

## PARC Member “F2F” Telecon Summary

### February 25, 2010

Dave Nakamura began the telecon with some opening remarks. He reminded the group that the PARC Charter expires March 10<sup>th</sup>. The recommendations of the PARC Priorities Work Development Action Team will influence the revisions to the updated PARC Charter. The PARC will also be examining its membership and scope, so expect some things to change for the better. No recommendations will be developed in the interim period until the new Charter is approved.

#### **PARC Priorities Work Development AT**

**Shahidi**

Expected Results: Priorities Paper Discussion & F2F Brief.

The presentation will be posted to the KSN site and distributed to the PARC for review and comment. Comments were requested by Wednesday, March 10<sup>th</sup>, so that further discussion could take place during the March 11<sup>th</sup> telecon.

The Team was tasked with coming up with recommendations on how the PARC should move forward to better handle priorities. They have reached agreement on their recommendations, and presented them to the PARC in their briefing.

The team received some questions and feedback. It was asked if they had assumed that all criteria in place now were correct, and they had not assumed so. Frank Alexander requested that the Team use the term RNAV included, and the Team agreed. It was also agreed that when discussions got to benefits, the PARC will have to broaden coordination to include other groups. It was explained that when the Team referred to “RNP established” that they were referring to the Seattle Green Skies initiative being worked in the RNP Concepts and Benefits Action Team. There was some discussion on the scope of the CSPO, and what elements of it might also be of concern to the PARC. It was mentioned that surveillance issues may need to be worked by the PARC. If PARC doesn’t work on surveillance, some other group or groups will have to. The PARC will then work with the leadership of those groups. The intent is still that the PARC will act as a clearinghouse for all things PBN. They will have to coordinate strongly with other groups, and can’t just declare themselves the default group. In the FAA response to the Task Force 5 recommendations was a promise to have a plan to discuss who the PBN clearinghouse group will be, and this plan was due by April. There will need to be more PARC integration with CAST, and it would be a good idea to bring in the CAST leadership to brief the PARC. Coordination with the JPDO was discussed. As the JPDO revises their scope, it may put greater emphasis on this need. The PARC should wait to see how the JPDO re-prioritizes, and then plan coordination activities accordingly.

#### **RNP Concepts and Benefits AT**

**Porter**

Expected Results: Status and Progress Updates.

The Action Team asked for approval of their current leadership structure. Approval was given, with direction given to make the leadership more formal. It was stated that the

Team will need to give a coordination briefing to the ATMAC RNP group. A discussion is needed on how to best approach this. Dave Nakamura and Suzanne Porter will work with Bob Lamond and Lorne Cass to come up with a plan to brief the ATMAC group. It was suggested that the Team might want to consider smaller metroplex areas for their first projects, as they might have fewer issues than larger areas.

**RNP SAAAR Transition to ILS**

**Cramer**

Expected Results: Present AT recommendations for criteria.

Changes to summary slide of the groups work were reviewed. They are still trying to track down info on post-capture maneuvering from the OEMs, but this will not hold up the recommendations. It was asked if the group was hearing back from pilots about capture info from above. The reply was that the procedure designs are for aircraft with capture from below, even at high temperature. FAA will take what group develops, but will need to determine how the tool will be used, and what benefit will be gained must be understood before the FAA starts on the project.

**RNP SAAAR Update Action Team**

**Cramer**

Expected Results: Update

The team is in hold status for now as they wait for the new versions of 101A and .52A to come out. They do have some outstanding issues that they may revisit once the new revised documents come out.

**JPDO Avionics & Trajectory Operations**

**Alexander**

Expected Results: Update to the PARC on both groups' activities.

The Avionics group has completed draft 1A. The Team should be complete with its review in a few weeks, with publishing planned for late March or early April. They put in some terms for GA, included surface movement, as well as other suggested items. Some items were deferred for version 2. The Team developed scenarios to get ideas on what TBO will look like in the far term. The JPDO and RTCA TBO work is moving in completely different directions, and the PARC needs to be aware of each group's efforts to determine where its efforts are most needed. It was stated that the PARC needs to look at the policy issues from the roadmap that had been identified.

**Issues with ATC Intervention in RNP SAAAR IAPs**

**Roberts**

Expected Results: Brief to the PARC

This issue came up during RNP charting saturation discussions with Pedro Rivas. Aircraft get 90 degree clearance to the RF, and end up out of containment corridor. The vertical path will be below them. The operational problem needs to be solved, and also the path to develop guidance needs to be determined. Time constraints led to an end to discussions at this point, so it was decided to continue discussion of this item during the next PARC telecon scheduled for March 11<sup>th</sup>