposed land uses, including new development projects, will increase wildlife hazards.

4.2 ATTRACTANTS

4.2.1 Food

Vegetation

4.2.1.1 Vegetation is frequently the dominant land cover at many aerodromes and can consist of open grassland, shrubs and trees. Certain vegetation may produce seeds, berries and attract invertebrates or other animals that are a food source for various hazardous wildlife. Managing an aerodrome's vegetation to minimize its attractiveness to wildlife is a critical activity.

4.2.1.2 Management actions targeted at vegetation can increase the risk of exposing prey items in the short-term. For example, mowing grass too short may expose invertebrates or other small animals, making them available to predatory birds. On the other hand, when the vegetation becomes too tall, it could fall down, providing shelter and a

fertile layer for mice or other wildlife. When planning any habitat modification, one must consider how the change may increase the availability of prey, and therefore, the risk of a wildlife strike. Bare soil gives weeds a chance to grow and may expose food such as seeds or invertebrates. Soil cultivation can also expose these food sources and may even bring buried prey items closer to the surface to attract hazardous wildlife. The timing and frequency of management actions on an aerodrome should be oriented to minimize hazardous wildlife.

Agriculture

4.2.1.3 Agricultural systems can increase the presence of wildlife on and around aerodrome lands depending on the cropping system. Agricultural systems that produce highly nutritious foods that can be exploited by wildlife (for example cereal grain) can increase the risk of strikes, as will those that involve frequent field tillage or mowing that exposes seeds, invertebrates or small animals. Certain cropping systems may benefit the aerodrome by removing vegetation that would otherwise provide habitat for prey species (e.g., hay operations that remove cut grass that would otherwise provide refuge for invertebrates or small mammals). Agricultural systems far from the aerodrome may aid in decreasing strike risks by luring hazardous wildlife away from the area of flight operations.

Waste Management

4.2.1.4 Food and garbage waste bins, slaughterhouses and open-air markets may be highly attractive to scavenging wildlife.

4.2.1.5 Landfills and garbage dumps are a significant source of food for wildlife. Certain species will travel several tens of kilometres to reach a dump. Birds flying to and from these sites may cross over an aerodrome or aircraft flight paths. It is not uncommon to observe hazardous birds, for example gulls, kites and vultures, soaring over dump sites in the thermals created by composting garbage. The greater presence of birds may give rise to problems for approaching aircraft.

4.2.2 Water

Water bodies

4.2.2.1 Water is a primary requirement for wildlife: it offers them drinking water; a resting site; an escape from predators and a feeding site. Eliminating water habitats or excluding wildlife from using these habitats will decrease the number of wildlife using an aerodrome.

4.2.2.2 Ponded water that forms in depressions can be an attractive habitat for a variety of wildlife, particularly water birds, and should be removed. Water bodies can be made inaccessible in a variety of ways: for example, covering them with wires or netting to inhibit birds from landing. Water bodies that cannot be eliminated or covered should be designed to discourage their use by wildlife as much as possible and have a perimeter road so that wildlife-control personnel can quickly access all parts of the water body to disperse birds.

4.2.2.3 Emergent vegetation in drainage ditches may decrease the drainage capability and provide refuge and food sources for wildlife. Alternatively, emergent vegetation may exclude hazardous wildlife from using them. Steep banks may limit access to some types of wildlife, whereas others will not be affected.

4.2.2.4 Wetlands are often used by significant numbers of water wildlife, which tend to be a higher hazard species due to their size and flocking behaviour. If possible, any change to these water bodies should reduce their attractiveness to wildlife if the wildlife is known to present a flight safety risk.

4.2.2.5 The existence of several bodies of water around the aerodrome may result in wildlife movements from one to another, thereby increasing the risk of wildlife strikes, especially if the aerodrome lies between those water bodies.

Wastewater management

4.2.2.6 Wastewater management facilities and their settling ponds often attract large numbers of wildlife. The closer the building is to the aerodrome, the greater the potential risk. The aerodrome operator should develop an agreement with those responsible for the wastewater management facility to ensure that wildlife hazards resulting from sewage ponds are suitably managed. New facilities should not be constructed near an aerodrome or where wildlife movements to and from the ponds may affect aircraft movements.

Quarries

4.2.2.7 Areas from which raw materials and stone are extracted are often filled with water. It is common for these areas to be left without being restored, thereby attracting birds. With any new excavation, the site should be restored to a state that suits flight safety. The enhancement of old extraction pits should be discouraged, as this can increase the risk of wildlife hazards.

4.2.3 Shelter (resting, security and nesting)

Open areas

4.2.3.1 Grasses can shelter prey that are fed upon directly by hazardous wildlife. Wildlife may hide in grasses or rely on open expanses of grassland to detect predators at a distance. Grasses can also provide a breeding habitat. Managing the species of grass on the aerodrome, as well as the height and density of grasses, may reduce the attractiveness of the habitat.

4.2.3.2 Soil will influence the vegetation that grows on a site and will also act as habitat for soil-dwelling organisms, some of which may be prey for hazardous wildlife. Some hazardous wildlife may use burrows or tunnels in the soil as a place to shelter from the environment, escape predators, or breed.

4.2.3.3 Other offsite land uses, such as parks, golf courses, and other amenity grasslands may attract hazardous wildlife. Managing these sites requires the dedicated engagement of stakeholders outside the aerodrome in order to influence land use changes that can reduce the attraction to hazardous wildlife.

4.2.3.4 Aerodrome pavement may provide a resting and loafing site for wildlife that are attempting to stay warm. Pavement can retain heat longer than its vicinity, resulting in wildlife using it to warm up on colder days. After rainfall, invertebrates (e.g. earthworms) may avoid the wet soil by coming onto the pavement areas, increasing their availability to hazardous wildlife. After heavy rainfall, pavement areas may become more attractive to gulls, increasing their presence at the aerodrome.

Forest

4.2.3.5 Trees and shrubs provide nesting or roosting opportunities for wildlife. Depending on the wildlife safety risk assessment, these may have to be eliminated on aerodrome property. The aerodrome operator should be aware of such areas in the vicinity of the aerodrome and the potential transiting routes for wildlife.

Nature reserves

4.2.3.6 The establishment of nature reserves in the vicinity of aerodromes can provide a strong attractant to hazardous wildlife. In general, nature reserves are formed where unique, diverse or remnant habitats exist and they may host hazardous species. The aerodrome operator should develop a solid relationship with reserve management, so that if habitat enhancement is conducted on the reserves, wildlife hazards to aircraft are considered.

Buildings

4.2.3.7 Wildlife often seek shelter and breeding sites on aerodrome property in the structural beams of hangars and bridges, in the nooks of jet ways and other structures. Airports should adopt a zero tolerance for hazardous wildlife using any airport structure.

4.2.3.8 The attraction of hazardous wildlife should be considered in the design phase of buildings, hangars, bridges and other structures at aerodromes to minimize exposed areas that birds can use for perching and nesting.

4.3 ON-AERODROME MANAGEMENT

4.3.1 General

4.3.1.1 On-aerodrome habitat management involves the removal and alteration of habitat features that attract hazardous species. Typical actions include adjusting the design of aerodrome buildings and structures, preventing wildlife from accessing aerodrome property using fencing, adjusting grass height, the pruning or removal of trees and shrubs, management of waste on the aerodrome and the removal of standing water (ponds, puddles).

4.3.1.2 The key to effective habitat modification is to remove existing attractions without introducing new enticements that may appeal to other species. Every species on the aerodrome represents a direct or indirect hazard; however, aerodromes should consult their risk assessment matrix (see Chapter 3) to identify the species with the greatest risk. On-aerodrome habitat modification should be aimed primarily against those species that pose the greatest risk to aircraft safety.

4.3.1.3 The aerodrome operator should be aware of not only managing habitat attractants on airside locations, but also ensure that habitat attractants are identified and managed landside.

4.3.2 Design (airport buildings and structures)

4.3.2.1 Screening holes and openings of hangars can prevent access to these buildings. In the case of hangars, where doors may be left open for an extensive period of time, netting can be installed across the base of the rafters to exclude birds from nesting in the rafter system. Adding a slope greater than 45 degrees to edges of buildings can also deter birds from nesting on these sites.

4.3.2.2 Where perching sites are present on existing structures, their access can often be eliminated with the installation of netting. Anti-perching devices, such as spikes, can be installed on ledges, roof peaks, rafters, signs, posts and other roosting and perching areas. If wildlife is already present on existing structures, the aerodrome operator should refer to Chapter 5 for more management techniques.

