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#### Abstract

Accidents are results of a sum of mishaps and unfortunate occurrences, and are defined as occurrences associated with the operation of an aircraft which takes place between the time any person boards the aircraft with the intention of flight until all such persons have disembarked. We cannot know when are they going to happen, so we should be prepared for actuating correctly for these.

In this project, we are going to make an estimation of the probabilities and the risk of accident focusing in one aircraft, the Airbus 320 family, which includes A318, A319, A320 and A321.

We have divided it into four parts. The first part includes an introduction and a brief description of the Airbus company, and some specifications of each aircraft of the family with some main differences among them. The second part is a definitions section, in which we explain what is an accident and some key words to understand the project, and some concepts like definitions of phases of flight, undesirable events, natures of flight, categories of flight and airplane damages. The third part consist of an analysis of the database we have selected to study, also the analysis of an Airbus report of accidents between years 1958 and 2014, comparing the results of each range of dates. The last part consists on the calculation part, in which we obtain the probabilities of each accident occurred, the measure of the risk and the conclusions.


## Introduction

Mainly, and before starting to carry out this project, it is very important to be aware of the development and the notable growth that such an important industry as aerospace has experimented.

The aerospace industry has become, among other transports like the railway or automobile, one of the safest at the time of make a transportation, either of goods or people, either commercial or military.

The fact of this industry is considered one of the safest is due to all the effort and dedication of a group of organisations, whom are responsible of the regulation of the different laws and rules, as well as procedures, at the time of keep the security and make all the operations in this environment safer and avoiding any type of incident.

But, obviously, and as in any different type of transport, it is possible that some mishaps and unexpected situations could happen, which may imply difficulties at the time of the operations, even reach that point of having an accident.

Table 1 \& Figure 1. 2014 U.S. Transportation Fatalities


If we access to the database of National Transportation Safety Board [1], which is an independent organization of the United States Government whose mission is investigate all different accidents referred to the aviation, automobile and marine fields, we can see some information about the accidents of each transport which have had any fatalities:

As we can check in the graphics above, in the United States, during the 2014, only one percent of the fatalities was resulted in the aviation industry.

The aviation field is very complex due to it is under so much rules and regulations, which ones must be obeyed, in order to all operations are performed as schematised and organised as possible, and avoid any type of incident.

But these accidents do not always depend on the compliance of rules, because there are much more factors what makes the operations safer or not. In this case, I allude to factors like adverse weather, human factors...

Due to this fact, studying carefully each accidents and occurrences which happen in aviation field is very important, because it involves analyse the failures occurred and the causes of them, which let us take some rules and measurements to avoid these accidents happening twice, and getting the accident risk lower at this industry. Also, is important to know that this measurement and rules changes involve economic outlay, therefore we can get an idea of the wealthy of this industry.

Then, anyone could be interested in the risk of accident during a flight, so this is the aim of this project, at which we will examine the risk of accident in particular aircraft. In our case, we have chosen the aerospace company of Airbus, and we will focus on the species A319/320/321 to realise the proper studies.

We will take one database of Airbus accidents found on internet [2], and we will compare it with reports done by Airbus of other years to evaluate the improvements of the security.

But first, we would like to introduce briefly in the history and the considered fleet of Airbus, we will explain some important characteristics of aircrafts under study, and also differentiate the subspecies of each aircraft.

## Airbus' history

Airbus is one of the leaders in aviation field, and with such a high influence. This company, with headquarters on Toulouse, France, has such a wide catalogue of products, which comprise families with a high success.

For getting an idea of how this company works is important to know that it consists of over 55.000 employees around the world. The importance of this company is observed on countries it cooperates with, like United States, Japan, India... It relies with some formation and engineering centres, over 150 services offices around the world, and commercial relations with over 7.700 international suppliers.

The company was founded in 2001 in Toulouse, France, as a Society by Simplify Actions (Société par Actions Simplifiée), and working before as a company responsible for coordination of the assembling, design and sale process.

It started with a memorandum by United Kingdom, Germany and France with the objective of designing a 300 passenger aircraft. After some indecisions by United Kingdom, and the participation of Spanish company CASA, in 1971 it consolidated the committee composed by Aèrospatiale, CASA and Deutsche Aerospace to create EADS, closing the group the incursion of BAE Systems PLC (British Aerospace) in 1979.

The first model created by the committee was the A300 in 1972, which did not have the expected success, even it caused a critical stage in Airbus. Later the A310 was introduced, with smaller size.

In 80s, two more variants of created models were presented, but the most important fact was the appearance of A320 with the innovation of install electrics wires (fly-by-wire), doing it without hydraulic conductions. This model had great success, competing with B737 of Boeing.

Varieties of this model were designed: the A321, higher than A320, and later the A318 and A319, smaller.

In the following section, we are going to focus in this last family of aircrafts, what has been one of the most successful of the company and therefore it has been the objective of this projective.

## Airbus 320 Family

This family comprise 4 types of aircrafts with different variants, depending on the size of the aircrafts, and provides sites for 100 until 240.

## A318

This model offers the
Figure 2. Airbus 318 advantages which characterize the A320 family, and it is the smallest model, with high fuel efficiency, security and comfort.

We will not consider this model in the analysis of the accident risk because we do not have any signals nor information of accidents
 suffered by this airplane type.

## A319

It is a shorten version of A320, only with one aisle. Its transversal section is the same than the rest of the family and is the most width single aisle in the market, so it offers a very high comfort to the public. Moreover, it is the aircraft with more range of the family, due to the possession of the same fuel tanks with less passengers.

Figure 3. Airbus 319


It has 6 emergency exists, or 8 in the configuration with kitchen. The number of passengers varies depending on the selected configuration: 124 with twoclasses system, or a maximum of 156 without kitchens and 2 more emergency exits.

We can distinguish three series of A319:

- A319-100: It is the standard model of A319, but differs with A320 because it is 3.73 meters shorter.
- A319-CJ: It is the executive version, with three additional fuel tanks, increasing its autonomy until 12.000 Km . Its capacity is over 39 passengers.
- A319-LR: This variety is the monoclass executive version, with an autonomy of 8300 Km .

A320
One of the main causes of this airplane has become one of the most successful in market is because be considered as one of the airplanes most comfortable in the short-medium range category. It consists of a wide cabin with one aisle.

Figure 4. Airbus 320
In this case, it has composed by 8 emergency exits, its maximum capacity is 220 passengers and the range goes from 3.100 to 12.000 Km , according to the variant.

We have two species
 of this type:

- A320-100: It is the original version, but the production of it was not very high because the later version was similar, but with reduced weights. Currently, there are no operative aircrafts of this specie due to they have been broken up or collected.
- A320-200: In this aircraft was introduced the modernization of the sharklets (tip device destined to improve the fixed wing airplane efficiency), and the increasing of fuel capacity.

A321
We can characterize this model because of being the model with longest fuselage, with single aisle, and could take up to 185 passengers in two-classes
configuration and a maximum capacity of 220. It has also 8
 emergency exits.

The series of this model are:

- A321-100: It was the first variety of this type, so it was improved to reach the following innovation, the 200 serie.
- A321-200: This specie differs with 100 serie because it has higher range, higher power of the engines and an installation of one or two optional fuel tanks apart from the other two installed yet.

In the next table, we can see some specifications of each model in the family:
Table 2. Specifications of A320 Family

| Models |  |  | A318 | A319 | A320 | A321 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dimensions | Overall length |  | 31.44 m | 33.84 m | 37.57 m | 44.51 m |
|  | Height |  | 12.56 m | 11.76 m |  |  |
|  | Wing span (geometric) |  | 34.10 m | 35.80 m | 35.80 m with Sharklets |  |
|  | Fuselage width |  | 3.95 m |  |  |  |
| Capacity | Pax | Typical seating | 107 | 124 | 150 | 185 |
|  |  | Max | 132 | 156 | 180 | 236 |
| Performance | Range |  | 5750 km | 6950 km with Sharklets | 6100 km with Sharklets | 5950 km with Sharklets |
|  | Max fuel capacity |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { up to } 24 \\ & 210 \text { litres } \end{aligned}$ | up to 24210 <br> (30 190) litres | $\begin{aligned} & \text { up to } 24210 \\ & (27200) \text { litres } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24050(30 \\ & 030) \text { litres } \end{aligned}$ |

And in the diagrams below the evolution of some specifications according to development during the year:

Figure 6. Specifications of A320 Family


As we have said, the length of the aircrafts increases with the model, while the fuselage section is the same for all the models. About the height and the wing span, the A318 differs on a higher height and less wing span, but with minor differences.

Obviously, the capacity of the family gets higher with the model, the same as the size of the aircrafts.

The range, as we have mentioned, is higher for A319 model, and it is cause the higher fuel capacity and less weight than preview models.

It is important to explain why this family has been such a revolutionary and successfully. A great part of this is due to the use of the control system fly-by-wire. This control system is one of the main advantages of Airbus competitiveness. This system replaces conventional controls of manual flight with an electronic interface, so the flight movements are converted to electric signals, and the flight control devices (computers) determine the movements must be effectuated by the actuators of each control surface, resulting on the ordered response.

This control system has upgraded considerably the security in flight, it has reduced the load of pilot working and, mechanic parts...

## Airbus 320neo

Airbus company is developing its last innovation: A320neo (New Engine Option). This new improvement is being applied to other models A319 and A321. The main idea of it is the change of aircraft engines, so aircrafts would reach less fuel consumption and also less impact in the environment.

We can see the demand of this family in the following graphics, using the source [3]:
Figure 7. Orders, deliveries and airplanes in operation


The clear idea we could get from the drawings is the higher demand of the A320 model, and then the demands of the other species. We can also know that the innovation of the new aircrafts has made to the airliners to grow their interests in this new configuration aircrafts. Clearly, the lowest specie demanded of the family is the A318 due to the currently appearance of series A320 and their next innovations.

If we compare the information about the demands of the family with the other families, we can see the following drawing:

Figure 8. Orders, deliveries and airplanes in operation (Families)


Then, with this we check that the family A320 has been the most successful and demanded over all designed and created aircrafts by Airbus.

Taking into account the origin of the different airliners, we could know what is the precedence of the airliners with more demand and operative aircrafts:

Figure 9. Orders, deliveries and airplanes in operation (Continents)


So, it is easy to see that the continents with higher demands are, from the most demanded, the Asiatic, European and North American companies. Under these three continents, we have the companies from Middle East, Latin-American and Africa.

Now, we can also know the airliners with more deliveries and with more active aircrafts until the present:

Figure 10. Orders, deliveries and airplanes in operation (Airliners)




It is possible to check that airliners with higher demand and higher number of operational aircrafts are those whose headquarter are in North America and European continents, and much more in Asia.

## Basic definitions

Before focusing on the topic of the project, we should know some important concepts for wellunderstanding about we are talking.

In first place, the aim of the report is the study of the accident risk of one determined fleet, so we must know so well the concept of accident, what is no the same as incident.

