GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY AERONAUTICAL CHARTING FORUM
Instrument Procedures Group
History Record

FAA Control # 98-01-208

SUBJECT: Two Procedures on the same IAP Chart (ILS & Localizer)

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION: We have concerns over issues that arise as a result of the Localizer procedure sharing the same instrument approach (IAP) chart as the ILS procedure. A couple of the problems that have come up recently that are associated with the two procedures being on the same chart are:

1. Guam: The pilots of KAL 801 appear to have been trying to decide if the Glide Slope (G/S) was giving them accurate information despite the fact that ATC told them it was unusable. We believe that if the Localizer procedure were on a separate chart for complicated procedures such as this one, ILS RWY 6L, the pilots would be less likely to be fooled into thinking they can use the G/S.

2. Portland, OR: A NOT AM was issued that stated that the ILS minimums were NA. The Localizer minimums were to be used; however, they were raised by NOT AM. This created confusion as to whether the approach was to flown as an ILS using G/S or to be flown as a Localizer-only approach. After inquiry, we found that the FAA did not want to restrict the use of the G/S, thus it was not NOTAMed unusable. We objected, saying that this is very convoluted, there is no guidance to pilots telling them how to interpret that they are to use an ILS procedure to Localizer minimums. The FAA ended up agreeing and changing the procedure at our request to a higher DH vs. the higher MDA using the G/S. This kind of problem would not exist if the two procedures were separated.

RECOMMENDATION: We recommend that the title of ILS procedures be changed to read, "ILS RWY XX or LOC RWY XX" so that ATC can clear the pilot for the Localizer approach instead of clearing the pilot for the ILS with the caveat that the G/S is unusable. We also recommend that criteria be developed to require the Localizer procedure be put on a separate chart when the procedures are complex.

COMMENTS: This recommendation affects Orders 8260.3B (TERPS), 8260.19C, and 7110.65.

Submitted by: Captain Tom Young
Organization: Air Line Pilots Association (ALPA)
Phone: (703) 689-4176 **FAX:** (703)689-4370
DATE: May 4, 1998

INITIAL DISCUSSION (Meeting 98-01): New issue introduced by Tom Young (ALPA) regarding concerns over localizer procedures sharing the same IAP chart as the ILS procedure. The recommendation is to revise the procedure title to read "ILS RWY XX or LOC RWY XX" and revise the ATC phraseology so the controller can clear the aircraft for a localizer approach when the GS is inoperative vice clearing the pilot for an ILS approach with the caveat that the GS is unusable. Complicated IAPs should be charted separately. AFS-420 and AVN-100 will review the issue and report at the next meeting. ACTION: AFS-420 and ATO-120.

MEETING 98-02: No action was taken on this issue. Jim Terpstra, Jeppesen, noted that the emphasis was not to split ILS/LOC procedures into single sheets, but to streamline pilot-controller communications. FAAH 7110.65 requires controllers to use the published procedure title in approach clearances. Receiving clearance for a "LOC RWY XX" procedure seems less confusing than clearance for "ILS RWY XX, GS inoperative". AFS-420 and ATO-120 will jointly work the issue and report at the next meeting. ACTION: AFS-420 and ATO-120.

MEETING 99-01: Howard Swancy, AFS-420, briefed that AFS has no problems with the current naming process and combination of procedures; however, he had no opportunity to address the issue with ATO-120. Bill Mosley, ATO-120, also stated that existing procedures are satisfactory with AIR Traffic. Bill Hammett, AFS-420 (ISI), suggested that perhaps ALPA would want to address this issue through ATPAC. Wally Roberts, ALPA, expressed concern over combining complex Localizer and ILS IAPs on the same chart and believes guidance should be in Order 8260.19 to address this. Bill Hammett responded that any organization has the opportunity to refer procedural matters, including complexity and charting issues, to the appropriate FPO for consideration. AFS-420 will continue to track the issue and ensure it is considered during the current revision to Order 8260.19. ACTION: AFS-420 and ATO-120.

MEETING 99-02: Dave Eckles, AFS-420), presented a status update paper on the issue. It is the FAA's position that the current policy of publishing ILS and LOC procedures on the same chart is acceptable. Current procedure development policy and charting guidelines permit separate publication when deemed necessary by the procedure developer/user. Additionally, any user can request specific procedures be split to alleviate complexity through the appropriate FPO. He recommended the issue be closed. Wally Roberts, ALPA, requested all procedure notes be scrutinized for complexity. He also suggested that ILS IAPs with LOC minima be identified as "ILS or LOC RWY XX". Dave stated that AFS-420 will take the issue for further study and international harmonization. He noted that any change in procedure identification would require a change to TERPS, paragraph 161. Bill Hammett, AFS-420 (ISI) recommended the issue be brought before the TERPS Working Group (TWG), which consists of representatives of all signatories to TERPS, during their February meeting. Dave agreed. The issue will remain open. ACTION: AFS-420.

MEETING 00-01: Bill Hammett, AFS-420 (ISI), presented a status update paper on the issue prepared by Jack Corman, AFS-420 and Chair of the TERPs Working Group (TWG). Subsequent to the last ACF meeting, this issue was addressed by the TWG which consists of signatories to TERPS. The TWG met in February, 2000 and agreed to accept ALPA's recommendation that ILS SIAPs with LOC minimums should be considered as combined procedures and named accordingly; e.g., "ILS or LOC RWY XX", "ILS or LOC/DME RWY XX", etc. These criteria will be incorporated in TERPS, Change 19. Bill also noted that when the change is effective, controller phraseology would be simplified. The group consensus was that the "ILS or LOC" change was good for both pilots and controllers alike and concurred with closure. Also see Issue 00-01-222. ITEM CLOSED.