4.3.2.3 Unused structures such as sheds, abandoned buildings and structures, old windbreaks and rotten fence posts should be removed from airport lands to prevent nesting and roosting.

4.3.2.4 Where birds have already nested in buildings, nest removal may be possible, but should be done in consultation with local and national environmental requirements. The trapping, removal or relocation of young birds may be conducted if nest removal is not completed outside the breeding season.

4.3.2.5 Perching sites are important for birds; they offer vantage points that overlook the immediate surroundings. Perches are places from which birds sing, call and display. They also act as observation points, hunting lookouts and as places to rest, digest, preen, roost and gather socially. As potential perches for birds, lone trees, hedgerows, fences,

gates, posts, shrubs, stumps, junk, weed patches and boulders should be removed from airport lands. If this is not possible, spoked wires can be attached to perching sites to discourage their use. Power lines are popular perches and should be relocated underground. Certain specific wire can also be fitted to runway, approach, taxiway and apron lights to discourage their use as perches.

4.3.2.6 Aircraft parked on aprons or fields are also popular nesting locations. Birds usually enter aircraft through small access holes just large enough to accommodate them. Parked aircraft should be regularly checked for nesting birds, and if they are expected to be parked long-term, the aerodrome operator should consider installing netting to prevent such access.

4.3.3 Fencing

4.3.3.1 A complete perimeter fence is the prime method of preventing hazardous wildlife, other than birds, from gaining access to the aerodrome. There is a variety of fencing available, including electric fences. The most suitable fence for an airport depends on many factors, including the observed wildlife hazards, the potential impacts of certain types of fencing, seasonality of hazards, costs (both for construction and maintenance) and adjacent habitat types. Adding the use of cattle gates at entry and exit points for vehicle access points within a perimeter fence can prevent many hoofed mammals from crossing into aerodrome property.

4.3.3.2 Fencing should be buried below the ground when possible to discourage animals from digging under the fence to gain access to aerodrome property.

4.3.3.3. Fences and gates should remain closed and be regularly inspected.

4.3.4 Grass

4.3.4.1 Grass height should be decided based on the target high risk species. Grass height may be limited next to the manoeuvring area, but grass may be kept at a taller height depending on the management of local high risk species.

4.3.4.2 There is no single recommended grass height that is effective at all aerodromes. It is recommended that aerodromes conduct a site-specific study to find an optimal grass height. The decision to maintain short or tall grass depends on which species pose the highest hazard at the specific aerodrome.

4.3.4.3 Vehicle access to grass areas should be restricted to minimize damage and alteration to grass heights. Damaged grass areas might lead to standing water and the emergence of weeds attractive to hazardous wildlife.

4.3.4.4 Vegetation that is undesirable or mildly toxic to wildlife may deter wildlife feeding. For example, there are varieties of tall fescue and perennial ryegrass that contain fungal endophytes that may be unattractive to some birds, mammals and insects. The aerodrome operator should be aware of their State regulations concerning these varieties.

4.3.4.5 There are alternatives to grass covering bare soil around an aerodrome. An example of this is the application of a wood mulch added to water, seed, fertilizer and soil amendments which can provide coverage to areas that may be more attractive to hazardous species and help aid in the growth of new grass. The use of artificial turf may reduce food, shelter and burrowing attractants for hazardous wildlife.

4.3.5 Forest, vegetation and agriculture

4.3.5.1 Large areas of brush, shrubs or forests, natural or decorative, can provide habitat with safe areas where wildlife loaf, perch, roost and nest. These areas are commonly found on undeveloped airport grounds and can attract birds and other wildlife.

4.3.5.2 Brush and bushy vegetation should be eliminated from airports when possible and at the very least be eliminated from the proximity of manoeuvring areas.

4.3.5.3 Tree species that produce soft fruits, berries, or high numbers of seeds are especially attractive to wildlife and should be removed. Trees also provide cover for medium-sized and large mammals. Large trees located at the edges of open areas provide excellent vantage points from which raptors can survey for food. In addition, trees can create an edge effect, which is an intermediate area often rich in bird life because it borders two different habitats such as grassland and wooded areas. Trees should be located as far as possible from runways.

4.3.5.4 Where tree removal is not possible, undergrowth should be removed. Trees can also be thinned at their tops to make them less attractive as roosting sites. Trees should be frequently inspected for colonies of nesting or roosting birds.

4.3.5.5 Some varieties of decorative trees and shrubs may be acceptable but should be selected with the appropriate assistance of experts to ensure low risk species are chosen.

4.3.5.6 Agricultural activities at aerodromes may attract hazardous wildlife and it is recommended that airport lands not be used for agriculture.

4.3.5.7 Aerodromes that have on-site agricultural practices should ensure that crop selection is done in line with their wildlife hazard management programme. Modified ploughing and harvesting practices may also be necessary to decrease the risks to aviation.

4.3.6 Waste management

4.3.6.1 Aerodromes should require a wildlife-proof storage of food waste, prohibit wildlife feeding and promote good sanitation and litter control programmes. In many instances, simply closing the lid of waste bins can limit the access to these food resources by hazardous wildlife.

4.3.6.2 Waste disposal sites on aerodrome property should be removed to an off aerodrome location, outside of the 13-km circle. If this is impossible, organic waste should not be accessible to hazardous wildlife (e.g. buried or incinerated). Where waste management must occur on aerodrome property, disposal activities should also be conducted at night to attract fewer birds. Additional mitigation could also include fencing, netting or overhead wires to prevent access.

4.3.6.3 Improperly disposed refuse can attract wildlife and the aerodrome should ensure that waste management procedures include closing the lids of garbage bins and that waste is disposed of into bins and not littered on the property. Signage to discourage the feeding of wildlife should also be erected in public areas.

4.3.7 Water

4.3.7.1 The best method to reduce the attractiveness of water bodies on aerodrome property is to remove them: for example, by draining or filling. Where aerodromes have drainage ditches, these can be replaced with buried culverts. Where drainage ditches remain, aerodromes may have to clear these ditches of emergent vegetation. Areas where temporary water pools form after rain or spring melts should be filled or fitted with improved drainage systems.

4.3.7.2 Clearing the ditches at regular intervals is important. They should be graded so that the water will run off as rapidly as possible. Grass and other vegetation should be cut on the sloping banks. Where practicable, the water attractant can be eliminated by replacing ditches with buried drain pipes.

4.3.7.3 Where water bodies cannot be removed, there are methods which can help reduce the attractiveness to wildlife. Water bodies should be cleared of emergent and submerged aquatic vegetation and the banks should be cleared of vegetation and brush. This can be done by cutting, dredging, or herbicide use.

4.3.7.4 The slopes of water bodies should be graded to a steep slope, which will discourage burrowing mammals, bird species and offer a clearly defined edge which can be easily mowed.

4.3.7.5 Physical barriers should be erected to prevent wildlife access to water bodies. Methods include fencing around the perimeter, exclusion wiring and netting across all the surfaces or riprap installed on water embankments. Visual enhancements can be attached to the wires and netting to prevent birds from flying into the barriers. In certain instances, barriers such as large black balls that float on water bodies have been used successfully to prevent access to water bodies.

4.3.7.6 If water bodies cannot be covered or drained, dredging will increase the water depth and, as a result, decrease the surface area.

4.3.7.7 Where storm water management ponds are present on aerodrome property, the aerodrome should ensure a maximum retention period for the storm water to reduce attractiveness (e.g. in North America, this time period has been identified as 48 hours).

4.4 OFF-AERODROME MANAGEMENT

4.4.1 The concept of compatible land use planning is the environmental relationship between airports and their community neighbours. Its implementation requires careful study and coordinated planning. Land use around airports can influence restrictions on aircraft flights and affect aircraft safety.

4.4.2 A 13-km circle centred on the aerodrome reference point is recognised where land use should be assessed with regard to wildlife hazard management. However, the circle may be extended or reduced based on a wildlife evaluation of the aerodrome vicinity. States should consider all aviation safety concerns related to land development in the vicinity of the aerodrome to minimize the attraction of wildlife. Aerodrome operators are encouraged to communicate their safety concerns with the local authority in order to raise awareness (see Chapter 2, 2.6, Methods of communication). Prior planning is necessary to ensure that incompatible land use is not allowed to become established. Such developments should be subjected to a risk assessment process as described in Chapter 3 and changes sought, or the proposal opposed, if a significant increase in the wildlife strike risk is likely to result.

