

AERONAUTICAL CHARTING MEETING
Instrument Procedures Group
Meeting 20-02 – October 27, 2020

RECOMMENDATION DOCUMENT

FAA Control # 20-02-349

Subject: Charting Required NAVAID Changeovers on IAPs, including SID/STAR

Background/Discussion: Due to the prevalence of RNAV substitution/alternate means as a flight technique or, in some cases as the preferred method of navigation in the aircraft, and the proliferation of RNAV-to-ILS-style “hybrid” IAPs, should the FAA require a charting solution to indicate to the pilot when a required NAVAID changeover occurs, or when the IAP requires the pilot to be using a particular NAVAID on the IAP? Would this require a change in TERPS criteria?

Precedent is established on airways, but this has not yet been done on IAPs.

Recommendations: See related issue ACF15-02-298. US-IFPP assemble small group to assess, scope, and formulate a recommendation. Perhaps also include PARC NAV WG assessment of recommendation.

Comments: Could have wide scope and application, or very narrow, depending on application. Interface with ACS and AIM/AIP explanations, as well as ICAO differences should be evaluated.

Submitted by: Joel Dickinson
Organization: AFS-410B, Flight Operations Group
Phone: 405-954-4809
E-mail: joel.dickinson@faa.gov
Date: 15 Mar 2020

Initial Meeting 20-02: Joel Dickinson, FAA Flight Operations Group, briefed the issue directly from his [recommendation document](#), suggesting there should be an indication of changeover point on instrument approach procedures, SID, and STAR charts, to include associated switches from PBN to conventional navigation for hybrid procedures. This was discussed at the US-IFPP and that group decided it should be presented to the IPG for feedback. Bill Tuccio, Garmin, asked if any examples are available, and Joel said there are several at Denver where there is no clear indication of when to switch from PBN to conventional navigation. Joel added RNP to GLS approaches would be another example. Rich Boll, NBAA, inquired if the changeover points were charted, would they become regulatory, Joel said that part of the discussion is

whether those would be advisory or mandatory. Gary McMullin, Southwest Airlines, said many impacts would have to be considered, possibly at the PARC NAV Working Group, such as consideration for different flight manuals. Joel wants the group to determine if this is worth pursuing, either at the IPG or PARC NAV WG, or is this is considered to be basic navigation understanding, and not necessary? John Moore, Jeppesen, suggested this should not go further until fully vetted in the ACM. The Andrew Lewis, Garmin, and Bill Tuccio suggested this is basic pilot knowledge and is not necessary. Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, felt more examples would be useful, and wants to accept the RD with Joel preparing some examples for the next meeting. Joel will also form an ad-hoc virtual working group to discuss this, and asked for interested participants and comments to be sent to him. Gary Fiske, FAA ATC Procedures (Terminal) Team, said he is concerned about additional chart clutter, and wonders if there is a systemic problem driving this as opposed to being a safety of flight issue. Joel emphasized the WG might very well determine there is little or no interest or need, and suggest nothing be done.

Action Items:

- Joel Dickinson, Flight Operations Group, will prepare some examples for the next meeting
- Joel Dickinson, Flight Operations Group, will form an ad-hoc virtual working group to discuss the issue.

Status: Item open

Meeting 21-01: Joel Dickinson, FAA Flight Operations Group, briefed that an ad-hoc working group was formed to discuss the value of the suggestion. The consensus of the group was this suggestion is not needed. The PARC PCPSI was coincidentally working AIM changes that would be more specific regarding vectors to final, and the WG put in DCP suggestions for a better diagram and explanation on service volumes for ILS/GLS in that DCP. Joel recommended closure of the issue.

Status: Item closed