

GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY AERONAUTICAL CHARTING FORUM
Instrument Procedures Group
April 29-30, 1996
HISTORY RECORD

FAA Control # 96-01-166

SUBJECT: **Determining Descent Point of Flyby Waypoints (Originally Submitted as Definition of "On Course" – title changed at ACF 97-01)**

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION: A question that has long puzzled pilots is the question under IFR Rules of what constitutes being "on course". This question is particularly important for a number of reasons including obstacle protection when turning on course and particularly when deciding when it is proper to begin descent where terrain protection is to be provided by maintaining the published course. A recent airline accident was caused in large part by the airplane descending when the aircraft had unintentionally strayed from the published arrival route on which obstacle protection was based upon maintaining course. So what is considered to be "on course"? Is it when the needle on the CDI is not fully deflected? Is it when the CDI needle is half deflected so there is potentially some additional level of conservatism? Should it be based on a figure shown on a cross track indicator?

RECOMMENDATION: Establish the definition for "on course" to be an understandable definition which also shows the pilot the edge of obstacle containment.

COMMENTS: This recommendation affects the Pilot Controller Glossary and FAA Order 8260.3B.

Submitted by Captain Tom Young, Chairman
ALPA Charting and Instrument Procedures Committee
AIR LINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION
PH: 703-689-4205
FAX: 703-689-4370
April 12, 1996

INITIAL DISCUSSION (Meeting 96-01): Wally Roberts, ALPA, presented the issue stating that the current definitions in the pilot/controller glossary were inadequate. Paul Best, AFS-420, stated that Flight Standards had studied this issue in the past to no definitive conclusion. He recommended that the ALPA group conduct a study and present a recommendation at the next meeting. **ACTION: ALPA.**

MEETING 96-02: Wally Roberts, ALPA, led the discussion noting that the current definition of "on course" does not support GPS navigation. Don Pate, AFS-450, noted that further discussion of the issue must include resolution of changing sensitivities and the capabilities of receivers to put the pilot on course. RTCA is also addressing the issue as to how it relates to descent points using GPS/FMS systems. A telcon will be held to discuss this at a later date - interested parties are: ALPA, APA, Jeppesen and AFS-420/440/450. AFS-450 will take the lead in establishing the telcon. **ACTION: AFS-450.**

MEETING 97-01: Don Pate, AFS-450, briefed that a telcon was held on March 14 to discuss this issue. Representatives of AFS-440, AFS-450 and ALPA participated. The discussion transcended to “when may descent begin on flyby waypoints”. ALPA took an IOU to prepare a paper on defining “on course” for ACF 97-1; however, it was not presented. This issue will be a subject of discussion at a scheduled meeting between ALPA and AFS-440/450 on April 25. It was agreed to change the issue title to Read: “Determining Descent Point on Flyby Waypoints”. It was suggested that AFS-410 be a part of the solution. AFS-450 will continue working the issue and report results of the April 25 meeting at the next ACF. **ACTION: AFS-450.**

MEETING 97-02: The discussion on “when may descent begin on flyby waypoints” continued. Jim Terpstra, Jeppesen, explained Canada’s desire to establish a flyover fix on the approach course inside the IF. He also recommended that Canada be invited to attend ACF meetings. ALPA took an IOU to prepare a paper defining “on course” at meeting 97-01; however, it was not presented. AFS-450, took an IOU to report progress on the issue at meeting 97-01; however, no report was given. Wally Roberts, ALPA, agreed to send Howard Swancy, Afs-420, a copy of the ALPA “on course” paper. **ACTION: ALPA and AFS-450.**

MEETING 98-01: Jack Corman, AFS-420, briefed that work is not complete on this issue. Report deferred to the next meeting. **ACTION: AFS-420.**

MEETING 98-02: Paul Best, AFS-400, briefed that criteria have been reviewed and that using the fix bisector as a descent point will provide obstruction clearance. Wally Roberts, ALPA, noted that determining the fix bisector is equipment specific. Paul agreed to coordinate with the Tech Center to ensure a valid FAA position on this issue. He will also coordinate with Carl Moore, AFS-420, to incorporate results of his study into the AIM. **ACTION: AFS-400 (NAS NRS).**

MEETING 99-01: No report available as the AFS-400 NAS NRS was unable to attend the meeting. **ACTION: AFS-400 (NAS NRS).**

MEETING 99-02: Paul Best, AFS-400 (NAS NRS), briefed that FAA General Council (AGC) is still working on a FAA definition of “on course”; however, he has no timetable indicating when it will be ready for release. Wally Roberts, ALPA, agreed to prepare a definition for consideration working through Paul as the FAA Flight Standards point of contact. Once a definition is developed, AFS-420 will present it for AIM publication. Subsequent to the meeting, Wally advised that ALPA would like to further address the ‘bisector concept’ to ensure that proposed RNP protected airspace issues are addressed in the “established on course” definition. He indicated that he requests to work this issue jointly with AFS-420. **ACTION: ALPA, AFS-400 (NAS NRS) and AFS-420.**