4.4.3 In order to successfully deal with land use issues, a comprehensive WHMP including coordination among the aviation regulatory authority, aerodrome operator, aircraft operators and the surrounding communities should be implemented.

Note.— A list of types of land use that should be prevented, eliminated or mitigated is available in the Procedures for Air Navigation Services - Aerodromes (PANS-Aerodromes, Doc 9981), Part II, Attachment to Chapter 6.

4.4.4 A monitoring process of sites where hazardous wildlife is to be found should be instigated, at least seasonally. The survey of the land use around aerodromes should be reviewed at a period determined by the safety risk assessment. In general, it is desirable to carry out a new comprehensive land use survey assessment every five years.

4.4.5 Modern technology like satellite detection facilitates the registration and monitoring of different land use types (see Chapter 6, Advancements in technology).

4.4.6 The aerodrome operator should engage with local farmers in the vicinity of the aerodrome to encourage them to choose agriculture practices that are the least attractive to hazardous species. These practices may include types of crop, livestock and grain and feed storage.

4.4.7 The appropriate authority should encourage prohibiting or restricting the establishment of new or existing organic waste sites near aerodromes. If a waste management site in the vicinity of an aerodrome cannot be closed, it may be necessary to provide control measures at the site to reduce its attractiveness to hazardous wildlife.

Chapter 5

MANAGEMENT OF HAZARDOUS WILDLIFE

5.1 THE IMPORTANCE OF UNDERSTANDING ANIMAL BEHAVIOUR

5.1.1 Wildlife can react in different ways to different methods of dispersal, and protect themselves from predators by hiding or fleeing. The role of the wildlife control personnel on duty at an aerodrome is to understand the ways in which hazardous wildlife species are likely to react vis-à-vis the different methods of dispersal in order to reduce their presence on or around an aerodrome most effectively and reduce their risk to aircraft.

5.1.2 Hazardous species may respond differently to expelling and deterring techniques. Some species fly away from the stimulus while other species crouch down and hide or even approach the stimulus. Knowing these responses will enable the controller to select the correct method to reduce the immediate risk.

5.1.3 When confronted with deterring or expelling techniques, all wildlife will initially become 'alert' to a potential threat before they exhibit their 'response'. For example, many birds that have become accustomed to the presence of routine wildlife control on an aerodrome adopt a 'watch and wait' behaviour. A wildlife control vehicle or person will result in wildlife becoming 'alert' but not necessarily responding until the control method becomes clear. If wildlife remains undetected on the aerodrome, it will learn that such a response saves itself energy and will therefore be able to continue with its activities unhindered. The reaction of species can therefore be controlled by moving past the wildlife, stopping and waiting or instigating an action. Since different species will react in different ways at different aerodromes in different seasons, time of the day and weather conditions, it is essential that these responses are understood on a site-by-site basis. Control can be achieved by understanding whether the 'response' of wildlife will be to ignore, hide or flee.

5.1.4 At aerodromes where active wildlife control measures are routinely implemented, behaviours may differ from aerodromes where infrequent actions are undertaken. The most likely response will again differ in relation to the amount of time target species have been subjected to deterring or expelling techniques at any given aerodrome.

5.1.5 Wildlife controllers must therefore be able to identify the species present at their aerodrome and understand their behaviour. The aerodrome should provide a wildlife guidebook to officers to assist them in detecting species, in particular rarer species that may not frequent the aerodrome on a regular basis. A dynamic risk assessment based on the likely reaction of the species present, the location of aircraft movements at the time and the control methods available will then enable the most appropriate cause of action. Chasing hazardous wildlife with simple methods such as loud noises and manual techniques (arm waving, clapping, etc.) may be all that is required to disperse them directly away from the wildlife control personnel. More sophisticated methods may include using a distress call system to draw a flock of gulls away from a runway, or using pyrotechnics to deter a group of circling raptors.

5.1.6 Wildlife control personnel should be equipped with a range of appropriate systems for deterring, dispersing or removing species they are likely to encounter and the ability to deploy such systems wherever necessary on the aerodrome. The objective of deterring or expelling is not to scare wildlife randomly around an aerodrome but to control movements and disperse them away from high risk areas. The ultimate objective is to render the aerodrome a hostile location and 'educate' hazardous species that the risk of remaining within the aerodrome environment outweighs the potential rewards that the environment may offer.

5.1.7 All active control systems should only be deployed when required, in order to reduce habituation (the process by which wildlife learns to ignore a stimulus if it has no actual threat). Overuse of individual methods results in

habituation and the subsequent failure of those methods. Human operated (active) control will always, therefore, be more effective than automated (static) scaring systems. Similarly, the use of lethal threat will remain an important tool to reinforce the effect of non-lethal expelling and deterring techniques.

5.1.8 Once the responses of different wildlife species at an aerodrome are understood, they can be associated with control actions to reduce their risk. When recording such actions, the patrols and observations explained below should be considered.

5.2. PATROLS AND OBSERVATIONS

5.2.1 Patrols of airside areas to check for birds and other hazardous wildlife are a direct requirement for wildlife hazard management of aerodromes. Critical risks result from wildlife being present on or crossing runways and approach or departure paths, therefore patrols should aim to prevent their presence in these areas. These patrols should facilitate either immediate dispersal from those locations or preventative dispersals from areas likely to result in such movements. Additionally, ATC and other personnel should inform wildlife controllers when they observe wildlife; the wildlife controller can then determine the level of hazard (See Chapter 3, Aerodrome wildlife safety risk assessment).

5.2.2 Patrols should target the locations of hazardous wildlife activity, especially near runways and approach or departure paths. Local knowledge, data assessments and visual observations can provide vital information on where recent hazardous wildlife has been congregating or dispersed from.

5.2.3 During patrols, the recording of hazardous wildlife will enable the aerodrome operator to identify existing and future problem areas (for example, low areas that gather standing water after rains, blocked drainage ditches, un-managed grassland, fruit- or berry-bearing bushes, buildings or lighting and signage stands that provide perching areas etc.). Such areas should be logged to take proactive habitat management action.

5.2.4 Wildlife controllers should ensure that wildlife does not habituate to routine pathways or timings. If the same path is followed on every occasion, wildlife may learn when it is safe to remain in an area and will only briefly depart on the approach of a vehicle. Randomization of routes and wildlife controller behaviour is beneficial. By waiting, or by returning to the same location shortly afterwards, controllers will gain an understanding of the observed species and which areas are being used most frequently. Constantly varied patrols will also help wildlife controllers to learn the behaviour in different seasons, times of the day, weather conditions and habitat preferences of wildlife at an aerodrome. For example, some aerodromes conduct wildlife management patrols at least 15 minutes prior to any movement. When possible, wildlife management personnel should position themselves at the most critical areas. For the patrols, the wildlife controllers should have appropriate vehicles, binoculars and recording devices (e.g. pad of paper, tablet, audio recorder).

5.2.5 During patrols, any wildlife remains found should be collected, identified to the species level and documented in a wildlife log. Even if remains are not evidenced as being recorded in a collision with an aircraft, its presence on the aerodrome may assist with identifying risks with that species that could prevent future strikes.

5.2.6 When a control action is undertaken, the wildlife management personnel should ensure they record the following information;

- a) name of the personnel on duty;
- b) shift start and finish time;
- c) time for each activity or record;
- d) weather and lighting conditions;

- e) location of activities;
- f) details of the wildlife observed and/or dispersed;
- g) numbers of each species seen, including zero sightings;
- h) type of dispersal action taken;
- i) reaction of wildlife to dispersal; and
- j) direction of dispersal.

5.3 REPELLENTS

5.3.1 Overview

5.3.1.1 The following provides an outline of possible options for controlling wildlife on aerodromes to reduce strike risks. This list is not exhaustive but covers a group of the main techniques used around the world for active wildlife control on aerodromes. There are many more systems available than it is possible to cover here. There is no single solution or set of procedures that is best for all situations. Aerodrome operators should carry out a thorough review of any equipment before purchase to ensure that it is fit for purpose. Each wildlife species is unique and will often respond differently to various repellent techniques. Factors such as food resources, weather, time of year or day and predation can clearly interact to diminish or enhance repellent effectiveness. To lessen habituation: use each technique sparingly and appropriately when target wildlife is present; use various repellent techniques in an integrated fashion; and if necessary, reinforce repellents with occasional lethal action directed at problem species.