According with International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) [4]:
Accident. An occurrence associated with the operation of an aircraft which takes place between the time any person boards the aircraft with the intention of flight until such time as all such persons have disembarked, in which:
a) a person is fatally or seriously injured as a result of: - being in the aircraft, or - direct contact with any part of the aircraft, including parts which have become detached from the aircraft, or - direct exposure to jet blast, except when the injuries are from natural causes, self-inflicted or inflicted by other persons, or when the injuries are to stowaways hiding outside the areas normally available to the passengers and crew; or
b) the aircraft sustains damage or structural failure which: - adversely affects the structural strength, performance or flight characteristics of the aircraft, and - would normally require major repair or replacement of the affected component, except for engine failure or damage, when the damage is limited to the engine, its cowlings or accessories; or for damage limited to propellers, wing tips, antennas, tires, brakes, fairings, small dents or puncture holes in the aircraft skin; or
c) the aircraft is missing or is completely inaccessible.

Incident. An occurrence, other than an accident, associated with the operation of an aircraft which affects or could affect the safety of operation.

It is important to say that the incidents are always a preview advise of an accident, so that is the importance of studying and prevent them in the future.

Then, it is possible to assume an accident as the transition between status of danger and loss, including human losses. An accident is considered as catastrophe when it carries remarkable losses, like so much fatalities.

About the risk, we could consider so many definitions such as:

- Likelihood that a harmful consequence (death, injury or illness) might result when exposed to the hazard.
- Probability of a future loss.
- Possibility of incurring specified loss (damage) in a definite period of life or during a particular activity due to various kinds of incidents or undesirable events, that may occur in the M-T-E system.

Said this, an accidents could be considered as an undesirable event, defined as an event whose occurrence in the M-T-E system could result in a exposure of danger for a propierty or a human. Then if we do not act correctly, it may carry any loss of damage.

We have talked about the M-T-E system but we have not commented anything about what it consists. This name comes from their three components: Man, Technology and Environment. It consists in a group whose elements may cause any type of undesirable event: by human errors, errors or system wrong performance of the airplane or by natural disasters like storms, hurricanes...

Once these concepts have been explained, we can conclude that for prevailing the security over the danger, we must decrease the risk of accident, and for getting it, the most important thing to do is study all the consequences and all factors which have had influenced in the accident, then we could avoid it in future occasions.

Doing this task is the objective of some organizations whose responsibilities are the reliability and the security in the aviation, so that it has a cooperation between them to establish rules and laws and maintain the security and make possible to avoid any mishap could happen during operation.

Some of these very important organizations are:

- International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) [5]: It consists on a specialized organism under ONU influence, created by United States in 1944. It works with 191 state members and with groups of the industry with the aim of reach the consensus about rules and recommended methods (SARPs) for the international aviation, so that the aviation sector was operationally safe, efficient and protected, economically sustainable and environmental responsible.
- Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) [6]: It is an agency of Transport Department of the United States with the authority of regulate and supervise all civil aviation aspects. It focuses basically on regulations in the United States. It was founded in 1958
- European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) [7]: This organization consist of 32 countries, 4 of them non-belonging to European Union, and was created in 2002, and it has the objective of ensure the maximum security level for the citizens and the environment, make easier the internal market of the aviation...

These three organizations are the some of the most important and influential actually.

Now, we will try to explain the various categories in which we will be able to distinguish and classify the accidents, like the nature flight, the phase of flight in which the occurrence happens, the classification of the accident by the cause of it...

## Nature flight

The first category to study is the nature of the flight. We can distinguish a lot of categories of the nature flights, but we are going to study only the categories which characterize our A-320 family accidents under study. So, we can define the following nature flights:

Domestic Scheduled Passenger: In these flights, the departure and the arrival occur in the same country, and it basically consist on the transport of people for different causes like business, holidays or short-term travels. These flights operate regularly and are planned a long time before.

Domestic Non-Scheduled Passenger: In this case, the flights are also considered to realise the departure and the arrival at the same country to transport passengers, but the difference is that they are not planned with so much time before. We can include in this group flights operated by tour companies, in which the flight ticket is usually included in the price of the package offer and are planned in a brief time, for example, for holiday periods.

International Scheduled Passenger: The definition of this nature type is the same as the domestic scheduled passenger, except that these flights take off and land in different countries.

International Non-Scheduled Passenger: As we can know intuitively, these are flights which departs in one country and land in other different country, and they are planned without so much time before, for example and as I have said before, planned holiday in other country by a company with all the trip organised.

## Phase of flight [8]

If we take the report of the Airbus 320 family accidents between years 1958-2014, we can see the classification of the phases of flight considered by the Airbus company at the time of analyse the accidents, so we will take this classification to our analysis, with some modifications using the ICAO report of data definition standards. We can differentiate the following phases:

Standing (STD): The phase of flight prior to pushback or taxi, or after arrival, at the gate, ramp, or parking area, while the aircraft is stationary.

Taxi (TXI): The phase of flight in which movement of an aircraft on the surface of an aerodrome under its own power occurs, excluding take-off and landing (ICAO Annex 2). We include in this phase:
$\rightarrow$ Pushback/ Towing (PBT): The phase of flight when an aircraft is moving in the gate, ramp, or parking area, not under its own power, but assisted by a tow vehicle.
$\rightarrow$ Power back: The aircraft is reversing under its own power from the parking position.
$\rightarrow$ Taxiing to/from runway: The phase of flight, after reaching the movement area, when the aircraft progresses under its own power to the departure runway, or post-flight moves under its own power after leaving the landing runway.

Take-off (TOF): The phase of flight from the application of take-off power until reaching the first prescribed power reduction, or until reaching the VFR pattern or 1000 feet ( 300 metres) above runway end elevation, whichever comes first or the termination (abort) of the take-off. We will consider in this section:
$\rightarrow$ Take-off run: The phase of flight from the application of take-off power, through the take-off roll and rotation up to 35 feet [12 metres] above runway end elevation or until gear-up selection, whichever comes first.
$\rightarrow$ Rejected take-off: The phase of flight in which any attempt is made to terminate a takeoff between the application of take-off power, through rotation and up to 35 feet [or 12 metres] above the elevation of the runway end (from the point where the decision to abort has been taken until the aircraft begins to taxi from the runway).
$\rightarrow$ Initial climb (ICL): From the end of the Take-off run sub-phase to the first prescribed power reduction, or until reaching 1000 feet above runway elevation or the VFR pattern, whichever comes first.

## En-route (ENR):

Instrument Flight Rules (IFR): From completion of Initial Climb through cruise altitude and completion of controlled descent to the Initial Approach Fix (IAF).

Visual Flight Rules (VFR): From completion of Initial Climb through cruise and controlled descent to the VFR pattern altitude or 1000 feet above runway elevation, whichever comes first.
$\rightarrow$ Climb to cruising level or altitude: Climb to Cruise:
IFR: From completion of Initial Climb to arrival at initial assigned cruise altitude.
VFR: From completion of Initial Climb to initial cruise altitude.
$\rightarrow$ Cruise: The phase of flight from the top of climb to cruise altitude, or flight level, to the start of the descent toward the destination aerodrome or landing site. Any level flight segment after arrival at initial cruise altitude until the start of descent to the destination.
$\rightarrow$ Initial descent:
IFR: Descent from cruise to either Initial Approach Fix (IAF) or VFR pattern entry.
VFR: Descent from cruise to the VFR pattern entry or 1000 feet above the runway elevation, whichever comes first.

Approach (APR): The phase of flight from the outer marker to the to the point of transition from nose-low to nose-high attitude immediately prior to the flare above the runway [IFR]; or [VFR] from 1000 feet ( 300 metres) above the runway end elevation or from the point of VFR pattern entry to the flare above the runway.
$\rightarrow$ Initial Approach: From the Initial Approach Fix (IAF) to the Final Approach Fix (FAF).
$\rightarrow$ Intermediate approach: The phase of flight between the middle approach fix and the final approach fix; or between the end of a reversal procedure or dead-reckoning track procedure and the final approach fix.
$\rightarrow$ Final approach: that part of an instrument approach procedure which commences at the specified final approach fix or point
$\rightarrow$ Missed approach or go-around: From the first application of power after the crew elects to execute a missed approach or go-around until the aircraft re-enters the sequence for a VFR pattern (go-around) or until the aircraft reaches the IAF for another approach (IFR).

Landing (LDG): The phase of flight from the point of transition from nose-low to nose-up attitude, immediately before landing (flare), through touchdown and until aircraft exits landing runway, comes to a stop or when power is applied for take-off in the case of a touch and-go landing, whichever occurs first.
$\rightarrow$ Level off-touchdown: The phase of flight from the point of transition from nose-low to nose-up attitude, just before landing, until touchdown.
$\rightarrow$ Landing roll: The phase of flight from touchdown until the aircraft exits the landing runway or comes to a stop, whichever occurs first.

Therefore, we have a classification above using the Airbus report [9] classification and the data standards of ICAO [10].

## Category [11]

The following classification is made to distinguish the type of the occurrence. We will differ the occurrences with a letter and a number; the letter will indicate the type of the occurrence, and the number will mean the damages suffered depending on the consequences:

Accident, $\boldsymbol{A}$ : The definition is well explained in the section of basic aspects.
Incident, I: It is also explained in the section of basic aspects too.
Hijacking, $\boldsymbol{H}$ : Means the unlawful seizure or wrongful exercise or control of the aircraft (or the crew thereof).

Criminal occurrence, $\boldsymbol{C}$ : In this case, we can consider a criminal occurrence as an action in which a modification or irruption in external operations try to obtain a benefit for yourself. Examples of this occurrences could be a sabotage or a shot down.

Other occurrence, $\boldsymbol{O}$ : Safety occurrences that cannot be defined as 'accident', or 'incident'. Usually these cases involve aircraft being damaged (beyond repair) on the ground as a result of hurricanes, typhoons, sabotage, hangar fires etc.

Hull- loss, 1: Airplane damage that is beyond economic repair. Hull loss / write-off also include events in which:
$\rightarrow$ Airplane is missing.
$\rightarrow$ Search for the wreckage has been terminated without it being located.
$\rightarrow$ Airplane is substantially damaged and inaccessible.
Repairable damage, 2: In this classification, we have the accidents which only need some repairs to make the aircraft available to continue its operations.

## Airplane damage [12]

Now, we can classify the accidents by the amount of damage as a result of the occurrence. We should know:

None: This is the group of the aircrafts which did not suffer any type of damage in despite of the occurrence.

Substantial: Damage or failure that adversely affects the structural strength, performance, or flight characteristics of the aircraft, and which would normally require major repair or replacement of the affected component. Not considered in substantial damage are; engine failure or damage limited to an engine only, bent or dented skin, damage to landing gear (to include wheels and tires), flaps, or wingtips.

Damaged beyond repair: This classification of the accidents involves the group of aircrafts which have not had the possibility of flight beyond repair.

Destroyed: In these accidents, the aircraft is not repairable, or, if repairable, the cost of repairs exceeds $50 \%$ of the cost of the aircraft when it was new.