MEETING 00-01: At meeting 99-02, ALPA agreed to prepare a draft definition of “on course” working through Paul Best as the FAA Flight Standards point of contact. Bill Hammett noted that a copy of Carl Moore’s, AFS-420, paper on using the bisector as

descent point on flyby waypoints is included in the meeting handout. Jim Terpstra, Jeppesen, noted that this is a good example of the type item that should be included in the proposed AC90-XX. He also stated that this philosophy should be written somewhere as an official source document for data base manufacturers. Kevin Comstock, ALPA, echoed that the paper should be given wide dissemination and perhaps included in the AIM as a temporary measure. Kevin also noted that ALPA believes that a limitation on ground speed should be included in the bisector concept to ensure containment within the obstacle area. AFS-420 will pursue further publication of the paper. **ACTION: AFS-420.**

MEETING 00-02: Dave Eckles, AFS-420, presented a status update paper on the issue. Subsequent to the last ACF, it has been determined that certain navigation equipment will not permit descent from the intermediate fix altitude to the FAF altitude unless the aircraft is within a specified distance of the intermediate course, on an intercept heading, or in some cases, wings level. The result is that the altitude to be lost between the IF and FAF may exceed TERPS descent gradient standards. A new study is underway within AFS-420 to evaluate various associated parameters such as ground speed, angle of turn, altitude to be lost, and bank angle and their interrelated effect on required intermediate segment length. Results of the study will be incorporated into TERPS for use in procedure design. **ACTION: AFS-420.**

MEETING 01-01: Dave Eckles, AFS-420, briefed that there are still some open issues and the matter is not fully resolved within AFS-420. When resolved, pilot education material for the AIM will be developed. **ACTION: AFS-420.**

MEETING 01-02: Norm LeFevre, AFS-420, briefed that FAA policy has not been resolved. There is no change in status. **ACTION: AFS-420.**

MEETING 02-01: Norm LeFevre, AFS-420, briefed that there is no avionics system that will tell the pilot when the aircraft reaches the bi-sector point in turns and that he has requested that AFS-410 respond to the issue. The following day, Hooper Harris, AFS-410, provided an in depth briefing on the issue noting the requirements of Part 91.181, the pilot practical test standards for course maintenance, and the pilot guidance published in AIM paragraph 5-4-7(c). Hooper noted that the bi-sector concept does not fall within any of the above guidance. Hooper proposed that new guidance be developed through the ACF to address descent after a flyby waypoint/fix to include positive course guidance requirements and an acceptable definition of “on course” (within 10°, off the peg, etc.). These solutions may require resolution of additional issues; e.g., minimum segment lengths may have to be extended, turn protection areas may need enlarging, new practical test standards may need to be developed and pilot education material revised. Steve Bergner, NBAA, recommends establishing speed standards for turns, especially at Intermediate Fixes. Steve also recommended that VNAV avionics that do not provide bi-sector information have their certificate withdrawn. Wally Roberts, ALPA, also recommended a 200 KT speed limit and a crosscheck of distance from the fix prior to starting a turn. Al Herndon, MITRE, noted that the problem also exists in the en route environment. Brad Rush, AVN-160, recommended that FAA avoid using “should” in future avionics specifications. Jim Terpstra, Jeppesen, added that existing TERPS criteria should not be modified due to the large number of procedures in print. He added that avionics standards must not be revised “after the fact”.

Hooper agreed that AIM guidance could resolve the issue and agreed to draft AIM language in concert with Wally for presentation at the next meeting.

ACTION: AFS-410 & ALPA.

MEETING 02-02: Hooper Harris, AFS-410, briefed that the agreements discussed at the last ACF remain valid; however, no action has been taken yet. The necessary AIM information is still planned for submission NLT February 20, 2003 for publication in Change 3 on August 7th. **ACTION: AFS-410.**

MEETING 03-01: Rich Gastrich, AFS-410, briefed that the agreements discussed at ACF 02-01 remain valid; however, no action has been taken to date. The AIM cutoff for the August AIM change was missed. Rich assured the group that the information would be forwarded NLT than August 7th for AIM/AIP publication on February 19, 2004. The draft AIM change will also address maximum speeds, distances, etc. Bill Hammett offered to circulate the draft AIM change through the ACF membership for comment if so desired by AFS-410. **ACTION: AFS-410.**

MEETING 03-02: Bill Hammett, AFS-420 (ISI), briefed the group that AFS-410 had developed AIM material to resolve this issue based on previous ACF discussions. However, as a result of an internal AFS-400 non-concur, the material did not make the August 7th cutoff for publication in the February 19, 2004 AIM. Work to resolve the non-concur is ongoing and it is expected to be complete in time for submission on February 19th for the August 04 AIM. **ACTION: AFS-410.**