5.3.1.2 Equipment used by wildlife management personnel on the aerodrome to control hazardous wildlife should be appropriate to the aerodrome environment and species encountered.

5.3.1.3 Advances in electronics, remote sensing and computers have resulted in systems that can automatically dispense repellents (for example, noisemakers, chemical sprays) when targeted wildlife enter selected areas. These devices are used to reduce habituation and increase the effectiveness of other repellent techniques. It should be remembered that automated repellents are not a substitute for trained people on the ground, who can respond appropriately to incursions by various wildlife species, and should be considered only when more traditional methods of control and dispersal have proved ineffective.

5.3.2 Audio repellents

Pyrotechnics

5.3.2.1 Use of pyrotechnic wildlife scaring techniques, either from a cartridge fired from a shotgun, a specialized pistol or from a stationary cannon, is a common means of dispersing wildlife at aerodromes. Wildlife will usually move away from the detonation so it is possible to control their direction to some degree: detonations behind wildlife can hasten their departure, and to either side can keep them on track and to hold a flock together. Pyrotechnics fired high in the path of an approaching flock will cause it to pause and orbit. However, birds will often avoid a significant headwind and they will eventually turn back.

5.3.2.2 There are various projectiles, fired from breech-loaded shotguns or from specialized launchers, which provide an auditory blast or scream as well as smoke and flashing lights to frighten birds. Pyrotechnics, when used

skilfully in combination with other harassment techniques and limited lethal reinforcement (shooting with a shotgun), are useful in driving birds off an aerodrome. Using pyrotechnics distributed by wildlife management personnel and targeting a specific species, helps teach wildlife to associate the pyrotechnic with a threat (person).

5.3.2.3 The effect of a cartridge can be improved by using a trace, especially when trying to control direction. The trace should be visible in sunlight throughout its flight.

5.3.2.4 Several types of pistols are used at aerodromes. The pistol should be fit for purpose and be pressure-tested for the type of cartridge used. Using pyrotechnics may present a FOD hazard to aircraft which should be managed accordingly.

5.3.2.5 In many circumstances, wildlife management personnel may not be allowed to fire a cartridge beyond the aerodrome perimeter, but by firing at a greater angle its effect can be extended outwards over a considerable distance, including locations with the approach path. A large flock of birds, rather than several smaller ones, is more likely to leave the aerodrome using this method. However, firing directly into a flock will probably fragment the cartridge and the wildlife may not regroup. Care is needed to control and not scare birds away. A detonation in close proximity to a flock may be useful to disperse wildlife that regroups quickly, such as flocks of starlings.

5.3.2.6 Each aerodrome should coordinate with ATC concerning the use of pyrotechnics.

5.3.2.7 In very dry conditions, proactive fire prevention is needed after a shot is taken. In these conditions, any trace should be followed until it has landed to check it has not ignited the vegetation.

5.3.2.8 Propane cannons (exploders) produce a shotgun sound blast. In general, birds quickly habituate to propane cannons that detonate at random or pre-set intervals throughout the day and they can scare birds into flight paths, creating extra hazard. To ensure they remain effective, cannons should be used only sparingly and only when birds are in specific areas. Reinforcement by occasional shooting of a common bird species with a shotgun may improve the effectiveness of the cannons. Some systems are designed so that cannons placed around an aerodrome may be detonated remotely, on demand by radio signal. Such systems are preferable to those on random timers.

5.3.2.9 Propane cannons are the most commonly used audio repellent for deer. However, deer, like most wildlife, will rapidly habituate to their use. Such systems are therefore best implemented infrequently for short-term emergencies (a few days) and should not be relied upon to repel wildlife effectively. Propane cannons are likely to be more useful as a secondary tool provided they are manually operated via remote control. Automated cannons should not be used as this may result in scaring wildlife into a higher risk location as opposed to controlling their departure.

Distress calls

5.3.2.10 Distress calls are a unique call only given by certain bird species when they have been caught by a predator. Distress calls should not be confused with other calls such as alarm calls and contact calls. Flocking species such as gulls, corvids, lapwings and starlings are the species that tend to have, and therefore respond most positively to, distress calls. Distress calls should be species-specific, although for mixed flocks the call of the most prevalent species should be chosen. Distress call equipment should always be manually operated as static automatic units increase the risk of habituation and have the potential to scare birds into the critical airspace rather than control their movements. The most effective units are vehicle mounted, administered through roof-mounted, forward facing speakers. Hand-held units can also be used. Distress call equipment should always be used from a stationary position, although starlings may be herded using a slowly moving vehicle.

5.3.2.11 With the distress call equipment, the controller is attempting to recreate a scenario where a bird has been caught by a predator. Other members of the species will then investigate the threat as a group and fly to the origin of the call, circling above and trying to ascertain where the potential danger is coming from. Throwing a lure up (white for gulls and black for corvids for example), which resembles a struggling victim, can stimulate a flock to lift if necessary. Aerodrome operators should be aware that predatory mammals may approach the sound of a distress call as they

investigate a possible food opportunity. Volume settings should be natural so they will not attract birds onto the aerodrome from a distance. It is good practice to start the broadcast at a low volume and increase it until the target birds start to respond.

5.3.2.12 When the call is stopped, the remaining birds' instincts are to move away from the danger as a group. They will fly further away from the source of the perceived threat in the direction from which they arrived. Birds will become habituated to distress calls relatively quickly hence they should be used sparingly within a suite of techniques underpinned with lethal control. At the time a distress call is being broadcast, other forms of dispersal should not be implemented as this may confuse the behavioural reaction of the birds in question.

Electronic noise-generating systems

5.3.2.13 Modern technology allows for the use of systems that can emit targeted sounds over very long distances. These long range acoustic devices (LRAD) offer the opportunity to target any sound type (acoustic wail, distress call, synthetic bang etc.) at wildlife some distance away. As the use of distress calls is primarily to draw birds towards the sound source their use at significant distances may not be appropriate for an aerodrome. Similarly, the use of 'noise' may startle wildlife but if it is unable to determine where the noise is coming from it may be difficult to control their reaction. Caution is required with the use of long range projection devices to ensure they do not draw birds in from a wider environment.

5.3.3 Visual repellents

Presence of humans and vehicles

5.3.3.1 While there are many visual stimuli that can be used to control wildlife, the most effective tool that elicits a response from hazardous wildlife is often the simple sight of a vehicle or person who implements wildlife hazard management. Wildlife that is consistently harassed within the aerodrome environment will quickly become aware of the approach of a controller and may react if the vehicle stops or a person alights from the vehicle before any control method is implemented. This demonstrates a learned behaviour in that wildlife is aware that control is forthcoming and it will leave before any further threat occurs.

Visual objects

5.3.3.2 Most visual repellents are a variation of the scarecrow. Visual repellents such as hawk effigies, silhouettes on kites, eye-spot balloons, flags, reflective tape and lures have short-term effectiveness that are not suitable as long-term solutions to an aerodrome's bird problems. If a system can educate hazardous species that control personnel is on-site, it may have some value as an indicator but it does not generally work as a long-term control method. Displaying dead birds in a "death pose" can scare other birds from entering a specific area by presenting what is interpreted by the birds as a deadly threat. However, species of scavenging wildlife are attracted to dead birds lying on the ground so their use on aerodromes should be carefully considered prior to any deployment.

Lasers

5.3.3.3 Certain species of birds perceive the approaching laser beam as a threat, causing the birds to fly away. Lasers are best used at night or at dawn and dusk. Since lasers may present a secondary hazard to pilots or drivers of other vehicles, caution should be exercised. Guidance on how to protect flight operations from the hazardous effects of laser emitters is contained in the *Manual on Laser Emitters and Flight Safety* (Doc 9815).

Remotely piloted aircraft systems (RPAS) and drones

5.3.3.4 See Chapter 6.

Trained predators

5.3.3.5 Trained dogs and falcons introduce a predator presence, resulting in a flee response of hazardous wildlife. Proper training for animals and instruction for their handlers will ensure that the animals do not become a strike risk.

Non-lethal projectiles

5.3.3.6 Any projectiles can be shot or catapulted toward the targeted species to elicit a flee response. Aerodromes should be aware of any restrictions for using these devices and wildlife personnel should be properly trained to ensure their safe handling.