Minor: Damage that neither destroys the aircraft nor causes substantial damage.

## Classification by the cause (Undesirable events) [13]

Before explaining the last classification of the accidents, is important to know the meaning of a relevant concept: undesirable event, and it will be important in coming sections to study the risks of accidents. An undesirable event could be described as an event, which occurrence in a considered M-T-E system, could result in physical hazard to humans or other ecosystems, wherein these events can be observed with sense data [14].

We are going examine a group of undesirable events which could happen without notice, to know what are the most common undesirable events and which of that we should be awareness to avoid the consequences.

There are a lot of classifications of the accidents causes, or in other words, undesirable events but we have taken a similar classification to the applied in the Airbus accidents report. So, we can differ some events:

System/Component Failure or Malfunction (SCF): Failure or malfunction of an aircraft system or component.

Usage Notes:

- Includes errors or failures in software and database systems.
- Includes failures/malfunctions of ground-based launch or recovery systems equipment.
- Includes all failures/malfunctions, including those related to or caused by maintenance issues.

Abnormal Runway Contact (ARC): Any landing or take-off involving abnormal runway or landing surface contact.

Usage Notes:

- Events such as hard/heavy landings, long/fast landings, off centre landings, crabbed landings, nose wheel first touchdown, tail strikes, and wingtip/nacelle strikes are included in this category.
- Gear-up landings are also recorded here.
- Do not use this category for runway contacts after losing control.
- Occurrences in which the gear collapses during the take-off run or the landing roll are not included here except if a condition in the usage notes above has been met.

Runway Excursion (RE): A veer off or overrun off the runway surface.

Usage Notes:

- Only applicable during either the take-off or landing phase
- The excursion may be intentional or unintentional.
- Use RE in all cases where the aircraft left the runway/helipad/helideck regardless of whether the excursion was the consequence of another event or not.

Loss of Control in Flight (LOC-I): Loss of aircraft control while or deviation from intended flightpath inflight.

- Used only for airborne phases of flight in which aircraft control was lost.
- Loss of control can occur during either Instrument Meteorological Conditions (IMC) or Visual Meteorological Conditions (VMC).

Controlled Flight into Terrain (CFIT): Inflight collision or near collision with terrain, water, or obstacle without indication of loss of control.

Usage Notes:

- Use only for occurrences during airborne phases of flight.
- Includes collisions with those objects extending above the surface (for example, towers, trees, power lines, cable car support, transport wires, power cables, telephone lines and aerial masts).
- Can occur during either Instrument Meteorological Conditions (IMC) or Visual Meteorological Conditions (VMC).
- Includes instances when the cockpit crew is affected by visual illusions or degraded visual environment that result in the aircraft being flown under control into terrain, water, or obstacles.

Ground collision (GC): Collision while taxiing to or from a runway in use.
Usage Notes:

- Includes collisions with an aircraft, person, ground vehicle, obstacle, building, structure, etc. while on a surface other than the runway used for landing or intended for take-off.

Hijack / Terrorism (H): Actions associated with terrorism activities, sabotages...
Fire (FI): Fire or smoke in or on the aircraft, in flight or on the ground, which is not the result of impact.

Usage Notes:

- Includes fire due to a combustive explosion from an accidental ignition source.
- Includes fire and smoke from system/component failures/malfunctions in the cockpit, passenger cabin, or cargo area.
Birdstrike (BS): Occurrences involving collisions / near collisions with birds.
Midair collisions (MAC): Airprox, ACAS alerts, loss of separation as well as near collisions or collisions between aircraft in flight.


## Usage Notes:

- Includes all collisions between aircraft while both aircraft are airborne.
- Both air traffic control and cockpit crew separation-related occurrences are included.

Turbulences (TURB): In-flight turbulence encounter.
Usage Notes:

- Includes encounters with turbulence in clear air, mountain wave, mechanical, and/or cloud associated turbulence.
- Wake vortex encounters are also included here.

Undershoot (USOS): A touchdown off the runway surface.
Usage Notes:

- An undershoot/overshoot of a runway/helipad/helideck occurs in close proximity to the runway/helipad/helideck and also includes offside touchdowns and any occurrence where the landing gear touches off the runway/helipad/helideck surface.

Fuel (F): One or more powerplants experienced reduced or no power output due to fuel exhaustion, fuel starvation/mismanagement, fuel contamination/wrong fuel, or carburetor and/or induction icing.

Explanations:

- Exhaustion: No usable fuel remains on the aircraft.
- Starvation/mismanagement: Usable fuel remains on the aircraft, but it is not available to the engines.
- Contamination: Any foreign substance (for example: water, oil, ice, dirt, sand, bugs) in the correct type of fuel for the given powerplant(s).
- Wrong fuel: Fuel supplied to the powerplant(s) is incorrect, for example: Jet A into a piston powerplant, 80 octanes into a powerplant requiring 100 octane.


## Risk and reliability of Airbus 320 fleet family

Before doing the analysis of our data of the last 20 years, we can make an overview of the accidents data between the years 1958 to 2014, for which the statistical analysis of Airbus Commercial Aviation Accidents [9] between that years are going to be used.

First, we can know by the report that, taking into account that tens of millions of flights each year are realised, the commercial aviation suffers the quantity between 2 and 13 fatal accidents depending on the year. For example, in the years of 2003, 20014 and 2005, the number of fatal accidents was 7,4 and 9 respectively. From these data, we can conclude that the fatal accidents are occurred by many undesirable events, which some of them cannot be predicted.

In the case of the 2014, the number of flights reach 28.4 million, in which there have been 2 fatal accidents ( 0.07 accidents per million flights) and 9 hull-losses ( 0.32 accidents per million flights).

We can see the evolution of the accidents happened during the last years in the following graphs:

So, we can see the obvious idea of the accident rate per million flight decrease, what means that the air transport has become safer yearly.

Figure 11. Yearly accident rate per million flights (Fatal Accidents)


In the case of the fatal accidents per year, is easy to see the variability of the number of fatal accidents. It is due to what we have said before: these accidents are occurred by many undesirable events, so they could appear in any time. But it is important to look at the yearly number of flights: the number of it has increase a lot while the fatal accidents have experimented a decrease, what show the progress in the safety of the air transport.

Figure 12. Yearly accident rate per million flights (Hull losses)


Regarding the hull losses in these years, the tendency of them are the same as the accidents: decreasing yearly and with perceptible changes on fatal accidents.

Considering the phase of flight, in Figure 13, there are also two graphs which show the percentage of fatal accidents and hull-losses respectively:

Figure 13. Accidents by phase of flight: a) Fatal accidents, b) Hull-losses
a)

b)


Both photos show basically the same percentages of the accidents with littles deviations, even if the most of hull-losses happen in the final phase of the flight, during landing, unlike the fatal accidents, where the most of them are occur in approach phase.

In conclusion, nearly $90 \%$ of the accidents in aviation are happened during the final phases of flight, as approach and landing are, also a significant percentage of the accidents are occurred during take-off and initial climb.

If we focus in the undesirable events, we have another two graphs which show the fatal accident (left) and the hull-losses (right):

Figure 14. Percentage of total accidents by undesirable event: a) Fatal accidents, b) Hull-losses


About the fatal accidents, most of the accidents are happened because of Loss of Control in Flight, followed by Controlled Flight into Terrain (CFIT) and the Runway Excursion (RE), while this cause of Runway Excursion (RE) is, in the most cases, the cause of a hull-loss, being the System/ Component Failure or Malfunction (SCF) the second most happened.

Checking these facts, is important to know what are the most repeated causes of the accidents: Loss of Control in Flight (LOC-I), Controlled Flight into Terrain (CFIT) and Runway Excursion (RE). During the last years, the data shows that the first two causes have decreased, however, the third cause keep around constant, with a slight decrease in the hull-loss accidents.

## Database of A319/A320/A321

Now, it is the moment of the analysis of the Airbus Family A320. We are going to study only the accidents of the aircrafts A319/320/321 because of the lack of information of the A318 type. All the data has been got from the website Aviation Safety Network, whose aim is providing everyone with a (professional) interest in aviation with up-to-date, complete and reliable authoritative information on airliner accidents and safety issues [15].

The first task to do is collect all data of the accidents of the three aircrafts types, and classify them by different classifications as we have explained before. Then, we have got the table (It is possible to find it in Annex I), and we have the following categories:

- Date of the Accident
- First flight
- Airplane type and specie
- Occupants of the Aircraft
- Fatalities because of the accident
- Nature of the flight
- Phase of flight where the aircraft was at the during the accident
- Category of the accident
- Airplane Damage
- Undesirable event
- Total airframe hours
- Cycles
- Days flown

Our aim is study the different cases of accidents taken place during the last twenty years, so the first accident we have is in 1997. Until the present day, 106 accidents have been occurred, in which a little amount of that have had any fatality. In the following section, we could see the graph which shows the result.

## Number of accidents

As we have said before, only 12 accidents of 106 have had fatalities, and in that accidents, there are different quantities of fatalities, what we can see in the following graphs:

Figure 15. Percentage of fatal accidents



We have observed that most of the accidents don't have any fatalities, exactly the $88.7 \%$ of the total accidents. In the other hand, the $11.3 \%$ of the accidents have, at least, one fatality. In the diagram on the right, we could confirm that in most of the accidents, all people on board pass away: exactly in 9 accidents (in one of that, the accident caused fatalities also in the ground, that is why the percentage exceeds $100 \%$ ), and in the rest of the accidents, only a quantity of people less than 3\% passed away.

## Accidents by the Aircraft type

We also know what species of the family suffered an accident. The following diagrams show the accidents of different varieties of each aircraft type:

Figure 16. Percentages of accidents by type


About the accidents depending on the aircraft type, the percentage of the A320 accidents is so much greater than the other, and it could be explained with the Airbus orders diagram shown in past sections. The orders of the A320 type are the highest contrasting with the other types, so the probability of having an accident with an A320 is higher if it is the type which operates more commonly.

## Accidents by Nature of flight

The accidents distributed depending on the departure and arrival airport, if these are in the same country or not, or if these flights are planned with ahead of time, are presented in the following diagram:

Figure 17. Percentages of accidents by nature


In this case, we have approximately the same accidents for international and domestic scheduled passenger flights. Most of the flights we take are scheduled in advance, either international or domestic flight. Consequently, the probability of having an accident of a scheduled flight will be higher than for non-scheduled, what are organised for special occasions.

## Accidents by phase of flight

Now, we are going to contrast the accidents occurred in determinate phase of flight, and we could compare this results with the analysis made by Airbus report, mentioned in past sections. First, we should display the picture with phases of flight and their proper percentage:

Figure 18. Percentages of accidents by phase of flight


Clearly, landing is the phase with more problems at the time of realise it. Then, we have similar values of percentages for standing, route, taxi and take-off. In past sections, we observed that the most unfriendly phases to operate without problems were at the end of the flight, I mean, landing and approach, as the above diagram shows. There are also meaningful percentages of accidents during the initial phases.

