IGOM scope

The IATA Ground Operations Manual (IGOM) defines basic ground handling procedures for airlines and ground service providers to ensure ground operations activities are safely and efficiently accomplished. The objective is to provide a complete set of standards to be adopted by operators, service providers and airports, as needed or comprehensively.

The IGOM scope includes ground operations procedures that cover:

- Passenger Handling Procedures
- Baggage Handling Procedures
- Aircraft General Safety/Servicing Procedures
- Aircraft Turn-around
- Load Control
- Airside Safety Operational Oversight

For more details please refer to the IGOM content.

IGOM Implementation

Introduction

In 2017 the IATA Operations Committee (OPC) established the Ground Operations Group (GOG) as an advisory body on all matters related to ground operations safety with the aim of reducing ground damages and injuries as well as improving operational efficiency. Within this mandate, the OPC has requested GOG in cooperation with IATA to develop an action plan for IGOM global acceptance.

The GOG in cooperation with the IGOM Technical Group has been reviewing the IGOM content on an annual basis ensuring its requirements are up-to-date, relevant, and responding to the latest industry practice.

The GOG reconfirmed the following benefits:

a) IGOM global adoption increases the level of standardization and harmonization of ground operations processes and procedures
b) IGOM implementation positively impacts the safety performance
c) It mitigates a potential regulatory control and simplifies the global oversight of ground operations services
d) IGOM serves as an industry baseline and benchmark for implementation of harmonized operational procedures to support the developing regions
e) IGOM provides an industry ready-made solution for ground operations

However, it has been recognized by ground operations stakeholders that industry safety solutions shall be implemented as performance-based requirements that focus on desired, measurable outcomes, rather than prescriptive processes, techniques, or procedures. As such, GOG has identified the need of
certain organizations to deviate from IGOM requirements in order to support specific company needs, policies and operational requirements, while mitigating safety risks.

To recognize the latest industry trends and practices while also aiming to achieve standardization and harmonization of ground operations processes, GOG recommends the following policies:

**Demonstration of IGOM adoption**

An operator/provider should conduct a gap analysis between their GOM and IGOM to ensure a complete set of procedures exists for the applicable operations.

A list of variations (if applicable) should be maintained by the operator for:

- Communication to providers (as applicable); and
- Provider’s management and performance measurement.

A list of variations (if applicable) should be maintained by the provider for:

- Communication to operator (as applicable);
- Management of respective customer airlines’ relationship, and
- Awareness of local operational/regulatory variations imposed by respective authorities.

When a variation from an IGOM “safety critical” procedure is identified, such variation should be risk reviewed, assessed and accepted by the operator/provider as per its own SMS specifications.

**IGOM Safety Critical procedures**

The IGOM Technical Group (TG) is in the process of undertaking a risk assessment of the entire IGOM, to determine which of the IGOM procedures are considered to be “safety critical”.

The “Risk Assessment Matrix” and the “Safety Severity Levels”, as published in the Airport Handling Manual (AHM), are utilized in this determination.

IGOM procedures that fall within the “red zone” defined as 5A, 5B, 5C, 4A, 4B and 3A were identified as “safety critical” (refer to Annex A). In future the safety operational procedures within the IGOM will be periodically reviewed and evaluated utilizing the data provided by the industry through Global Aviation Data Management (GADM).

This approach will allow to measure the effectiveness of the existing procedures and will drive the continuous improvement.
Auditing Conformance Criteria (to be reviewed by IOC and GOC)

IOSA
The GRH 1.6.9 would be assessed as in conformity if the following criteria are met:

- An operator has completed and maintained updated a gap analysis between IGOM and company GOM (as applicable to the operator’s scope of operations) to ensure a complete set of procedures exists for the applicable operations.
- IGOM “safety critical” procedures only (red ones) are to be risk reviewed, assessed and accepted by the operator as per its own SMS specifications.
A list of variations (if applicable) should be maintained.

NOTES:
1. The operators that have not adopted the IGOM will still be able to be in conformity with the IOSA GRH provisions with the only exception of GRH 1.6.9.
2. GRH 1.6.9 is a recommended practice and conformity with it is not a mandatory condition for closing the IOSA audit and obtaining the IOSA Registration.
3. The auditing should be simplified for those operators that have adopted IGOM as IGOM procedures represent an acceptable means of conformance to some GRH ISARPs.
4. The IOSA GRH TG is progressing on identifying all safety critical procedures in the IGOM to ensure that the IOSA GRH section will gradually be aligned and consistency is improved. Full alignment is expected to be spread over multiple revisions of the IOSA Standards Manual (ISM) (estimated 2-3 years). Additionally, the IGOM will be referenced as an acceptable means of compliance in certain IOSA standards and recommended practices.