5.3.4 Trap and relocate

Hazardous wildlife can be caught and released away from the aerodrome. The aerodrome operator should be aware of local laws and regulations when trapping and releasing hazardous wildlife. If live bait is used, it should be monitored and fed regularly (daily at a minimum). When bait or decoys are used, measures should be taken to prevent additional wildlife from being attracted to the aerodrome.

5.3.5 Chemical repellents

Non-lethal chemical repellents work by affecting the animal's senses through smell or taste aversion. These repellents may be sprayed on roosting sites, food sources or other gathering areas where hazardous wildlife is present. Certain chemical repellents (e.g. predator urine) may actually attract other hazardous wildlife, and aerodromes should be aware of the impacts of using these repellents. It is important to note that only chemical repellents registered and approved by the proper national, regional and local authorities should be used.

5.3.6 Lethal control

5.3.6.1 All lethal control should be undertaken humanely and safely by management and according to local laws at all times. It is often a national law to ensure that lethal action is only implemented after non-lethal methods have shown to be unsuccessful. Aerodrome personnel should maintain a record of the managed species and those removed through lethal control each year. Where a State does not allow the use of lethal means, the issue should be addressed at the State and national wildlife committee level.

5.3.6.2 The implementation of lethal action to reduce or eliminate the presence of hazardous wildlife on or around an aerodrome requires understanding the behaviour of the species being targeted. Action to influence and educate wildlife may be needed in full view of all targeted species in order for them to associate lethal action with the presence of a wildlife controller. When habitat management and wildlife repellents fail to reduce risk, the implementation of lethal methods can therefore reinforce the effect of non-lethal techniques. It can also be used to reduce the numbers of hazardous individual animals, remove sick or injured wildlife, or to deal with an immediate risk. In certain circumstances lethal measures can be used to eradicate an airside population of a species that cannot be educated by non-lethal methods.

5.3.6.3 Adults and juveniles can be euthanized using humane methods such as firearms or carbon dioxide gas. Bird eggs may be oiled or addled to prevent hatching or nests can be removed after eggs are laid.

Chapter 6

ADVANCEMENTS IN TECHNOLOGY

6.1 GENERAL

There are continuing advancements in existing technologies that can predict and detect wildlife potentially hazardous to aircraft operations and provide information thereon to reduce the risk of these hazards. Such technologies and procedures are particularly important in dealing with the significant hazards posed by wildlife in the vicinity of aerodromes.

6.2 SATELLITES FOR LAND USE MONITORING

Satellite imagery can aid in monitoring off-aerodrome sites that may attract hazardous wildlife. Land use around the aerodrome may be monitored by viewing a series of satellite images taken over a specific period of time. These images can allow airport managers to track changes in land uses that may impact the distribution of wildlife around the airport. Expansions of wetlands or waterbodies, landfills, or amenity grasslands, are all examples of land use changes that may increase the strike risk of wildlife. The availability of satellite imagery can provide quantifiable data on land uses and becomes critical evidence for habitat management measures and communicating with stakeholders.

6.3 GEOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION SYSTEM (GIS)

6.3.1 Geographical Information Systems (GIS) can be used by aerodrome managers to manage and analyse spatial data. Much of the data collected as part of a WHMP is spatially referenced, as it pertains to a specific geographical location. Using GIS to analyse the data allows aerodrome managers to assess patterns of wildlife observations and control interventions as they relate to aircraft operations. Wildlife strikes can be related to specific points on the runway and mapped with GIS to show “hotspots” where strikes occur.

6.3.2 GIS may also be used to track and analyse land uses off the aerodrome. When combined with other data collection methods (such as satellite land use imagery), GIS can be a powerful tool for analysing and understanding how wildlife hazards are distributed and interact with the aerodrome operating environment. It is recommended to provide professional training for aerodrome personnel in charge of working with GIS, to optimize the quality and reliability of the results.

6.4 DETECTION SYSTEMS

6.4.1 Radio detection and ranging (RADAR)

6.4.1.1 RADAR (e.g. avian or FOD detection radar) can act as a tactical tool that detects and tracks wildlife hazards in real time.

6.4.1.2 RADAR data can be used by wildlife controllers to monitor wildlife activity, especially birds, over large areas of an aerodrome and its vicinity. The sensor data may also be used for the real time tracking of wildlife in response to control measures. This is especially important when controlling birds at night to ensure they have exited the aircraft operating area.

6.4.1.3 RADAR data may also be used to create avoidance algorithms for aircraft and bird flight paths. When flight paths are predictable, an avoidance algorithm may be used to trigger an alert to an air traffic controller that an increased strike risk is imminent.

6.4.1.4 RADAR may provide strategic data for the assessment of wildlife hazards. RADAR datasets that span anywhere from a single season to several years can reveal patterns of wildlife movements. These patterns can then be used to target habitat attractants and strategize mitigations that reduce the risk of wildlife hazards.

6.4.1.5 RADAR datasets can show spatial patterns and timing of bird and bat movements. Aerodrome and aircraft operators can then alter flight operations to minimize the likelihood of aircraft operating in areas of high bird concentrations.

6.4.1.6 These same datasets may be used to assess patterns of habitat use on and off the aerodrome. Priorities for habitat management can be created by identifying areas that provide a strong attractant for hazardous wildlife. These data may be critical to convince external stakeholders that a hazard exists when wildlife is using off-site properties and take appropriate measures.

6.4.1.6 RADAR data can be used to assess the efficacy of mitigation measures (treatment and control) of habitat use and active control techniques.

6.4.1.7 The ability of RADAR sensors and their associated processing software to detect and track wildlife activity at different altitudes, distances, and under varying atmospheric conditions must be understood to maximize the benefit of a RADAR system. RADAR signals may be blocked by obstacles, influenced by ground clutter, and are not always able to detect all wildlife.

6.4.2 Camera detection

Wildlife monitoring cameras may include thermal detection cameras (infrared), or high or low definition cameras. The process usually consists of the installation of a series of cameras that monitor the field continuously, detecting movement of objects. These cameras may be associated with software that analyses and processes the images. This information can be used in conjunction with avian radars (helping to determine that radar detections are accurate), as an alert system to the wildlife control unit and to carry out data collection about the movements of wildlife on and in the vicinity of an aerodrome.

6.5 REMOTELY PILOTED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS (RPAS) AND DRONES

6.5.1 RPAS and drones have the ability to manage wildlife from the air and can manoeuvre over hazardous wildlife to harass or survey. RPAS that harass wildlife may be constructed to simulate a predator (e.g. bird of prey). Surveillance RPAS have cameras attached that give the operator a view of the land on and in the vicinity of the aerodrome that can assist with identifying hazardous wildlife. Surveillance benefits may include night time observations and monitoring areas that are difficult to access. An example of this is observing rooftops where nesting can be seen without having to climb the roof.

6.5.2 Any operational RPAS must comply with local and national regulations. An aerodrome must have established flight rules for the operation of an RPAS on and around the aerodrome. RPAS operators should be certified to the degree that the law requires.

6.6 PULSE LIGHTS ON AIRCRAFT AND AERODROME USE OF FLASHING LIGHT PATTERNS

6.6.1 Wildlife can detect flicker or pulse rates (frequency) as well as particular colours (wavelength). Lighting techniques can therefore be used to deter them away from aircraft. Frequency and wavelength may be adjusted, as different species may react to different lighting techniques.

6.6.2 Pulse lighting is a modification to the aircraft lighting that pulses lights at a specific frequency and pattern. Wildlife may be able to detect the aircraft sooner, resulting in increased avoidance time.

6.6.3 Flashing light patterns are produced by displaying one or more moving shapes on LED screens. There are different combinations of moving patterns that can be used according to the targeted species. The continuous movement of the pattern may induce a sense of discomfort in birds which move away from the light-emitting screens. This repellent device depends on the ability of wildlife to see the device and is affected by the size of the screen and the landscape of the aerodrome.

6.7 DATABASE

Databases should be implemented at aerodromes in order to keep record of wildlife incidents (see definition in Chapter 1, 1.3.4) and allow aerodrome operators to draw conclusions and trends based on these data. Database management can be as simple as using electronic spreadsheets or can be more complex with other intricate systems. Databases should be connected with reporting systems so that aerodrome personnel can input data directly into the database. Data can then be easily extracted and manipulated in order to produce reports and draw trends and conclusions about wildlife incidents. The aerodrome should ensure that these results are reflected in an updated risk assessment when necessary.