In conclusion, during the years, the phase of flight which we should be more meticulous is, par excellence, the landing phase. It is possible that never changes, because most of the flight time may be operated with automatic pilot, and the moment when the pilot takes control could be the most probably accident time due to a human error, taking into account also the weather conditions, which could be adverse.

## Accidents by category

In the present section, we will analyse the probability of suffer an accident by a hijack, an accident, an incident... and depending on the losses, if they are considered hull-losses or repairable damage. That being said, let's have a look to the diagram.

Figure 19. Percentages of accidents by category


The greatest category of accident is the group of accidents, which are more common. Within this group, we have a clear vantage of repairable damage above the hull-loss.

Regarding the hijack, none of the accidents cause any hull-loss as contrast to repairable damage, and the criminal occurrences, fire and other situations only induced hull-losses.

## Accidents by aircraft damage

Another way to classify the accidents, as we explained before, is by the damages as result of the accidents, depending on the aircraft conditions after the accident: if it is possible to make the aircraft operate again by reparations, or if the accident is named as hull-loss.

Figure 20. Percentages of accidents by aircraft damage


In this category, the aircrafts which have experienced substantial damages are predominant. We can support this result using the diagram of accidents by category. Most of the aircraft damaged are classify as repairable damage aircraft, it means the aircraft would be prepared to operate again after some reparations or renovations of appropriate pieces, what comes to be a substantial damage.

The following most popular damage is that one that after it the aircraft is recognised as inoperative, followed by minor damages and with equal percentages of destroyed and none damaged.

Concluding, the results say that if the aircraft experienced an accident, probably it suffers substantial damages, or could become inoperative.

## Undesirable events

It is the moment to analyse the undesirable events the aircraft could suffer at any instant of flight. The result if an undesirable event take place could be very dangerous, from beat the adversities to experience a hull-loss, and they appear without any previous notify.

According to the classification taken after, we have the obtained diagram below:

Figure 21. Percentages of accidents by undesirable event


Majority of the accidents are produced by abnormal runway contact, runway excursion or ground collision. Comparing with the information from the Airbus report, the similarity between years 1958-2014 and the last 20 years is the predominant undesirable event of runway excursion.

If we contrast with the report effectuated by Airbus, we can conclude that the accidents due to abnormal runway contact, ground collision, hijack or terrorism have increased, while the cause of loss of control in flight has decreased, which was the predominant between years 1958 to 2014.

If we consider the same categories as Airbus report, which they call it Others, it exceeds the percentage of abnormal runway contact, which is the predominant, with a value of $43.4 \%$. In the category of Others we would include: Ground collision, Hijack/ Terrorism, Fire, Bird, Air collision, Turbulences, Undershoot, Fuel and Unknown categories.

## Lifetime until accident

The last probabilities we are going to calculate are depending on the flight time until the accident. The first task we have done for this category is to estimate the flight hours per day with the accidents we have their flight hours.

To estimate the flight hours per day of the accidents we do not have it, we only should make an average with the flight hours we have. Then, we calculate the operative days of the aircraft, subtracting the date of first flight to the date of the accident. Done it, we would have the lifetime of most of the aircrafts and the total airframe hours. Finally, we have collected all data in two diagrams: one of total airframe hours, and another one with the lifetime until the accident; for this second diagram, we have assumed months with 30 days.

Figure 22. Percentages of accidents by lifetime


Obviously, the results are as we expected. Logically, the probability of having an accident increase with the antiquity of the aircraft and increase as much as airframe hours do. A little quantity of aircrafts exceeds 20 years of life, and the most of them have an accident during their three first years of operation.

It is possible to present a third diagram which shows the number of cycles realized by the aircraft until the accident. We can characterize a cycle as the total number of take-offs and landings at the time of the accident, so we could treat this category as the number of flights. Then, the following picture present the number of aircrafts classify by cycle interval until the accident:

Figure 23. Percentages of accidents by cycles


As we waited for, in most of cases, the aircrafts suffer accidents in their first years of operation, most common between 0 and 20000 flights, while a very little quantity of airplanes reach a high number of flights. Despite this, generally we could consider that these airplanes keep in operation for a long time.

## Analysis of results

In this section, we are going to analyse the probabilities of the accidents, depending on the phase where the aircraft is operating and the undesirable event which excites the accident among others.

It is important to have some assumptions before doing all the calculations, because we are working with so much information and the clarifying of them will be so good for our understanding.

One of the most important task in this project is to know: the total number of flights operated and the number of the accidents happened between two dates. As we have known before, we have taken the information of 20 years, but it is not so right. We started to analyse the data from $1 / 1 / 1997$, that is clear, but we took the data until the last accident, which was in $2 / 4 / 2017$. So, we do not have only 20 years, but we have some days more. The program used is the Microsoft Excel and when we are working with dates, all functions of it treats years of 360 (in our case, we will use 360 days), and months of 30 days. So:

First Date Considered: 1/1/1997 Last Date Considered: 2/4/2017
Using the function DIAS (DAYS in English), the program gives back the dates between that dates, and if we take this days and divide them by 365 (days in one year) we have:

Days Considered: 7396 Years Considered: 20.263
Another task we will need in the future calculations is the obtaining of the average airframe hours per day and cycles per day, and with them, we will be able to estimate the total flights in the considered time. This calculation was explained briefly in the section Lifetime until accident: it is simply to take the difference dates of first flight and the accident to obtain the operation dates, and then divide total airframe hours these operation days to obtain the average airframe hours per day. About the average of cycles per day, we will take the cycles and the operation
days, and following the same process as before, we obtain the cycles per day. Done it, we have got these values:

Average Airframe Hours per Day: 7.2 Average Cycles per Day: 4.2
The next step is to obtain the total number of flights, but first we need the aircrafts which have operated during the last 20 years. Because knowing the number of active aircrafts is a very hard task, and probably we will not get the true amount, we have made our own assumption.

We have consult in so much websites looking for the number of flights of the A-320 Family, and we found one of them, where there was a list with the different A-320 varieties, and their status [16]. So we considered all the aircrafts which were frame between years 1997 and 2017, and whose status was active. Then, we collected the following data:

Table 3. Built and operative airplanes

|  | Built airplanes between 1997 and 2017 | Operative airplanes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A319 | 1488 | 1406 |
| A320 | 4669 | 4190 |
| A321 | 1537 | 1473 |
| Total | 7694 | 7069 |

Finally, the number of total flights will be:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Total flights }=\text { Operative Airplanes } * \text { Days considered } * \text { Average } \frac{\text { Cycles }}{\text { Day }} \\
\text { Total flights }=7069 * 7396 * 4.217=220519022
\end{gathered}
$$

Thus, the number of total flights will be over 220 million, bringing to mind that it is only an approximation, assuming the same number of flights each year, with the same number of active aircrafts.

The last task to start the calculation of probabilities is estimate the number of hours per flight, and the easier way is to divide the averages got before (airframe hours per day and cycles per day), and we would obtain the number of hours per cycle:
№ of hours per Flight/Cycle: 1.740
If we multiply this value with the total number of flights, we could get the total number of flight hours:

Total flight hours: 1.740
That said, we can begin to determine the probabilities of each category.

## Probability of accident

Before start collecting all the probabilities, we need to get the main probability, which one is of having an accident. As we know, we can obtain this probability as:

$$
P(\text { Accident })=\text { Total accidents } / \text { Total flights }
$$

And remembering that the number of accident was 107:

$$
P(\text { Accident })=107 / 220519022=4,85219 * 10^{-7} 1 / \text { Flight }
$$

And calculating it with flight hours:

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(\text { Accident })=\text { Total accidents } / \text { Total flights Hours } \\
P(\text { Accident })=107 / 383732498,4=2.7884 * 10^{-7} 1 / \text { Flight Hour }
\end{gathered}
$$

And with these probabilities, we can calculate the rest. The calculations of probability will be computed with both units: 1/Flight and 1/Flight Hour.

## Probability of accident during each phase of flight

The expression we should apply is the following:

$$
P(\text { Phase of flight })=\% \text { of phase of flight with accidents } * P(\text { Accident })
$$

Now, we apply the formula above for each phase of flight. The percentage of accidents in each phase of flight are shown in the table below:

Table 4. Probability of accident during each phase of flight

| Phase of flight | Accidents (\%) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Approach (APR) | $6,54 \%$ |
| Initial climb (ICL) | $1,87 \%$ |
| Landing (LDG) | $45,79 \%$ |
| Pushback / towing (PBT) | $2,80 \%$ |
| Route (ENR) | $14,95 \%$ |
| Standing (STD) | $11,21 \%$ |
| Take-off (TOF) | $8,48 \%$ |
| Taxi (TXI) | $0,93 \%$ |
| Unknown (UNK) |  |

## Probability of having an accident during Standing (STD)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(S T D)=11.21 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=4.53476 * 10^{-9} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(S T D)=11.21 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=2.60598 * 10^{-9} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Probability of having an accident during Pushback / towing (PBT)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(P B T)=2.8 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=1.36043 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(P B T)=2.8 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=7.81795 * 10^{-9} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Probability of having an accident during Taxi (TXI)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(T X I)=8.41 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=4.08128 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(T X I)=8.41 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=2.34538 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

Probability of having an accident during Take-Off (TOF)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(\text { TOF })=7.48 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=3.6278 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(\text { TOF })=7.48 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=2.08479 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

Probability of having an accident during Initial Climb (ICL)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(I C L)=1.87 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=9.06951 * 10^{-9} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(I C L)=1.87 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=5.21196 * 10^{-9} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

Probability of having an accident during Route (ENR)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(E N R)=14.95 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=7.25561 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(E N R)=14.95 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=4.16957 * 10^{-9} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Probability of having an accident during Approach (APR)

$$
P(I C L)=6.54 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=3.17433 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }}
$$

$$
P(I C L)=6.54 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=1.82419 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
$$

## Probability of having an accident during Landing (LDG)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(I C L)=45.79 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=2.22203 * 10^{-7} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(I C L)=45.79 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=1.27693 * 10^{-7} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

Done it, we can represent the results above with a diagram:
Figure 24. Probability of accident during each phase of flight


In the representation above, we can check the percentages we obtained in last sections: the highest probability to suffer an accident in a flight, is during the landing phase, which one have probability values of $2.222 \mathrm{E}-07$ (1/Flight) and 1.277E-07 (1/Flight Hours). Then the probabilities are more or less the same, being the second highest value in route phase (7.256E-08 1/Flight and 4.17E-08 1/Flight Hours), followed by standing, taxi and approach. At present, he largest problems come at landing phase, and is rarely to have accidents during in route phase due to it is a phase commonly operated by automatic pilot. If we check the data table in Annex I, we could conclude to say that most of the accidents produced in this phase are because of hijacking or terrorist activities.

About the phases we have less probabilities of having an accident are in the initial climb (9.07E09 1/Flight and 5.21E-09 1/Flight Hours) and in the pushback/ towing (1.36E-08 1/Flight and $7.818 \mathrm{E}-091 /$ Flight Hours). The rest of the probabilities are in the table below the diagram.