ISAGO
As of 2019, the conformity with the ORM 3.2.2 will be established as follows:

Headquarters audit (HQ)
The auditor will be required to review the provider’s processes and procedures. If the GSP declares that they have aligned their processes with IGOM (performed review of IGOM completed gap analysis and made modifications as applicable) the auditor will be able to record the IGOM adoption through auditor actions (auditor actions represent specific IGOM provisions and requirements) for all applicable operational GOSARPs (LOD, PAB, HDL and AGM). If variations to the IGOM procedures are implemented by the GSP, the auditor will review their list and will record this fact in the assessment and executive summary. Once the assessment for the ISAGO operational disciplines is completed the auditor will be able to determine either conformity or non-conformity with the ORM 3.2.2.

The ORM 3.2.2 would be assessed as in conformity if the following criteria are met:

- A provider has completed and maintained updated a gap analysis between IGOM and company GOM (as applicable to the provider’s scope of operations) to ensure a complete set of procedures exists for the applicable operations.
- IGOM “safety critical” procedures only (red ones) are to be risk reviewed, assessed and accepted by the provider as per its own SMS specifications.
- A list of variations (if applicable) should be maintained.

The IGOM provisions will be sampled as per the ISAGO audit scope and content of the audit disciplines.
Station audit (ST)

The auditor will have the HQ audit results available when performing the station audit. The auditor is required to review the HQ assessment. If ORM 3.2.2 is assessed as in conformity (complete IGOM implementation or with variations), the auditor will verify implementation of IGOM processes through mandatory observations and auditor actions (similarly as during the HQ audit the auditor actions and mandatory observations represent specific IGOM provisions and requirements). Once the implementation of the corporate processes is verified the auditor will be able to assess the level of alignment between the HQ and respective station(s), including conformity to IGOM requirements and IGOM and/or local variations, as applicable.

The IGOM provisions will be sampled as per the ISAGO audit scope and content of the audit disciplines.

Any operator that will have access to the ISAGO report will be able to review the details of the providers’ adoption of IGOM requirements including those that were identified as safety critical.

NOTES:

1. The GSPs that have not adopted the IGOM will still be able to conform to the ISAGO Standards and Recommended Practices when documenting and implementing their own company policies, processes and procedures.

2. Specific customer airlines’ requirements (including potential variations from IGOM) will be assessed during the ISAGO audit utilizing sampling methodologies and mandatory observations.

3. ORM 3.2.2. is a recommended practice and conformity with it is not a mandatory condition for closing the ISAGO audit and obtaining the ISAGO Registration and/or Station Accreditation.
### Annex A

#### LEVEL OF SEVERITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Physical Injury</th>
<th>Impact on Environment</th>
<th>Damage to Asset</th>
<th>Impact on Operations</th>
<th>Damage to Company Reputation</th>
<th>Occurred regularly in the Company</th>
<th>Occurred more than once in the Company</th>
<th>Has occurred once in the Company</th>
<th>Known in the Industry</th>
<th>Unknown but possible in the Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1C</td>
<td>1D</td>
<td>1E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor Loss</td>
<td>Limited or local Implications</td>
<td>2A</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>2D</td>
<td>2E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Regional Implications</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>3C</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td>3E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Permanent Disability</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>National Implications</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>4D</td>
<td>4E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>One or more Fatalities</td>
<td>Catastrophic</td>
<td>Catastrophic</td>
<td>Catastrophic</td>
<td>International Implications</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td>5C</td>
<td>5D</td>
<td>5E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROBABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequent</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td>Improbable</td>
<td>Extremely Improbable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- **Green**: Negligible risk
  - No actions required but facts must be recorded.
- **Yellow**: Minor risk
  - Perform any action thought to be possible at local level where reasonably practicable to move risk into green category.
- **Amber**: The risk has to be reduced, as safety ensured. Action shall be taken urgently to reduce the risk by one category.
- **Red**: STOP!!
  - The activity must be stopped immediately or must not be started and urgent action taken to reduce the risk to its lowest reasonably practicable level. Substantial risk, safety not ensured.