Chapter 7

TRAINING

7.1 TRAINING REQUIREMENTS

7.1.1 An aerodrome operator should adequately train their wildlife hazard control personnel and managers in wildlife hazard management. This training should be conducted by competent wildlife hazard control personnel or specialists with proven experience in this field in accordance with recognized competency-based training principles.

7.1.2 A State should prepare and distribute guidelines for the training of aerodrome wildlife management personnel.

7.1.3 An aerodrome operator should ensure that wildlife management personnel are competent. Competency is the combination of skills, knowledge and attitude required to perform a task to the prescribed standard. Potential wildlife management personnel should complete a training programme and be tested, and the results recorded and kept on file. This record-keeping period may be defined by local and national regulations. In the absence of such regulations, records should be kept long enough to provide proof of competency.

7.1.4 Recurrent training should be carried out to ensure that personnel are kept up-to-date with any changes in wildlife hazard management at the aerodrome. Recurrent training is recommended to be completed at least every two years.

7.2 CONTENT OF A TRAINING PLAN

7.2.1 When training personnel for wildlife hazard management, the topics mentioned in the *Procedures for Air Navigation Services - Aerodromes* (PANS-Aerodromes, Doc 9981), Part II, Appendix 1 to Chapter 6, should be covered and may also include, but are not limited to:

- a) nature and extent of the wildlife management problem;
- b) management of hazardous wildlife and their habitat;
- c) national and local regulations, standards and guidance material related to aerodrome wildlife hazard management programmes;
- d) overview of aerodrome WHMP;
- e) wildlife ecology and biology;
- f) wildlife identification and observation, including the use of field guides and wildlife survey methods;
- g) protected species, including related regulations and policies;
- h) documentation, identification, and reporting measures of wildlife strikes;

- i) off-aerodrome land use issues;
- j) wildlife removal techniques;
- k) safe use of firearms, hazardous materials;
- l) stakeholder involvement;
- m) importance of awareness and outreach programmes; and
- n) basic principles of the safety management system (SMS) and how they apply to aerodrome wildlife hazard management (See the manual on *Flight Safety and Volcanic Ash* (Doc 9974) and the *Safety Management Manual* (Doc 9859)).

7.2.2 Within the aerodrome, personnel may require different levels of training depending on their role within the WHMP.

7.2.3. Wildlife personnel should also have the necessary competencies to operate on the aerodrome. These competencies can be found in the *Procedures for Air Navigation Services - Aerodromes* (PANS-Aerodromes, Doc 9981).

7.2.4 Personnel appointed to provide training in wildlife management at the airport should ultimately be determined by the airport operator. They should be able to demonstrate proven competence in the field of work and produce evidence that they have completed a formal course of instruction combined with professional experience.

Chapter 8

OPERATIONAL NOTIFICATIONS

8.1 GENERAL

8.1.1 Operational notifications include active correspondence addressing wildlife issues on or near an aerodrome, notifications and alerts. Protocols allowing clear, concise communication should be established prior to the implementation of operational notifications and included within the training requirements for personnel involved with wildlife management. This becomes especially important during active control of wildlife hazards and emergencies. Personnel and offices responsible for wildlife hazard management should be identified for ease of contact during both day and night.

8.1.2 Personnel involved with data collection, surveys, patrols, wildlife control and emergency responses should work closely with air navigation services provider (ANSP) personnel. Wildlife controllers should coordinate with the ANSP when necessary to ensure that the movements of dispersing wildlife will not affect aircraft.

8.1.3 Clear and precise procedures should be developed for ATC and controllers should be trained such that they are able to give specific and timely information to pilots and wildlife control crews to avoid identified hazards. Operational standards for procedures and training protocols should be uniformly developed and implemented among States.

8.1.4 Pilots have the authority to alter flight operations when hazard advisories are issued. Training in procedures for such altered flight operations based on these data should be provided by airlines and developed and monitored by State regulatory agencies.

8.1.5 Data from predictive models and remote-sensing systems, where available, should be shared with all entities responsible for reducing wildlife strike hazards, including aerodrome operations personnel, ATC, airlines, pilots and regulators. Communications procedures and regulatory oversight are necessary to ensure the timely exchange of information and proper responses to hazard advisories. Data from models and remote-sensing systems can be supplied at varying levels of detail to different agencies. For example, aerodrome operations and wildlife control personnel will need detailed and specific information on the level of hazard and the specific time and location of the detected or predicted hazard to appropriately respond with control or dispersal equipment. The ANSP will need to be advised when there is a potential wildlife hazard and may provide this information to pilots (see the *Procedures for Air Navigation Services — Air Traffic Management* (PANS-ATM, Doc 4444).

8.1.6 Data links are available through wireless computer systems or cellular phone technology to alert individuals and agencies that can respond to hazard advisories. Data links to specific aerodrome operations, including their vehicles, are currently available in numerous States and aerodromes. Links to ATC should be established with appropriate audio or visual triggers when threshold levels are met. Uplinks to aircraft are possible with existing communications networks, in either voice or digital formats, should action from pilots be necessary.

8.1.7 The continual dissemination of general warnings for extended periods of time should be avoided. General warnings such as “birds in the vicinity of the aerodrome” offer little information to aid pilots and eventually may be ignored if not updated with more specifics.

8.1.8 Drivers should follow the procedures for their particular aerodrome when reporting sightings of wildlife, with respect to the correct use of radiotelephony and standard phraseology. Their reports may include more specific information such as:

- a) large flock of birds on grass north of taxiway Bravo; and
- b) feral dog in vicinity of runway 17 and taxiway Charlie.

8.1.9 Essential aerodrome information is information regarding the manoeuvring area and its associated facilities which is necessary to ensure the safe operation of aircraft. Essential aerodrome information is passed to aircraft whenever possible prior to start-up or taxi and prior to the commencement of final approach. For example:

- a) caution large flock of birds north of runway 27 near taxiway A; and
- b) wildlife 1, permission to disperse flock of geese at approach end of runway 09.

8.2 AUTOMATIC TERMINAL INFORMATION SERVICE (ATIS)

8.2.1 ATIS is a continuous broadcast of recorded aeronautical information for aerodromes and their immediate surroundings. ATIS broadcasts contain essential information, such as current weather information, active runways, available approaches, wildlife hazards and any other information required by the pilots. The broadcasts indicate significant (moderate or severe) wildlife activity, as reported by an approved agency that presents temporary hazards on the ATIS broadcast. Pilots take notice of available ATIS broadcasts before contacting the local control unit, which reduces the controllers' workload and relieves frequency congestion.

8.2.2 The recording is updated in fixed intervals or when there is a significant change in the information. ATIS broadcasts involving wildlife should be timely and specific as defined in the *Procedures for Air Navigation Services — Air Traffic Management* (PANS-ATM, Doc 4444). Pilots do not need to know species-specific information but they do need to know general descriptive information detailing size and number of animals, locations and timing of occurrence. Examples include:

- a) large birds on approach to Runway 32 between 500 - 2,000 feet AGL;
- b) deer observed near threshold of Runway 05R; and
- c) flocking birds on airfield.

8.3 NOTICE TO AIRMEN (NOTAM)

8.3.1 A NOTAM is a notice distributed by means of telecommunication containing information concerning the establishment, condition or change in any aeronautical facility, service, procedure or hazard, the timely knowledge of which is essential to personnel concerned with flight operations. They can communicate persistent bird and wildlife hazards and can be mandatory or advisory in nature. Examples of NOTAM subjects include changes in hours of operations, hazards such as pavement issues, wildlife, snow, surface conditions, and others. NOTAMs are effective at providing seasonal wildlife alerts when bird migration or nesting occurs and can also provide useful information concerning the presence of threatened or endangered species.

8.4 PILOT REPORT

A pilot report may be filed to indicate encounters with hazardous wildlife. The pilot reports are short-lived warnings providing immediate information on pilot observations that are transmitted in real time to ANSPs. Large animals near active surfaces, soaring vultures and raptors within approach and departure corridors and waterfowl such as geese feeding in grassy areas next to runways, are all examples of timely reports generated by pilots.