## Probability of accident by the nature of flight

In this case, we are going to use the following expression:

$$
P(\text { Nature })=\% \text { of accidents with each nature } * P(\text { Accident })
$$

Then, we apply it to each case.
Table 5. Probability of accident by nature of flight

| Nature of flight | Accidents (\%) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Domestic Non Scheduled Passenger | $0,93 \%$ |
| Domestic Scheduled Passenger | $42,06 \%$ |
| International Scheduled Passenger | $38,32 \%$ |
| Int'l Non Scheduled Passenger | $7,48 \%$ |
| Unknown | $10,28 \%$ |
| Test | $0,93 \%$ |

Probability of having an accident with Domestic Non-Scheduled Passenger flight (DNS)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(D N S)=0.93 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=4.53476 * 10^{-9} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(D N S)=0.93 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=2.60598 * 10^{-9} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

Probability of having an accident with Domestic Scheduled Passenger flight (DS)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(D S)=42.06 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=2.04064 * 10^{-7} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(D S)=42.06 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=1.17269 * 10^{-7} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

Probability of having an accident with International Scheduled Passenger flight (IS)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(I S)=38.32 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=1.85925 * 10^{-7} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(I S)=38.32 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=1.06845 * 10^{-7} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

Probability of having an accident with International Non-Scheduled Passenger flight (INS)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(\text { INS })=7.48 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=3.6278 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(\text { INS })=7.48 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=2.08479 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

Probability of having an accident with International Test (T)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(T)=0.93 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=4.53476 * 10^{-9} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(T)=0.93 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=2.60598 * 10^{-9} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

Figure 25. Probability of accident by nature of flight


In the category of nature of flight, we see that the highest probabilities of having accidents are in flights of domestic and international scheduled passenger, being the highest for domestic scheduled flights (2.04064E-07 1/Flight and 1.17269E-07 1/Flight Hours) while international flights have a bit less probability (1.85925E-07 1/Flight and 1.06845E-07 1/Flight Hours). It is because we said in the analysis done in last sections: the most of Airbus aircrafts flights are planned with enough time, and they are not used for charter flights, for example.

The following highest probability by nature is for international flights, but non-scheduled (3.6278E-08 1/Flight and 2.08479E-08 1/Flight Hours). We have also a percentage a bit higher than international non-scheduled flights, but this category consists of unknown nature accidents. For test and domestic non-scheduled, the probabilities are so much low than the highest values.

## Probability of accident by airplane damage

Another analysis of the probability will be done considering the damages suffered by the airplane if it has had an accident. The calculations are going to be done by:
$P($ Airplane Damage $)=\%$ of accidents which cause each damage $* P($ Accident $)$

Table 6. Probability of accident by airplane damage

| Aircraft Damage | Accidents |
| :--- | :--- |
| Damaged beyond repair (DBR) | $14,02 \%$ |
| Destroyed (D) | $8,41 \%$ |
| Minor (MR) | $11,21 \%$ |
| None (NO) | $7,48 \%$ |
| Substantial (S) | $57,01 \%$ |
| Unknown | $1,87 \%$ |

## Probability of having a Damaged Beyond Repair accident (DBR)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(D B R)=14.02 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=6.80213 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(D B R)=14.02 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=3.90897 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Probability of having a Destroyed accident (D)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(D)=8.41 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=4.08128 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(D)=8.41 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=2.34538 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Probability of having a Minor accident (MR)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(M R)=11.21 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=5.44171 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(M R)=11.21 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=3.12718 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Probability of having a None accident (NO)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(N O)=7.48 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=3.6278 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(N O)=7.48 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=2.08479 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

Probability of having a Substantial accident (S)

$$
P(S)=57.01 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=2.7662 * 10^{-7} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }}
$$

$$
P(S)=57.01 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=1.58965 * 10^{-7} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
$$

Figure 26. Probability of accident by airplane damage


In case of accident, as we see in the diagram above, it is easy to say that most of the accidents only cause substantial damages ( $2.7662 \mathrm{E}-071 /$ Flight and $1.58965 \mathrm{E}-071 /$ Flight Hour). The other damages have similar probabilities between them, for example, aircrafts considered damaged beyond repair (6.80213E-08 1/Flight and 3.90897E-08 1/Flight Hour) and Minor damages ( $5.44171 \mathrm{E}-081 /$ Flight and $3.12718 \mathrm{E}-081 /$ Flight Hours). It means that majority of the aircrafts which got hurt, would need any repair or aircraft pieces replacement to continue its operations, and a little amount of that would be considered inoperative or got destroyed, or only suffer minor damages.

The probability of not having any damage is the lowest if we have an accident (3.6278E-08 1/Flight and 2.08479E-08 1/Flight Hours).

## Probability of accident caused by each undesirable event

And the last probabilities to obtain is those what indicates it of an accident caused by an undesirable event. In this section, we will do:

```
P(Undesirable Event ) = % of accidents cause by Undesirable Event * P(Accident)
```

The percentages of them are presented on table 7:

Table 7. Probability of accident by undesirable event

| Undesirable Event | Accidents |
| :--- | :--- |
| Abnormal Runway Contact (ARC) | $25,23 \%$ |
| Birdstrike (BS) | $2,80 \%$ |
| Controlled Flight Into Terrain (CFIT) | $1,87 \%$ |
| Fire (FI) | $4,67 \%$ |
| Fuel (F) | $14,93 \%$ |
| Ground collision (GC) | $14,02 \%$ |
| Hijack / Terrorism (H) | $1,48 \%$ |
| Loss of Control in Flight (LOC-I) | $19,63 \%$ |
| Midair collision (MAC) | $2,80 \%$ |
| Runway excursion (RE) | $1,87 \%$ |
| System/Component Failure or Malfunction (SCF) |  |
| Turbulences (TURB) | $0,93 \%$ |
| Undershoot (USOS) | $0,93 \%$ |
| Unknown |  |

## Probability of Abnormal Runway Contact (ARC)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(A R C)=25.23 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=1.22438 * 10^{-7} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(A R C)=25.23 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=7.03615 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Probability of Birdstrike (BS)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(B S)=2.8 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=1.36043 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(B S)=2.8 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=7.81795 * 10^{-9} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Probability of Controlled Flight into Terrain (CFIT)

$$
P(\text { CFIT })=1.87 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=9.06951 * 10^{-9} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }}
$$

$$
P(C F I T)=1.87 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=5.21196 * 10^{-9} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
$$

## Probability of Fire (FI)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(F I)=4.67 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=2.26738 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(F I)=4.67 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=1.30299 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Probability of Fuel (F)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(F)=0.93 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=4.53476 * 10^{-9} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(F)=0.93 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=2.60598 * 10^{-9} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Probability of Ground Collision (GC)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(G C)=14.95 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=7.25561 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(G C)=14.95 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=4.16957 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Probability of Hijack / Terrorism (H)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(H)=14.02 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=6.80213 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(H)=14.02 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=3.90897 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Probability of Loss of Control in Flight (LOC-I)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(L O C-I)=7.48 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=3.6278 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(L O C-I)=7.48 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=2.08479 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Probability of Midair Collision (MAC)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(M A C)=1.87 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=9.06951 * 10^{-9} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(M A C)=1.87 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=5.21196 * 10^{-9} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Probability of Runway Excursion (RE)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(R E)=19.63 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=9.52299 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(R E)=19.63 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=547256 * 10^{-9} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Probability of System/Component Failure or Malfunction (SCF)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(S C F)=2.8 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=1.3604 * 10^{-8} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(S C F)=2.8 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=7.81795 * 10^{-9} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Probability of Turbulences (TURB)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(\text { TURB })=1.87 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=9.06951 * 10^{-9} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(\text { TURB })=1.87 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=5.21196 * 10^{-9} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Probability of Undershoot (USOS)

$$
\begin{gathered}
P(\text { USOS })=0.93 \% * 4,85219 * 10^{-7}=4.53476 * 10^{-9} \frac{1}{\text { Flight }} \\
P(\text { USOS })=0.93 \% * 2.7884 * 10^{-7}=2.60598 * 10^{-9} \frac{1}{\text { Flight Hour }}
\end{gathered}
$$

Figure 27. Probability of accident by undesirable event


First of all, the undesirable event which is most common to happen is the abnormal runway contact ( $7.04 \mathrm{E}-081 /$ Flight and $1.22 \mathrm{E}-071 /$ Flight Hour), which is related with the phase where most of the accidents occur: landing. The other undesirable event related with the landing is the runway excursion (5.47E-08 1/Flight and 9.52E-08 1/Flight Hour). Then, the most probably undesirable events to happen are the abnormal runway contact and runway excursion, what occur in landing phase of flight (phase with most probability of accident).

The second most accidental phase was the route, where most of the accidents have a common cause or undesirable event: hijack or terrorism activity (3.91E-08 1/Flight and 6.8E08 1/Flight Hour).

Other undesirable event which has a high probability of occurrence is ground collision (4.17E-08 $1 /$ Flight and $7.26 \mathrm{E}-08$ 1/Flight Hour), which one is could happen in phases of standing, pushback or taxi (all probabilities together sum a high probability).

With less probabilities, we have others undesirable events like loss of control in flight (2.08E-08 1/Flight and 3.63E-08 1/Flight Hours), fire (1.3E-08 1/Flight and 2.27E-08 1/Flight Hours), which one were produce while airplanes were in the hangar, and system/component failure or malfunction (7.82E-09 1/Flight and 1.36E-08 1/Flight Hours).

## Risk analysis

Before, we have already said something about the risk, but we are going to go over it.
As we said, Risk is a possibility of incurring specified loss (damage) in a definite period of life or during a particular activity due to various kinds of incidents or undesirable events, that may occur in the M-T-E system, or what is easier, the probability of a future loss.

The risk is calculated to know the probability of having losses by the M-T-E, this is:

- Losses due to human errors, like wrong pilot decisions or failures in the airplane technology system because of bad treatments of technicians or pre-flight inspectors.
- Losses caused by a technologic failure, life engine failures, design errors or airframe errors.
- Losses caused by the environment and by some occurrences which happen without advertisement, like birdstrikes, turbulences or adverse weather conditions.

But, before suffering an accident and its respective losses, we are warned by another important concept: hazard.

What is the hazard? It is a condition, associated with design, operation or environment of a system that has the potential for harmful consequences or, explained with other words, a possibility of making specified loss, assigned to a situation developed after occurrence of an undesirable event in the man-technology-environment system.

So the hazard emerges when an undesirable event appears, this is when an event in the considered M-T-E system could result in hazard exposure for humans or property. If the undesirable event is not correctly responded to, may lead to loss or injury.

Then, we have the following process:


Hence, the importance of risk study comes: try to know the appearance probability of undesirable events to avoid the hazard and, in case it emerges, act with correct procedures to keep away from any accident or loss.

