

GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY AERONAUTICAL CHARTING FORUM 01-01

April 26-27, 2001

Recommendation Document

SUBJECT: Standardization of Equipment and ATC Procedural Notes.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION: Where SIAPs have no tie to the en route structure, ATC radar vectors to the approach course are mandatory. The note "Radar Required" is charted to alert the pilot that the transition onto such a SIAP is via ATC radar vectors. But, at a location such as KBWI, this requirement exists-in addition to an "equipment" requirement to determine a fix on the approach course with either DME or ATC call-out of the fix by radar. This results in a confusing note "radar or DME required."

RECOMMENDATION: Where a radar fix is one of two approved methods of determining a fix on an approach course, it should be classified as an equipment note and appear in the briefing strip. Where radar is required for radar vector transition onto the approach course, this should appear in the Plan View as a special note. The AIM should explain these requirements to pilots. AVN-100 should be directed to complete this re-charting by NOTAM on a priority basis. A General GENOT should be issued to pilots explaining the issue pending inclusion in the AIM.

COMMENTS: This affects FAA Handbook 8260.19, IACC specifications, and the Aeronautical Information Manual.

SUBMITTED BY: Captain Simon Lawrence, Chairman
Charting and Instrument Procedures Program

AIR LINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION

PHONE: (703)689-4176

FAX: (703) 689-4370

DATE: March 30, 2001

01-01 MEETING: Mr. Wally Roberts, ALPA, presented this new issue. He recommends that where a radar fix is one of two approved methods of determining a fix on an approach course, it should be classified as an equipment requirement and appear in the briefing strip. He further recommends that where radar is required for radar vector transition on the approach course, this should appear in the plan view. If adopted, the AIM should explain these requirements to the pilot. The consensus was that the problem occurs only when there is ambiguity over aircraft equipment vs. ATC radar needed. The ACF agreed that every approach that requires radar for entry should be looked at and corrected first per the charting decision reached by the group (radar required [vectors] for procedure in the plan view, radar and/or DME for equipment requirement by the title). The use of little balls or balloon boxes and subscript was discussed as a means of identifying where specific equipment is required in the procedure. Also, Mr. Marty Walker, FAA ATP-120, stated that radar vectors are not mandatory.

Dave Eckles, FAA AFS-420, stated that he had presented this issue to the ICAO OCP but that the OCP wasn't prepared to address the issue at its last meeting. Mr. Eckles also stated that

the AIM correction for radar required was in PCG currently and will likely be corrected soon. **ACTION:** ALPA, FPA and AFS-420.

01-02 MEETING: The recommendation when this issue was first presented was that where a radar fix is one of two approved methods of determining a fix on an approach course, it should be classified as an equipment requirement and appear in the briefing strip. The recommendation continues by requesting that where radar is required for radar vector transition on the approach course, this should appear in the plan view. If adopted, the AIM should explain these requirements to the pilot.

The previous consensus was that the problem occurs only when there is ambiguity over aircraft equipment vs. ATC radar needed. The ACF previously agreed that every approach that requires radar for entry should be looked at and corrected first per the charting decision reached by the group (radar required [vectors] for procedure in the plan view, radar and/or DME for equipment requirement by the title). The use of little balls or balloon boxes and subscript was discussed as a means of identifying where specific equipment is required in the procedure. Previously, Mr. Marty Walker, FAA ATP-120, stated that radar vectors are not mandatory. Dave Eckles, FAA AFS-420, stated that he had presented this issue to the ICAO OCP but that the OCP wasn't prepared to address the issue at its last meeting. Mr. Eckles also stated that the AIM correction for radar required was in PCG currently and will likely be corrected soon.

It was reported that AT would not allow transitions at some places like Dallas and BWI. It was also stated that 75-100 airports don't have a tie-in to the enroute structure. It was also stated that name changes in the pilot-controller glossary need to be addressed. Finally, it was stated that a change to the .19 is required to address when/where to publish radar required. Mr. Brad Rush also stated that he has not received a list from Mr. Roberts yet. **ACTION:** ATP-120, AVN and AFS-410.

02-01 MEETING: Mr. Brad Rush reported that AFS-420 has issued policy guidance to AVN on how to address this issue. It was stated that AVN would add to 8260 -3. The resolution is: if it is required to enter the procedure than it will go on the plan view. If it is required to execute the procedure is will go in the briefing strip. There was also a suggestion to improve the text of the notes. **ACTION:** Mr. Bill Hammett will provide Jeppesen, AVN-500, and AVN-100 a copy of the draft .19. **CLOSED**