8.5 AERONAUTICAL INFORMATION PUBLICATION (AIP)

Additional information at aerodromes, such as an indication of bird concentrations at the aerodrome, together with an indication of significant daily movement between resting and feeding areas, to the extent practicable, and charts related to bird concentrations in the vicinity of the aerodrome, should all be included in the Aeronautical Information Publication (AIP).

Note.— More information on the contents of the Aeronautical Information Publication is available in the Procedures for Air Navigation Services — Aeronautical Information Management (PANS-AIM, Doc 10066), Appendix 2.

Chapter 9

WILDLIFE HAZARD MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME

9.1 AERODROME WILDLIFE HAZARD MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME (WHMP)

9.1.1 Introduction

9.1.1.1 A wildlife hazard management programme (WHMP) is a method for aerodrome operators to adopt reasonable wildlife risk control measures, address features that may attract wildlife, control the presence of wildlife on, and in the vicinity of, the aerodrome. A WHMP should be developed based on the wildlife hazard risk assessment, according to the size and complexity of the aerodrome.




Figure 9-1. Wildlife hazard management programme process

9.1.1.2 An aerodrome should establish procedures for data collection, risk analysis and the implementation of wildlife control measures. Aerodrome personnel should be competently trained in wildlife hazard management with well-defined roles and responsibilities.

9.1.1.3 The WHMP should not only consider the establishment of internal actions specific to the aerodrome operator. For it to be effective, involving different stakeholders and external entities throughout its development will be needed, since they may be linked to the presence of wildlife, attracting habitats, land use, etc.

9.1.1.4 Wildlife hazards on, and in the vicinity of, the aerodrome are constantly changing due to modifications in land use, management policies, and environmental factors. In addition, wildlife can adapt or habituate to control strategies that were once effective, or they might develop new behavioural or feeding patterns on, or near, the aerodrome. These factors can affect the efficacy of the WHMP's success.

9.1.1.5 The WHMP should be reviewed if changes to wildlife hazards are observed (e.g. planned land use changes, significant strike event, new wildlife species observed, operational changes, etc.) and at a minimum, this review should occur annually. The WHMP should be revised as necessary.

9.1.1.6 A WHMP should include, as a minimum:

- a) a description of the organization of the WHMP;
- b) the roles and tasks of aerodrome personnel involved with the WHMP;
- c) a description of the aerodrome operations;
- d) procedures including means and aerodrome personnel for collecting, reporting and recording data on observed wildlife and wildlife strike events;
- e) a wildlife safety risk assessment method and procedure (including annual reviews);
- f) procedures, means and personnel for habitat and land management;
- g) procedures, means and personnel for the expelling, deterring and removing of wildlife, including lethal means where appropriate;
- h) procedures for coordinating with internal and external stakeholders;
- i) procedures, means and provisions for the training of aerodrome personnel; and
- j) procedures and performance indicators to monitor the mitigation measures applied and assess their effectiveness, as well as the effectiveness of the WHMP itself (in terms of increase or decrease on the wildlife strike risk level).

9.1.2 Roles and tasks in the WHMP

9.1.2.1 The WHMP should detail the roles and tasks of all aerodrome personnel who:

- a) develop and implement the WHMP;
- b) oversee the daily activities (detailed in the sections below);
- c) record wildlife (presence and movements);

- d) record and analyse the collected data (observations, wildlife strikes, etc.);
- e) carry out periodic surveys, wildlife studies and safety risk assessments to develop and implement the WHMP;
- f) manage the habitat to reduce the attractiveness of identified areas, if relevant;
- g) expel, deter and remove hazardous wildlife;
- h) report wildlife strikes to the CAA and ICAO;
- i) coordinate with stakeholders and external entities;
- j) evaluate and update the WHMP as needed; and
- k) for any other reason, is involved in wildlife hazard management.

9.1.2.2 In addition to the previous responsibilities, the aerodrome operator should appoint a wildlife manager or coordinator who will coordinate all tasks related to wildlife hazard management associated to the WHMP.

9.1.2.3 With regard to the wildlife control personnel at the aerodrome, if they do not cover the operating hours of the aerodrome, it should be indicated which groups would be in charge of wildlife control in their absence.

9.1.2.4 Further information about roles and tasks regarding stakeholders are in Chapter 2, Stakeholders.

9.1.3 Collecting, reporting and recording data on wildlife strikes and observed wildlife

9.1.3.1 Collected data should be as accurate and reliable as possible since it will help identify hazards at the aerodrome and within its vicinity.

9.1.3.2 The WHMP should refer to the protocols or communication procedure between the different stakeholders present at the aerodrome involved in detection, recording, collecting and reporting of wildlife observations and strikes.

9.1.3.3 The aerodrome operator should ensure that there is a process for rapid communication among those involved in wildlife control as well as with ATC and airlines. This is necessary when a specific wildlife hazard is present to allow the issuance of appropriate warnings to aircraft operating on, and within the vicinity of, the aerodrome, by the ANSP.

9.1.3.4 It should also be indicated what means and procedures the aerodrome operator uses to collect and identify species by feathers, animal remains, DNA analysis, etc.; as well as the personnel involved in the previous activities.

9.1.3.5 More information about how wildlife surveys should be conducted and how wildlife incidents should be recorded and reported is available (See Chapter 2, 2.2.4 Collecting, reporting and recording data on wildlife incidents and observed wildlife).

9.1.4 Wildlife safety risk assessment

9.1.4.1 The data collected and recorded throughout the year should be used to carry out a wildlife risk assessment (see Chapter 3).

9.1.4.2 The results and conclusions of the wildlife risk assessment should be documented in the WHMP and provide information about the hazardous wildlife species and their presence. This will help identify which are the most sensitive areas of the aerodrome and its vicinity, since areas with high presence of wildlife may coincide with aircraft flight paths.

9.1.4.3 The aerodrome operator should prioritize its wildlife management depending on the level of risk. Mitigation measures should be applied to species with the highest risk.

9.1.5 Wildlife hazard management measures

9.1.5.1 The aerodrome operator should apply measures for habitat and land use management, to prevent the entry of wildlife at the aerodrome and to expel or eliminate the wildlife currently present within the aerodrome.

9.1.5.2 The WHMP should include the resources used to perform wildlife management tasks (e.g. vehicles, pyrotechnics, traps, etc.). Personnel in charge of habitat and wildlife management, and personnel responsible for carrying out the preventive and corrective measures should be indicated. Further information about these measures can be found in Chapter 4, Habitat management and Chapter 5, Management of hazardous wildlife.

9.1.5.3 All different mitigation measures should be included in the WHMP, enabling appropriate assessments throughout the year.

9.1.5.4 It is advisable that each measure in the WHMP include the following information, at a minimum,:

- a) species and risk activity targeted;
- b) type and description of mitigation;
- c) technical details;
- d) implementation period and time frame;
- e) personnel responsible for its application; and
- f) results and effectiveness.

9.1.5.5 Each measure should have an appropriate performance indicator, i.e. a specific measurable characteristic that can assess its effectiveness.

9.1.5.6 Some examples of performance indicators are provided below:

Example 1

Issue: The buzzard population at Aerodrome X increased despite habitat management, resulting in an increased risk. The main food source for the buzzards was identified as small rodents. Rodenticide was introduced on the aerodrome to reduce the number of rodents as food source for buzzards.

Indicators: the number of buzzards on the aerodrome; the number of rodents on the aerodrome; the mass of rodenticide used; the number of buzzard strikes.

Example 2

Issue: Cracks and cavities are found in the terminal building. Increased number of swifts and pigeons are nesting and sheltering. The aerodrome operator introduces netting in these cavities to prevent access.

Indicators: number of cracks or cavities detected; number of cracks or cavities covered; number of nests in the cavities; number of birds in the cavities; amount of faeces found in the cavities.

9.1.6 Coordination with stakeholders

9.1.6.1 The WHMP should include a description of the communication, cooperation and coordination mechanisms with all relevant stakeholders; especially with those involved in activities that may encourage the presence of wildlife (crop harvesting, water features, pigeon racing, landfills, hunting, etc.).

9.1.6.2 Wildlife hazard management mitigation measures undertaken by external stakeholders in the vicinity of the aerodrome should be recorded, monitored and evaluated in the aerodrome WHMP.

9.1.6.3 Further information about stakeholders can be found in Chapter 2.

9.1.7 Personnel training

9.1.7.1 The WHMP should include training information for:

- a) wildlife control personnel; and
- b) those responsible for WHMP development and implementation.