## Measure of categories probabilities

In this project, we are going to calculate the risk of some categories of loss. These categories could be established with so much parameters, but we have chosen the classification shown below:

## Table 8. Categories of loss

| Category 1 | $0 \%$ Fatalities, None Damage |
| :--- | :--- |
| Category 2 | $0 \%$ Fatalities, Any Damage |
| Category 3 | $1-50 \%$ Fatalities |
| Category 4 | $51-99 \%$ Fatalities |
| Category 5 | $100 \%$ Fatalities |

The first category includes all accidents without fatalities nor airplane damages, while the second includes also accidents without fatalities, but with the condition of have suffered any type of damage. About the categories 3, 4 and 5, they include accidents what have a quantity of $1-50 \%, 51-99 \%$ and $100 \%$ of occupants respectively.

In the following diagrams, we can see number of accidents of each category and the percentage over the total of accidents:

Figure 28. Accidents by category of loss


Analysing the graphics, we could conclude that most of the accidents, exactly 86, or $80.37 \%$ of all the accidents occurred during the last 20 years. It means that a great amount of accidents only has caused damages to the aircraft, and no fatalities. The quantity of accidents without any type of consequence is 8 or $7.48 \%$ of the total accidents.

Attending to the accidents with at least one fatality, $3.74 \%$ of the total accidents (4 accidents) induced fatalities between $1-50 \%$ of the occupants, while we do not have any information about accidents from fourth category. The last category, which one is based on accidents that reach $100 \%$ occupants fatalities, is characterized by 9 accidents over the total, what means the 7.48\% of total accidents.

This is, assuming the total number accidents for last 20 years, the mayor quantity of them only required a reparation to continue active, then we have almost equal number of accidents for accidents without any type of loss and for destructive accidents.

The aim of classify the losses by categories is to obtain a representative value of risk: risk of the undesirable event appearance which induce any category of loss. First of all is to collect all the accidents in a conditional table so that we can identify the number of accidents due to each undesirable event which has caused one of the categories. Our collection is below:

Table 9. Categories of loss vs. undesirable events

| Number of accidents <br> category of loss Category |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Abnormal Runway Contact | Category |

And then, we calculate the probabilities of having an accident which involves each category of loss due to the occurrence of an undesirable event. It is done by:

$$
P_{i}=\frac{\text { Number of accidents by the category caused by the undesirable event }}{\text { Total number of accidents caused by the undesirable event }}
$$

We have made the calculations and we have got the following results:
Table 10. Probabilities of categories of loss vs. undesirable events

| Occurrence of category per undesirable event | Category 1 | Category 2 | Category 3 | Category 4 | Category 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abnormal Runway Contact | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Runway excursion | 0 | 0,857142857 | 0,095238095 | 0 | 0,047619048 |
| Ground collision | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hijack / Terrorism | 0,533333333 | 0,133333333 | 0,133333333 | 0 | 0,2 |
| Loss of Control in Flight | 0 | 0,625 | 0 | 0 | 0,375 |
| Fire | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| System/Component Failure or Malfunction | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Birdstrike | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Midair collision | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Controlled Flight Into Terrain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Turbulences | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Undershoot | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fuel | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

For the safest category, which does not include any fatality or damage, we only have information about hijacks or terrorism activities, which represents a probability of 0.533 , this is the half of accidents caused by this undesirable event. The hijacking of these accidents only caused chaos and fear, but after taking the situation under control, the aircraft arrives to the airport and nobody resulted hurt.

About the second category, which one does not have fatalities but any damage, is occurred in the $100 \%$ of the accidents caused by the following undesirable events: fuel, undershoot,
turbulences, midair collision, birdstrike, system/component failure or malfunction, fire, ground collision and abnormal runway excursion. We have a little probability of having a category 2 accident by hijack (0.133), and higher in cases of loss of control in flight and runway excursion.

The third category is the lowest involved (excluding the fourth category, which is not involved by accident), with low values in runway excursion (0.095) and hijack (0.133).

The last and the most several categories, the number 5, is involved all times controlled flight into terrain has occurred. The others undesirable events which cause this category are runway excursion (0.047), hijack (0.2) and loss of control in flight (0.375).

We can review the results in the figure below:
Figure 29. Probabilities of categories of loss vs. undesirable events


## Hazard measure

At this point is necessary to explain how to do the hazard measure.
How can we get the numerical estimation of the hazard? The best way to explain it is with the following expression:

$$
Z(c)=P\left\{C_{1} \geq c \mid A\right\}
$$

The meaning of the coefficients is: $Z(c)$ - Hazard of having losses include in one category $c$ and $C_{1}$ is the loss caused by occurrence of the event $A$.

Then, the hazard of suffer one category of loss is the sum of all the probabilities that, happening an occurrence $A$, it has had losses of higher or equal categories than the considered category. We can express it with the following sequence:

$$
\begin{gathered}
Z\left(c_{1}\right)=p_{1}+p_{2}+p_{3}+p_{4}+p_{5}=1 \\
Z\left(c_{2}\right)=p_{2}+p_{3}+p_{4}+p_{5} \\
Z\left(c_{3}\right)=p_{3}+p_{4}+p_{5} \\
Z\left(c_{4}\right)=p_{4}+p_{5} \\
Z\left(c_{5}\right)=p_{5}
\end{gathered}
$$

Where the $p$ are the probabilities of occurrence.

## Risk measure

The last step to obtain the risk of the undesirable event appearance which induce any category of loss is to apply the expression of the risk measure, which one could be written by:

$$
(\text { Risk measure })=(\text { Unreliability measure }) *(\text { Hazard measure })
$$

The unreliability measure is basically the likelihood of undesirable event, and the hazard measure, as we have explained before, is the probability of loss. We could also express the formula like:

$$
\Lambda_{c_{i}}(t)=Q(t) * Z\left(c_{i}\right)
$$

Where

$$
Q(t)=\frac{W_{j}(\Delta \tau)}{\Delta \tau * Z\left(c_{i}\right)}
$$

The coefficients are:

$$
\begin{aligned}
W_{j}(\Delta \tau) & \rightarrow \text { Numberof accidents due to occurrence } \\
\Delta \tau & \rightarrow \text { Number of data collection years }
\end{aligned}
$$

However, if we want to calculate the risk (1/flight), it is simply applying the expression below, due to we have the probabilities of each undesirable event defined by $1 /$ Flight:

$$
\Lambda_{\text {Undesirable Event }}\left(\frac{1}{\text { flight }}\right)=P(\text { Undesirable event }) * Z\left(c_{i}\right)
$$

These probabilities are in the section Probability of accident caused by each undesirable event. It is important to use the probability with the units $1 /$ Flight to collect the right value.

To obtain the risk with the other units (1/Flight Hours), we would have to do the following estimation:

$$
\Lambda_{\text {Undesirable Event }}\left(\frac{1}{\text { Flight Hours }}\right)=\frac{h * d}{\Delta \tau} * P(\text { Undesirable event }) * Z\left(c_{i}\right)
$$

Where:

$$
h \rightarrow \text { Average of flight hours per day by one plane } \rightarrow 7.23537
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
d \rightarrow \text { Number of days under study } \rightarrow 7396 \\
\quad \Delta \tau \rightarrow \text { Years under study } \rightarrow 20.263
\end{gathered}
$$

And using also the probability in 1/Flight, we can know this risk.
We have collected both of risks and the hazard measures in one table, which we can see here:
Table 11. Hazard and risk of categories of loss

| Abnormal Runway Contact |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
| Hazard (Z(C) ) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Risk <br> (1/Flight) | 1,22438E-07 | 1,22438E-07 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Risk (1/year) | 0,000323349 | 0,000323349 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Runway excursion |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
| Hazard (Z(C) ) | 1 | 1 | 0,142857143 | 0,047619048 | 0,047619048 |
| Risk <br> (1/Flight) | 9,52299E-08 | 9,52299E-08 | 1,36043E-08 | 4,53476E-09 | 4,53476E-09 |
| Risk (1/year) | 0,000251494 | 0,000251494 | 3,59277E-05 | 1,19759E-05 | 1,19759E-05 |
| Ground collision |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
| Hazard (Z(C) ) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Risk <br> (1/Flight) | 7,25561E-08 | 7,25561E-08 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Risk (1/year) | 0,000191614 | 0,000191614 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hijack / Terrorism |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
| Hazard (Z(C) ) | 1 | 0,466666667 | 0,333333333 | 0,2 | 0,2 |
| Risk <br> (1/Flight) | 6,80213E-08 | 3,17433E-08 | 2,26738E-08 | 1,36043E-08 | 1,36043E-08 |


| Risk (1/year) | 0,000179638 | $8,38312 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $5,98794 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $3,59277 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $3,59277 \mathrm{E}-05$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Loss of Control in Flight | C1 | C 2 | C 3 | C 4 | C5 |
|  | Hazard (Z(Cj)) | 1 | 1 | 0,375 | 0,375 |
| Risk <br> (1/Flight) | $3,6278 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $3,6278 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $1,36043 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $1,36043 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $1,36043 \mathrm{E}-08$ |
| Risk (1/year) | $9,58071 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $9,58071 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $3,59277 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $3,59277 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $3,59277 \mathrm{E}-05$ |


| Fire | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hazard (Z(Cj)) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Risk <br> (1/Flight) | $2,26738 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $2,26738 \mathrm{E}-08$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Risk (1/year) | $5,98794 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $5,98794 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |

System/Component Failure or Malfunction

|  | C1 C2 | C2 | C5 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hazard (Z(Cj)) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Risk <br> (1/Flight) | $1,36043 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $1,36043 \mathrm{E}-08$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Risk (1/year) | $3,59277 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $3,59277 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Birdstrike |  |  | C2 |  |  |
| Hazard (Z(Cj)) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Risk |  |  |  |  |  |
| (1/Flight) | $1,36043 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $1,36043 \mathrm{E}-08$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Risk (1/year) | $3,59277 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $3,59277 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Midair collision |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | C1 |  |  |  | 0 |
| Hazard (Z(Cj)) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Risk (1/Flight) | 9,06951E-09 | 9,06951E-09 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Risk (1/year) | 2,39518E-05 | 2,39518E-05 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Controlled Flight Into Terrain |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
| Hazard (Z(Cj)) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Risk (1/Flight) | 9,06951E-09 | 9,06951E-09 | 9,06951E-09 | 9,06951E-09 | 9,06951E-09 |
| Risk (1/year) | 2,39518E-05 | 2,39518E-05 | 2,39518E-05 | 2,39518E-05 | 2,39518E-05 |
| Turbulences |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
| Hazard (Z(Cj)) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Risk (1/Flight) | 9,06951E-09 | 9,06951E-09 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Risk (1/year) | 2,39518E-05 | 2,39518E-05 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Undershoot |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
| Hazard (Z(Cj)) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Risk (1/Flight) | 4,53476E-09 | 4,53476E-09 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Risk (1/year) | 1,19759E-05 | 1,19759E-05 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
| Hazard (Z(Cj)) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Risk (1/Flight) | 4,53476E-09 | 4,53476E-09 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Risk (1/year) | 1,19759E-05 | 1,19759E-05 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fuel |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hazard (Z(Cj)) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Risk <br> (1/Flight) | $4,53476 \mathrm{E}-09$ | $4,53476 \mathrm{E}-09$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Risk (1/year) | $1,19759 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $1,19759 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |

And according to:

$$
\Lambda_{c_{i}}(1)=\sum_{i=1}^{i=m} \Lambda_{c_{i}}(i)
$$

We fulfilled the table of total risk:
Table 12. Total risk of categories of loss

| Total | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Risk <br> (1/Flight) | $4,85219 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $4,48941 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $5,89518 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $4,08128 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $4,08128 \mathrm{E}-08$ |
| Risk (1/year) | $1,28 \mathrm{E}-03$ | $1,19 \mathrm{E}-03$ | $1,56 \mathrm{E}-04$ | $1,08 \mathrm{E}-04$ | $1,08 \mathrm{E}-04$ |

If we represent the obtained results:
Figure 30. Total risk of categories of loss: a) Risk (1/Flight), b) Risk (1/Year)
a)



Obviously, the pattern of the diagrams is the similar, the only difference is the time considered (one of the risk shows the risk in one year and the other in one flight). The aim of the representation of them is to assimilate that the most probably result, in case of an undesirable event happens, is to have no fatalities, and in any case, some damages in the aircraft but without influence over the occupants of its.