MEETING 04-01: Vinny Chirasello, AFS-410, briefed that there is no change in the status. A second resolution developed by his office was met with a second non-concur within AFS-400. The non-concur centered on different phases of flight, types of procedures, and differing avionics functioning. Work to resolve the non-concur prior to the August 7 AIM cut-off date is ongoing. **ACTION: AFS-410.**

MEETING 04-02: Vinny Chirasello, AFS-410, reported that there has been no progress on this issue. Tom Schneider recommended the issue be presented to the AFS-400 Technical Review Board (TRB) meeting for input. AFS-410 has the IOU to place the issue on the TRB agenda and continue efforts to develop AIM guidance. **ACTION: AFS-410.**

MEETING 05-01: Vinny Chirasello, AFS-410, briefed that no progress has been made on this issue. He will place the issue on the AFS-400 TRB agenda to resolve the AFS-420 non-concur. **ACTION: AFS-410.**

MEETING 05-02: Vinny Chirasello, AFS-410, briefed there has been no action on this issue. Steve Bergner, NBAA, stated that the subject is important and needs clarification and resolution. Brad Rush, NFPG, added that the issue is not limited to approach procedures. Vinny promised to pursue resolution more aggressively through an AFS-400 Technical review Board (TRB). **ACTION: AFS-410.**

MEETING 06-01: Vincent Chirasello, AFS-410, briefed the issue was discussed at an AFS-400 Technical review Board (TRB) after the last ACF meeting. However, the language never made it to the AIM. Vinnie added that his office is staffing a request to adopt the ICAO definition of “on course” for FAA use. He promised AIM material prior to the cutoff for the Feb 07 AIM. Tom stated he would circulate the AIM proposal to the ACF-IPG Master Mailing List for comment as soon as received from AFS-410.

ACTION: AFS-410 and ACF-IPG Chair.

MEETING 06-02: Robert (Rico) Carty, AFS--410, briefed that there has been no progress on this issue. **ACTION:** AFS-410.

MEETING 07-01: Ernie Skiver, AFS-410, briefed that there has been no progress on this issue. Wally Roberts, NBAA, briefed that TSO 149 and 146 boxes switch to the next leg at the bisector of the fix. Brad Rush responded that flight inspection practices are not to descend until the aircraft is wings-level after the turn. **ACTION:** AFS-410.

MEETING 07-02: Mark Steinbicker, AFS-470, briefed they are still assessing how different avionics systems operate as not all use the same methodology; e.g., some FMS systems recognize and begin descent at the bisector of the turn, others operate in a different manner. Mark briefed that the operational expectation in ACs 90-100 and 90-101 is for pilots to be contained within .5 of the required accuracy for straight segments and within 1 times the required accuracy during turns. Tom Schneider, AFS-420, asked whether AC 90-94, would also address the issue. Mark replied that AC 90-94 may go away to be replaced by a new AC that would incorporate all RNAV and RNP procedures. Brad Rush, AJW-321, cautioned on changing criteria as some boxes cannot accommodate the current design; e.g., wings-level prior to ramping down. Rich Boll, NBAA, asked if there was intent for a pilot to have to switch in/out of VNAV mode and whether VNAV systems approved IAW AC 20-129 will meet the new requirements. Mark replied that the pilot should not have to switch modes and that he sees no problem with existing AC 20-129 VNAV systems complying with the proposed changes. Kevin Comstock, ALPA, said .5 of the required accuracy (or ½ the RNP required) was chosen in AC90-100 for straight segments, but he didn't think the same applied for turns. Mark replied that systems that generate a path around a turn need to ensure containment within 1 times the required accuracy. If the system does not generate a path, pilots must minimize overshoot or undershoot and return to the course as soon as possible. Descent upon waypoint sequencing should be OK as long as deviation is within the aforementioned limits. All agree that updated guidance must be written; AFS-470 will continue working the issue. **ACTION:** AFS-470.

MEETING 08-01: John Swigart, AFS-470, briefed that he is the new specialist for this issue. He realizes the issue has been on the “back burner” for some time and promised that he will work with MITRE to provide an update at the next meeting. Rich Boll, NBAA, requested the status of AC 90-94 and the new AC 90-RNP which is under development and being worked through the PARC. Mark Ingram, ALPA, asked whether this should be an issue for the USIFPP. Tom Schneider, AFS-420, responded perhaps so, since an AC revision is involved. John added that the issue is being addressed by several groups; however, his

office will continue efforts to resolve the issue and develop AIM material. He will also provide an update on status of draft AC 90-RNP. **ACTION: AFS-470.**