9.1.7.2 The WHMP should include procedures for the initial and recurrent training of personnel involved in wildlife control and in wildlife hazard management.

9.1.7.3 Further information about training contents and requirements can be found in Chapter 7, Training.

9.1.8 Self-evaluation

The aerodrome operator should have a procedure to evaluate at least the following aspects periodically:

- a) proper implementation of tasks and responsibilities regarding wildlife control;
- b) adequate functioning of communication protocols;
- c) correct identification of the most hazardous species and attracting areas; information is updated periodically and appropriately;
- d) effective collection and recording of data (including the protocol for collecting animal remains and identification of wildlife strikes);
- e) accuracy and effectiveness of the reporting system;
- f) state of implementation and effectiveness of each mitigation measure;
- g) periodic coordination with stakeholders (wildlife local committees, working groups, etc.) according to schedule; and
- h) occurrence of appropriate wildlife training according to schedule.

9.2 WILDLIFE HAZARD MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME EVALUATION

9.2.1 The aerodrome operator should evaluate the effectiveness of the WHMP annually, at minimum. Changing conditions on the aerodrome, both operational and ecological, personnel performance and outdated procedures may be identified during this evaluation, prompting a review of the WHMP.

9.2.2 WHMP evaluation may have several levels of complexity and detail, and may consist of simple responses to basic checklists, or establishing a quantifiable measurement system, which includes leading and lagging indicators and qualifications, from which it will be considered if the WHMP is working well or if it needs to be improved.

9.2.3 The most basic level of WHMP evaluation should be to respond affirmatively or negatively to questions contained therein. If the answers to those questions are negative or unclear, measures should be established to address shortcomings. Basic questions may include:

- Are wildlife management roles, tasks and responsibilities adequately established at the aerodrome? Is the “wildlife manager or coordinator” considered in the WHMP?
- Is there a proper communication procedure between the different stakeholders to alert about the presence of strikes with wildlife?
- Are the wildlife management personnel aware of the species that pose a risk to air traffic and about attractive areas for wildlife at the airport and its vicinity?
- Are wildlife observations and strikes recorded and reported properly? What is the average of identification of species on wildlife strikes?
- Does the WHMP include an appropriate wildlife risk assessment conducted by competent personnel?
- Are habitat management measures and measures of dispersion and extraction of wildlife taken at the aerodrome? Is the effectiveness of these measures measured?
- Is there coordination with external stakeholders? Are regular meetings held with them? Is the local wildlife committee effective?
- Is training on wildlife management given to personnel involved in wildlife management (at all different levels)?
- Is the self-evaluation of the WHMP being performed?

9.2.4 Once this base is established, complexity can be increased by asking more specific questions to determine the degree of compliance.

- Has a land use plan been established with regard to effective land use on and off the aerodrome, as it pertains to the WHMP?
- What ecological measures are implemented to reduce wildlife attractiveness at the aerodrome and in the vicinity?
- Are garbage dumps forbidden around the aerodrome? If yes, within what distance are they forbidden?
- Is the aerodrome fence suitable to prevent hazardous wildlife incursions?
- Which repellent methods are implemented at the aerodrome?

- Are aerodrome personnel employed and trained specifically to control and disperse wildlife at the aerodrome?
- What is the wildlife strike rate at the aerodrome over the last five years (with or without damage to the aircraft)?
- Is there a procedure to regularly collect information about wildlife on, and in the vicinity of, the aerodrome, both dead and living?
- Has a procedure for the positive identification of wildlife remains been established?
- How many reports from pilots are related to intrusions of wildlife, other than birds, over the last five years?
- Has a list of wildlife attractants at, and in the vicinity of, the aerodrome been completed?

9.2.5 The foundation for these evaluations is the maintenance of consistent records of wildlife presence, wildlife control activities and wildlife incidents. Using a standardized format for all record keeping allows for an easy compilation of events and activities into monthly and annual statistical and narrative summaries. Once these summaries are available, objective examinations and comparisons of trends in strikes, wildlife activities, control methods deployed, and other factors can be made. Examples of systematic documentation procedures include: daily logs of wildlife activities, surveys, patrols, wildlife strikes with aircraft and wildlife control activities.

9.2.6 The most rigorous and systematic method to know how well wildlife is being managed at the aerodrome would be to use a performance measurement mechanism. Performance indicators (parameters used for monitoring and assessing performance) are select metrics that are most closely aligned with the ultimate goal of reducing wildlife risks, and will help to assess if the wildlife hazard is adequately managed by the aerodrome operator.

9.2.7 Performance indicators should be metrics obtained and measured in a simple way, and which are clear about what they measure. They can be primary (lagging) or secondary (leading) indicators.

9.2.8 Primary (lagging) indicators measure events that have already occurred. They are also referred to as outcome-based indicators and normally represent, but not always, the negative outcomes the organization is aiming to avoid. Secondary (leading) indicators measure processes and inputs being implemented to improve or maintain performance. These are also known as activity or process indicators as they monitor and measure conditions that have the potential to lead to or contribute to a specific outcome.

9.2.9 Lagging indicators are typically output oriented, easy to measure but hard to improve or influence (e.g. number of wildlife strikes), while leading indicators are typically input oriented, hard to measure and easy to influence (e.g. number of repellent activities).

9.2.10 Although there has generally been a tendency to use lagging indicators (number of wildlife strikes related to aircraft movements, percentage of strikes resulting in damage or effect on flight, etc.) as measures of the effectiveness of a WHMP, leading indicators are good indicators as well. They show how personnel are performing their tasks and how the system is prepared to prevent the worst events (incidents and accidents) from happening, through good safety practices, correct use of procedures, etc.

9.2.11 Some leading indicators for evaluating a WHMP would be:

- a) presence of wildlife at the aerodrome;

- b) completeness of wildlife strike reports;
- c) completeness of wildlife management logs;
- d) percentage of wildlife species identification in strike events;
- e) percentage of personnel receiving wildlife management training;
- f) percentage of wildlife management actions completed; and
- g) frequency of meetings of wildlife committees.

9.2.12 An ideal performance measurement will take into account both primary and secondary indicators. In order to use these metrics, it is essential to have an accurate historical record of all activities and events that belong to wildlife hazard management.

9.3 CAA EVALUATION OF WILDLIFE HAZARD MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME EFFECTIVENESS

9.3.1 The CAA should evaluate the WHMP to ensure the effective and efficient mitigation of wildlife hazards. CAAs may be able to identify gaps in the WHMP and should ensure that the WHMP complies with any regulations.

9.3.2 CAAs can evaluate the programme's effectiveness and determine its compliance with regulations by conducting periodic inspections and audits. The CAA may use evaluation questionnaires similar to those indicated in 9.2, Wildlife hazard management programme evaluation.

9.4 CAA EVALUATION OF THEIR SAFETY OVERSIGHT SYSTEM FOR WILDLIFE HAZARD

9.4.1 The CAA should have a national plan for wildlife hazard management as part of the State Safety Programme. This plan may include regulations, the publication of guidance material, outreach, research, data collection and partnerships with the goal of reducing wildlife risk.

9.4.2 The CAA should measure the effectiveness of the oversight of aerodromes and aviation safety in general as described in the *Safety Management Manual* (Doc 9859). With respect to wildlife hazards to aviation, this may include reviews of its methods to address wildlife hazards.

9.4.3 The CAA should ensure that the personnel involved in wildlife hazard oversight activities are properly trained (See Chapter 2, 2.5, Civil Aviation Authorities). If the CAA is not able to conduct a review itself, it may look for external assistance (other countries, other national wildlife committees) to determine if the guidance is sufficient.

9.4.4 The CAA should have procedures in place to determine compliance with wildlife strike reporting requirements. The CAA should evaluate the quality and quantity of the wildlife strike reporting data. The CAA can identify deficiency trends and ultimately improve wildlife strike reporting.

9.4.5 The CAA should analyse and summarize their strike records to determine not only the quantity of those records but their quality as well. There are a number of methods used to determine how best to evaluate the effectiveness of wildlife strike reporting and the ultimate reduction in damaging strikes; some use a simple ratio between damaging vs. non-damaging strikes, or a number of damaging strikes per aircraft operations, or total mass of wildlife struck rather than the number of strikes incurred.

9.4.6 The effectiveness of the CAA can be measured by assessing the number of aerodromes that have implemented a successful WHMP.

— END —

ISBN 978-92-9258-972-1



9

789292

589721