Rarely, if an undesirable event occurs, the consequences imply us any fatalities, which are represented by 3,4 and 5 categories, and have the smallest value of probability.

## Conclusions and remarks

Firstly, the most important fact we should have clear is that we are studying a system composed by three elements: Man - Technology - Environment. Possibly, the technology is only the element we could improve to avoid the major quantity of accidents as possible.

Obviously, in the other elements we could find problems and adversities, but they are difficult to solve, basically because the problems would be, for example, pilot errors or dangerous weather. All people could cause problems or make mistakes, and we could find some adverse conditions of flight without a preview advise. This is the reason of that we only can improve some aspects about aircraft design or software.

Said that, during our project we have checked some aspects: most of the accidents do not involve fatalities, and in that case, major part of the occupants passed away. The accidents are caused, overall, in the phase of landing, where the pilot activity is crucial and any error could take place.

Depending on the nature of flight, we could conclude that the accidents are usually produced in flights which are scheduled, domestic flights as much as international.

We have discovered also what is the aircraft variety which has most risk at the time of flight: the A320. This observation is clear, only because the number of flights of this variety is so much higher than the others two species.

In case of having an accident, we could suffer some types of damages, depending on the status of the aircraft. In our case, almost the Airbus airplanes suffer substantial damages, which means the replacement of damaged pieces or reparations.

About the undesirable events, most of the accidents have been caused by abnormal runway contact, runway excursion, also in minor quantity by hijack or ground collision.

Finally, with the analysis of the hazard and the risk, we have been able to know what would be the consequences (fatalities and damages) classified by categories depending on the undesirable event. In case we would suffer a hijack, the probability of survive without any damages in the aircraft is near to $50 \%$. In most of undesirable events, only some damages in the aircraft and no fatalities would be the result. About the worst category, or catastrophe, would be almost secure if a controlled flight into terrain happens, and less probability for loss of control in flight or hijack.

These calculations have been a demonstration of why the aviation is considered as the safest transport in present, and it will be much safer if they continue taking regulations and rules to avoid any type of problem, as it has done until present. At any time, it is possible an occurrence happens, but in other transports too, but it is merely fate.
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## Appendix I

| Date | Serie | Fatal. | Pax. | Phase of flight | Cat | Damage | Airframe Hours | Cycles | Undesirable Event | First Flight | Days Flown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10/03/1997 | A320-212 | 0 | 115 | TOF | A1 | Damaged beyond repair | 4640 | 4024 | Runway excursion | 01/07/1995 | 618 |
| 22/03/1998 | A320-214 | 3 | 130 | LDG | A1 | Damaged beyond repair | 1224 | 1070 | Runway excursion | 01/07/1997 | 264 |
| 12/05/1998 | A320-231 | 0 | 54 | TXI | A2 | Substantial | 18139,08252 | 10574,15099 | Unknown | 01/07/1991 | 2507 |
| 21/05/1998 | A320-212 | 0 | 187 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 22265 | 10612,11164 | Runway excursion | 01/07/1991 | 2516 |
| 12/02/1999 | A320-211 | 0 | 169 | ENR | A2 | Minor | 14425 | 11164,65004 | Midair collision | 14/11/1991 | 2647 |
| 02/03/1999 | A320 | 0 | 82 | UNK | H2 | Unknown |  |  | Hijack / Terrorism |  |  |
| 15/10/1999 | A320-231 | 0 | 94 | TXI | A2 | Substantial | 32206 |  | Ground collision |  |  |
| 26/10/1999 | A320-231 | 0 | 92 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 14058,3316 | 8195,283353 | Abnormal Runway Contact | 01/07/1994 | 1943 |
| 20/01/2000 | A320-231 | 0 | 152 | TOF | A2 | Substantial | 22350,07016 | 13028,93993 | System/Component Failure or Malfunction | 06/08/1991 | 3089 |
| 11/04/2000 | A320-231 | 0 | 0 | STD | 01 | Damaged beyond repair | 15273,87443 | 8903,882222 | Fire | 01/07/1994 | 2111 |


| 11/05/2000 | A321-231 | 0 | 19 | ENR | H2 | None |  |  | Hijack / Terrorism |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12/06/2000 | A320-232 | 0 | 152 | TOF | A2 | Substantial | 3012 |  | System/Component <br> Failure or <br> Malfunction |  |  |
| 05/07/2000 | A320 | 1 | 96 | ENR | H2 | Minor |  |  | Hijack / Terrorism |  |  |
| 23/08/2000 | A320-212 | 143 | 143 | APR | A1 | Destroyed | 17370 | 13990 | Loss of Control in Flight | 16/05/1994 | 2291 |
| 07/02/2001 | A320-214 | 0 | 143 | LDG | A1 | Damaged beyond repair | 1149 | 869 | Turbulences | 01/07/2000 | 221 |
| 17/03/2001 | A320-212 | 0 | 151 | TOF | A2 | Substantial | 9346 | 4175,671909 | Fuel | 01/07/1998 | 990 |
| 24/07/2001 | A320-231 | 0 | 0 | STD | C1 | Damaged beyond repair | 23949,0878 | 13961,08487 | Hijack / Terrorism | 01/07/1992 | 3310 |
| 01/09/2001 | A321 | 0 |  | ENR | H2 | None |  |  | Hijack / Terrorism |  |  |
| 16/11/2001 | A321-231 | 0 | 88 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 11952,83778 | 6967,888882 | Abnormal Runway Contact | 09/05/1997 | 1652 |
| 21/01/2002 | A321-131 | 0 | 93 | APR | A2 | Substantial | 6140 | 3943,690136 | Turbulences | 01/07/1999 | 935 |
| 28/08/2002 | A320-231 | 0 | 159 | LDG | A1 | Substantial | 40084 | 18530 | Loss of Control in Flight | 01/07/1990 | 4441 |


| 19/01/2003 | A319-114 | 0 | 2 | TXI | A1 | Damaged beyond repair | 6743,36853 | 3931,036585 | Loss of Control in Flight | 01/07/2000 | 932 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21/03/2003 | A321-131 | 0 | 175 | LDG | A1 | Damaged beyond repair | 13516 | 18580 | Abnormal Runway Contact | 01/07/1996 | 2454 |
| 16/06/2003 | A320-231 | 0 | 185 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 29223,67542 | 17035,89782 | Abnormal Runway Contact | 25/05/1992 | 4039 |
| 06/11/2003 | A320-232 | 0 | 128 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 7741,850136 | 4513,099942 | Runway excursion | 01/12/2000 | 1070 |
| 23/03/2004 | A321-211 | 0 | 194 | TXI | A2 | Minor | 14108,97922 | 8224,808305 | Ground collision | 20/11/1998 | 1950 |
| 18/10/2004 | A320-232 | 0 | 106 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 12124 | 16248 | Loss of Control in Flight | 01/07/1998 | 2301 |
| 15/01/2005 | A320-214 | 0 | 184 | TOF | A2 | Unknown | 19318,44847 | 11261,6606 | Abnormal Runway Contact | 24/09/1997 | 2670 |
| 10/05/2005 | A319-114 | 0 | 43 | TXI | A2 | Substantial | 4912,818918 | 2863,92043 | Ground collision | 01/07/2003 | 679 |
| 18/05/2005 | A320-211 | 0 | 178 | LDG | A2 | Minor | 28957 | 16321 | Runway excursion | 12/07/1991 | 5059 |
| 18/09/2005 | A321-231 | 0 | 197 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 16473 |  | Loss of Control in Flight |  |  |
| 03/05/2006 | A320-211 | 113 | 113 | APR | A1 | Destroyed | 28234 | 14376 | Controlled Flight Into Terrain | 28/06/1995 | 3962 |


| 05/05/2006 | A320-211 | 0 | 0 | STD | 01 | Damaged beyond repair | 35330,33104 | 20595,76357 | Fire | 21/12/1992 | 4883 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 05/05/2006 | A320-211 | 0 | 0 | STD | 01 | Damaged beyond repair | 24824,56805 | 14471,44477 | Fire | 12/12/1996 | 3431 |
| 05/05/2006 | A320-232 | 0 | 0 | STD | 01 | Damaged beyond repair | 8270,032435 | 4821,003022 | Fire | 19/03/2003 | 1143 |
| 08/09/2006 | A319-112 | 0 | 109 | TXI | A2 | Minor | 13215 |  | Ground collision |  |  |
| 28/12/2006 | A321-211 | 0 | 168 | ENR | H2 | None | 1302,367313 | 759,2130743 | Hijack / Terrorism | 01/07/2006 | 180 |
| 17/07/2007 | A320-233 | 199 | 187 | LDG | A1 | Destroyed | 20000 | 9300 | Runway excursion | 13/02/1998 | 3441 |
| 27/07/2007 | A321-231 | 0 | 111 | STD | A2 | Minor | 8110,854208 | 4728,210313 | Ground collision | 01/07/2004 | 1121 |
| 26/10/2007 | A320-214 | 0 | 154 | LDG | A1 | Substantial | 26394,6442 | 15386,71831 | Runway excursion | 30/10/1997 | 3648 |
| 09/01/2008 | A319-114 | 0 | 73 | APR | A2 | Substantial | 15029 |  | Abnormal Runway Contact |  |  |
| 17/02/2008 | A319-111 | 0 | 51 | TXI | A2 | Substantial | 16587 |  | Ground collision |  |  |
| 04/05/2008 | A321-231 | 0 |  | LDG | A2 | Substantial |  |  | Abnormal Runway Contact |  |  |
| 30/05/2008 | A320-233 | 3 | 124 | LDG | A1 | Damaged beyond repair | 21957 | 9992 | Runway excursion | 29/11/2000 | 2739 |


