THE FORTY-FIFTH MEETING OF THE INFORMAL PACIFIC ATC CO-ORDINATING GROUP (IPACG/45)

(Tokyo, Japan, 11 & 12 December 2019)

Agenda Item 6: CNS Issues

Discrepancy between micro-slop feature And FANS 1/A+ requirements

(Presented by United States)

SUMMARY

This paper provides information that was presented to the recent North Atlantic Technology and Interoperability Group (NAT TIG) concerning discrepancies between the aircraft capability to fly micro-SLOP and the DO-258A definition of offset distance parameter units.

1. Introduction

1.1. During the eighth meeting of the NAT TIG, the International Business Aviation Council (IBAC) presented working paper (WP)/19, which identified concerns related to the discrepancy between the aircraft capability to fly the standard lateral offset procedure (SLOP) in increments of 0.1nmi, and the requirements specified in DO-258A, *Interoperability Requirements for ATS Applications using ARINC 622 Data Communications (FANS 1/A Interop Standard)*, for offset distance parameters to be formatted in units of 1 nmi. The NAT TIG/8, WP/19 is included in Attachment A for review by the meeting.

1.2. This issue was further highlighted in WP/9, which provided information from Airbus on the status of their FANS deployment.

> (para 2.5 c) *Airbus takes this opportunity to recall that DO-258A/ED-100A does not allow to uplink/downlink offset information with a resolution of 0.1NM, but only with a resolution of 1NM (as per the definition of the [distanceoffset] parameter).*
>
> (para 2.5 d) *It can also be noted that DO-351A/ED-229A (B2 standard) allows to uplink/downlink offset information with a resolution of 0.1NM, but only with a minimum value of 1NM (as per the definition of the [DistanceSpecifiedNmR] parameter).*

2. Discussion

2.1. The NAT TIG felt that further investigation by the aircraft manufacturers was needed on this discrepancy and the potential consequences. An action was created for Airbus, Boeing, and IBAC to "I*nvestigate the operational effect of offsets in tents of a NM (micro-SLOP) on downlink CPDLC message*" to be completed by the next TIG meeting in March 2020.

2.2 One particular cause for concern was the potential side effect on the content of a DM40 "ASSIGNED ROUTE" (as an answer to the UM137 "CONFIRM ASSIGNED ROUTE") when an aircraft is actively flying a micro-SLOP path and has to concatenate a DM80 "DEVIATING" with an Offset Distance value which is not considered as valid per DO-258A/ED-100A definition.

3. Conclusion

3.1 The meeting is invited to note the information provided and consider this information in airspace planning, as necessary.