**Figure 1: Risk Assessment Matrix**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Physical Injury</th>
<th>Impact on Environment</th>
<th>Damage to Asset</th>
<th>Impact on Operation</th>
<th>Damage to Company Reputation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very light injury, without First Aid intervention. No full day work stoppage. No risk on health. Self repair.*</td>
<td>Product spillage 100% contained with adapted means into direct working area. No ground/water pollution.</td>
<td>No real damage to assets (GSE, platform, tooling, aircraft...) No repair requested*</td>
<td>Impact on operation is not measurable nor visible*</td>
<td>Nothing visible from outside company perimeter. Even internally the company full responsibility cannot be engaged.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor loss</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Limited or local implication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical injury that implied First Aid intervention, but without hospitalization. Cuts, abrasions, minor skin or eye irritations. Work stoppage less than 3 days. May require additional medical support, but health fully recovered with basic treatment.*</td>
<td>Low/restrained impact on direct adjacent area of the working surface. Fully restrained w/o major environment pollution.*</td>
<td>Small identified damage to assets (GSE, platform, tooling), which is not repaired in the next planned maintenance task. No process interruption*</td>
<td>Cycle time of operation is impacted owing to specific measures (additional staff means...)*</td>
<td>Even if visible from outside company direct organization, it is not subject to damage the image of the enterprise.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Regional Implications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two category included: a) Reversible effects with specialist medical treatment: Deep wounds, fractures, scalds burns, respiratory infections, temporary blindness or hearing loss. Over 3 days sick off. b) Irreversible effect: Loss of fingers, toes, damage to eyes, weeks or months off sick*</td>
<td>Issue (spillage/dust/chemicals) contained but there is a light polluting impact on environment, there is limited waste to land*</td>
<td>Damage to assets (GSE, platform, tooling), which will need a repair task in the next few days, that will stop product's usage for less than 1 day. The mean can be operated with specific attention since then. Temporary process interruption*</td>
<td>Cycle time of operation is impacted by a delay from minutes to few hours. Operating revenue is impacted. Known solution and/or extra means will solve the issue</td>
<td>Subject that impacts the company image but repercussions are limited and only visible from direct regional company environment*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Disability</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>National Implications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-explanatory</td>
<td>Harmful/pollutant product spillage/Fire/Dust smokes with impact on third party installation. Ground/Water significant pollution*</td>
<td>Important damage to assets (GSE, platform, tooling) that prevent normal usage of the product and needs a repair urgently. Incidence of this repair task will be more than one week product's immobilization.*</td>
<td>Operations are stopped for max 1 day. Solution are known but cannot be applied to solve the issue w/o impacting significantly normal cycle time/operational revenue*</td>
<td>Issue is contained in the country (national level) but impacts massively the reputation of the company. Loss of reputation (customers, public...)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or More Fatalities</td>
<td>Massive</td>
<td>Massive</td>
<td>Massive</td>
<td>International Implications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|        | Self-explanatory | Huge impact on land/ground/water/air. High uncontrolled | The asset(s) (GSE, platform, tooling) is/are destroyed. No repair possible. | Operations are stopped for several days. Impossibility to further work until | The issue is known at international level and reported largely by media/s. The responsibility of the company can be
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Physical Injury</th>
<th>Impact on Environment</th>
<th>Damage to Asset</th>
<th>Impact on Operation</th>
<th>Damage to Company Reputation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pollutants emission. Explosion, burst. Big damages on third party installations. Nuisance to population (smell, noise…)*</td>
<td>Has/have to be replaced*</td>
<td>solution is found. Big impact on operation revenue value.*</td>
<td>Legally engaged. The company image is degraded automatically because of this event, as it could be preserved by public as negligent, unsafe and faulty company. Overall loss of confidence in the enterprise. Incident will impact negatively for sure the value share and will bring to loss of market share, due to this lack of confidence.*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Safety Severity Levels
IGOM ADOPTION: As per scope of operation, the operator/provider is to perform a gap analysis between own GOM and IGOM

Are there any GAP(s) identified as variation(s)?

Yes

Does the operator/provider intend to maintain the variation(s)?

Yes

Is the variation(s) classified in IGOM as “Safety Critical”? Yes

Conduct RA. Variation(s) to be Risk reviewed, assessed and accepted by the operator/provider’s own SMS specifications

End of Process

No

Align procedures with IGOM

No

Yes

Yes

No