| 18/07/2008 | A321-211 | 0 | 228 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 24737,74357 | 14420,83056 | Abnormal Runway Contact | 09/03/1999 | 3419 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 28/07/2008 | A321-231 | 0 | 167 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 24810,09731 | 14463,00907 | Abnormal Runway Contact | 09/03/1999 | 3429 |
| 20/10/2008 | A320-232 | 0 | 163 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 34617 |  | Abnormal Runway Contact |  |  |
| 27/11/2008 | A320-232 | 7 | 7 | APR | A1 | Destroyed | 10124 | 3931 | Loss of Control in Flight | 30/06/2005 | 1246 |
| 15/01/2009 | A320-214 | 0 | 155 | ICL | A1 | Damaged beyond repair | 25338,2796 | 14770,91215 | Birdstrike | 15/06/1999 | 3502 |
| 01/02/2009 | A320-232 | 0 | 169 | ENR | H2 | None |  |  | Hijack / Terrorism |  |  |
| 09/02/2009 | A321-211 | 0 | 229 | LDG | A2 | Minor | 11482 | 3542 | Runway excursion | 27/02/2006 | 1078 |
| 04/05/2009 | A320-211 | 0 | 154 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 57600 | 29027,24654 | Abnormal Runway Contact | 01/07/1990 | 6882 |
| 28/10/2009 | A321-231 | 0 | 147 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 6150,067865 | 3585,172851 | Abnormal Runway Contact | 01/07/2007 | 850 |
| 10/01/2010 | A319-131 | 0 | 53 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 39679 | 17634,83258 | Abnormal Runway Contact | 31/07/1998 | 4181 |
| 18/06/2010 | A321-131 | 0 | 151 | TXI | A2 | Substantial | 32967 | 20549,36721 | Ground collision | 14/02/1997 | 4872 |


| 28/07/2010 | A321-231 | 152 | 152 | APR | A1 | Destroyed | 34018 | 13566 | Controlled Flight Into Terrain | 14/04/2000 | 3757 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12/08/2010 | A319-111 | 0 | 127 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 12763,19966 | 7440,288129 | Runway excursion | 13/10/2005 | 1764 |
| 24/09/2010 | A319-132 | 0 | 129 | LDG | A1 | Damaged beyond repair | 15763 | 8936 | Loss of Control in Flight | 04/03/2005 | 2030 |
| 10/01/2011 | A320-216 | 0 | 129 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 7676,73177 | 4475,139288 | Runway excursion | 14/02/2008 | 1061 |
| 25/08/2011 | A320-214 | 0 | 0 | STD | C1 | Substantial | 3255,918282 | 1898,032686 | Ground collision | 01/06/2010 | 450 |
| 29/08/2011 | A320-214 | 0 | 143 | LDG | A2 | Minor | 4758 | 2301 | Runway excursion | 19/01/2010 | 587 |
| 12/09/2011 | A321-211 | 0 |  | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 9261,278667 | 5398,848529 | Abnormal Runway Contact | 11/03/2008 | 1280 |
| 13/12/2011 | A319-111 | 0 | 119 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 28615,90401 | 16681,59838 | Abnormal Runway Contact | 13/02/2001 | 3955 |
| 05/02/2012 | A320-211 | 0 | 166 | LDG | A1 | Substantial | 43423 | 32544,93379 | Abnormal Runway Contact | 21/12/1990 | 7716 |
| 12/02/2012 | A320-232 | 0 |  | ENR | H2 | None | 24708,80207 | 14403,95916 | Hijack / Terrorism | 07/10/2002 | 3415 |
| 13/02/2012 | A320-214 | 0 | 142 | LDG | A2 | Minor | 20997,05523 | 12240,2019 | Runway excursion | 04/03/2004 | 2902 |
| 14/02/2012 | A319-111 | 0 | 148 | LDG | A2 | Minor | 4290,576758 | 2501,185295 | Abnormal Runway Contact | 01/07/2010 | 593 |


| 20/09/2012 | A320-232 | 0 |  | ENR | A2 | Substantial | 34208,84808 | 19941,99675 | Midair collision | 11/10/1999 | 4728 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 06/02/2013 | A320-211 | 0 | 83 | LDG | A1 | Substantial | 59395,18483 | 34624,33404 | Runway excursion | 17/08/1990 | 8209 |
| 16/03/2013 | A320-214 | 0 | 0 | STD | 01 | Damaged beyond repair | 44584,37434 | 25990,39425 | Ground collision | 02/05/1996 | 6162 |
| 29/03/2013 | A321-111 | 0 | 181 | LDG | A2 | Minor | 37757 | 22420 | Runway excursion | 06/01/1997 | 5926 |
| 16/04/2013 | A321-231 | 0 | 139 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 30268 | 13619 | Abnormal Runway Contact | 20/04/2004 | 3283 |
| 24/05/2013 | A319-131 | 0 | 80 | TOF | A2 | Substantial | 28362 | 18157,84603 | Abnormal Runway Contact | 10/08/2001 | 4305 |
| 24/05/2013 | A320-232 | 0 | 178 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 3164 | 1330 | Runway excursion | 10/05/2012 | 379 |
| 02/06/2013 | A320-214 | 0 | 171 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 4428,048863 | 2581,324453 | Runway excursion | 29/09/2011 | 612 |
| 08/06/2013 | A320-232 | 0 | 171 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 3545,33324 | 2066,746702 | Abnormal Runway Contact | 04/02/2012 | 490 |
| 13/06/2013 | A319-111 | 0 | 101 | LDG | A2 | Minor | 18146,31789 | 10578,36884 | Runway excursion | 01/08/2006 | 2508 |
| 03/07/2013 | A320-212 | 0 | 1 | STD | 01 | Substantial | 51045,56328 | 29756,93466 | Fire | 10/03/1994 | 7055 |
| 10/08/2013 | A320-232 | 0 |  | STD | A2 | Substantial | 8928,451465 | 5204,82741 | Ground collision | 25/03/2010 | 1234 |
| 29/09/2013 | A320-216 | 0 | 157 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 7974 | 6010 | Abnormal Runway Contact | 16/03/2010 | 1293 |


| 03/12/2013 | A320-214 | 0 | 64 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 48773,65586 | 28432,52963 | Abnormal Runway Contact | 20/06/1995 | 6741 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 05/01/2014 | A320-231 | 0 | 179 | LDG | A1 | Substantial | 55705 | 30655,3368 | Undershoot | 11/02/1994 | 7268 |
| 02/02/2014 | A320-231 | 0 | 192 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 54604 | 23974 | Runway excursion | 04/01/1994 | 7334 |
| 13/03/2014 | A320-214 | 0 | 154 | TOF | A2 | Substantial | 44230 | 22038,26841 | Runway excursion | 22/11/1999 | 5225 |
| 01/04/2014 | A321-231 | 0 | 82 | ENR | H2 | None | 12755,96429 | 7436,070278 | Hijack / Terrorism | 03/06/2009 | 1763 |
| 04/07/2014 | A320-232 | 0 | 155 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 19144,7995 | 11160,43219 | Abnormal Runway Contact | 06/04/2007 | 2646 |
| 27/07/2014 | A320-214 | 0 | 0 | STD | C1 | Damaged beyond repair | 10100,58205 | 5888,119177 | Ground collision | 30/09/2010 | 1396 |
| 28/12/2014 | A320-216 | 162 | 162 | ENR | A1 | Destroyed | 23039 | 13610 | Loss of Control in Flight | 25/09/2008 | 2285 |
| 24/03/2015 | A320-211 | 150 | 150 | ENR | C1 | Destroyed | 58313 | 46748 | Hijack / Terrorism | 29/11/1990 | 8881 |
| 29/03/2015 | A320-211 | 0 | 138 | LDG | A1 | Substantial | 62680,04461 | 36539,23813 | Abnormal Runway Contact | 10/07/1991 | 8663 |
| 14/04/2015 | A320-232 | 0 | 82 | LDG | A1 | Substantial | 23595 | 11742,49555 | Abnormal Runway Contact | 30/08/2007 | 2784 |
| 25/04/2015 | A320-232 | 0 |  | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 22509,24839 | 13121,73263 | Runway excursion | 18/10/2006 | 3111 |


| 19/07/2015 | A321-231 | 0 | 175 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 28449,49041 | 16584,58782 | Abnormal Runway Contact | 12/10/2004 | 3932 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15/08/2015 | A321-231 | 0 | 159 | LDG | A2 | Substantial | 7358,375316 | 4289,55387 | Abnormal Runway Contact | 01/11/2012 | 1017 |
| 19/09/2015 | A321-211 | 0 | 175 | TOF | A2 | Substantial | 10720 | 4722 | System/Component <br> Failure or <br> Malfunction | 23/04/2012 | 1244 |
| 31/10/2015 | A321-231 | 224 | 224 | ENR | C1 | Destroyed | 56000 | 21000 | Hijack / Terrorism | 09/05/1997 | 6749 |
| 02/12/2015 | A321-211 | 0 | 0 | PBT | A2 | Substantial | 2214,024431 | 1290,662226 | Ground collision | 30/01/2015 | 306 |
| 14/01/2016 | A319-112 | 0 | 110 | APR | A2 | Substantial | 21387,76542 | 12467,96582 | Birdstrike | 11/12/2007 | 2956 |
| 02/02/2016 | A321-111 | 1 | 81 | ENR | C1 | Substantial | 50401,615 | 29381,54598 | Hijack / Terrorism | 06/01/1997 | 6966 |
| 29/03/2016 | A320-232 | 0 | 64 | ENR | H2 | None | 33630,01816 | 19604,56872 | Hijack / Terrorism | 08/07/2003 | 4648 |
| 10/05/2016 | A321-211 | 0 |  | ICL | A2 | Substantial | 40445,74043 | 23577,78381 | Birdstrike | 19/01/2001 | 5590 |
| 11/05/2016 | A320-214 | 0 | 64 | TXI | A2 | Substantial | 35713,80586 | 20819,30964 | Ground collision | 05/11/2002 | 4936 |
| 19/05/2016 | A320-232 | 66 | 66 | ENR | C1 | Destroyed | 33876,02088 | 19747,97563 | Hijack / Terrorism | 25/07/2003 | 4682 |
| 28/05/2016 | A320-214 | 0 |  | PBT | A2 | Substantial | 29607,15024 | 17259,44389 | Ground collision | 15/03/2005 | 4092 |
| 23/12/2016 | A320-214 | 0 | 118 | ENR | H2 | None | 24629,21296 | 14357,56281 | Hijack / Terrorism | 29/08/2007 | 3404 |


| 03/03/2017 | A320-214 | 0 | PBT | A2 | Substantial | 18616,6172 | 10852,52911 | Ground collision | 15/02/2010 | 2573 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02/04/2017 | A319-114 | 0 | STD | A2 | Substantial | 50835,73744 | 29634,617 | Ground collision | 06/01/1998 | 7026 |

