

WG4 Teleconference
June 20, 2001

Participants:

Pio Blankas (Honeywell)
Ganghuai Wang (CAASD)
Sethu Rathinam (Collins)
Tim Rand (Collins)
Michael Petri (FAA WJHTC)
Richard Barhydt (NASA)
Randy Bone (CAASD)
Jerry Anderson (FAA Certification)
Michael Ulrey (Boeing)

The telecon was devoted to reviewing the safety tables for enhanced visual acquisition, enhanced visual approaches, and approach spacing. The revised tables are attached.

During the discussion of enhanced visual approaches, the subject of ATC workload came up. We considered adding "increase ATC workload" as a separate hazard, but then rejected that idea, because ATC is not the subject of our analysis. Instead, we agreed to point out the potential for increased ATC workload by adding it into the effects column.

We also agreed to re-order the columns of the table to put the mitigations between the hazard class and the equipment criticality. See the attached tables for the changes.

Finally, we discussed hazards for approach spacing. We discussed the possibility of three different hazards types associated with approach spacing. These are:

- Near mid-air collision (NMAC)
- Reduced margin of safety due to wake vortex constraints being broken
- Reduced margin of safety due to a hazardous workload increase

NMACs could be produced by the following causes:

- Trailing aircraft missed approach results in NMAC with lead aircraft
- Bad guidance and bad alerting results in NMAC
- Pilot doesn't follow speed commands or alerts.

We agreed that the following hazard is not associated with approach spacing, but should be considered for ACM:

- NMAC due to VFR traffic in area after breaking out of clouds -- not an issue because approach spacing doesn't need to do another application.

Reduced margin of safety due to wake vortex constraints being broken could occur in the same way as an NMAC, with larger bounds on the separation. Finally, we agreed that a hazardous workload increase is primarily avoided by good design.

Aside from the approach spacing application, we diverted the discussion momentarily to talk about CSPA. It was the position of certification (Bob Passman), that false alarm induced breakouts / missed approaches maneuver increases workload should not be considered to be a hazardous increase in workload and could be considered to be a minor effect. Previously the missed approach was described as if it was a hazardous increase in crew workload. The attached paper reflects this discussion.

Next telecon: Wednesday, June 27, 1-3 pm eastern time. Joint telecon with WG1 and WG6 (ADS-B MASPS) to talk about intent / TCPs.