





SDM WORKSHOP

FREE ROUTE AIRSPACE

MAY, 29TH 2019, BRUSSELS







- 01 Introduction
- 02 Challenges & Limitations
- 03 Best Practices
- 04 System Evolution

01 - Introduction

- CFSPs provide different flight planning solutions according their customer needs (airlines, business aviation, military operators)
- ➤ CFSPs act as data integrator (Global AIS) for AIP and NOTAM
- >CFSPs enable airspace users to operate a global network, across borders, regions...
- CFSPs have implemented individual solutions to cope with dynamic airspace changes and restrictions, some are automated, some require manual effort...
- CFSPs use different algorithms to generate a trajectory and flightplan
- Final responsibility remains on the AOs which flightplan to use and if they want to change it







- 01 Introduction
- 02 Challenges & Limitations
- 03 Best Practices
- 04 System Evolution

02 – Challenges & Limitations

- Free Route is easy until you apply numerous restrictions.
- Complexity of FRA, RAD and FUA requires more and more iterations to identify optimum PLANNABLE trajectories.
- This has a measurable impact to calculation times which can not only be solved by additional hardware but requires software enhancements.
- ➤ Reduces flexibility for AOs to react on short notice to changes/improvements.



02 – Challenges & Limitations

- Fairly fragmented airspace in Europe with various (non/low-unified) requirements, affecting also cross-border FRA implementations, where we find lack of effective and optimum route options.
- Introduction of new and more restrictions, creating the airspace with more and more complexity, including connections to/from FRA airspace, time constraints, etc.
- Vertical connectivity often an issue as well.
- ➤ NM uses generic aircraft performance data which leads to different 4DT compared to filed flight plan



02 – Challenges & Limitations

- Free Route in many cases is a translation of current flow methodologies into an airspace on which many restrictions are applied.
- Traffic flows and corridors remain the same because the sector configurations remain rather unchanged.
- LOAs remain largely unchanged as far as we are aware.
- ➤ Given the perceived lack of change in traffic flows couldn't the so far realized benefits have been achieved by instead improving the fixed airway network?









- 01 Introduction
- 02 Challenges & Limitations
- 03 Best Practices
- 04 System Evolution

03 – Best Practices

T-12 months T-6 weeks Include CFSPs in Deployment to T-3 months Launch day concept phase customer environment Pre-validation tests FRA goes in (e.g. Company Routes together with NM operations Maintenance) **Implementation Duration** T- 56 days T-5 months AIP/RAD Preliminary data **Publication (ICAO** T-4 weeks available Flight safety relevant Annex 15) changes...

Implementation Timelines

03 – Best Practices

CFSP Involvement

- ➤ Early involvement of CFSPs already during conception phase and for pre-validations.
- ➤ Single point of contact from ANSPs for CFSPs.

RAD housekeeping

- > Removal of obsolete rules...
- Replacement of very complex rules by rather simple rules...
- ➤ Workshop proposed with algorithm specialists of CFSPs and restriction publishers to establish guidelines simplifying RAD restrictions.









- 01 Introduction
- 02 Challenges & Limitations
- 03 Best Practices and System Evolution
- 04 System Evolution

04 - System Evolution



- ➤ Jeppesen is generating dynamic trajectories and using eRAD and eAUP/eUUP via B2B data exchange
- ➤ Jeppesen does not agree that RAD simplification is required as stated in the presentation, but does agree that harmonisation is required
- > Jeppesen pioneered EFPL, and is implemented in production.
- >Jeppesen is ready to deliver 4D trajectory data via FFICE in line with the project status

04 - System Evolution 😉 Lufthansa Systems



- ▶ Pre-validations in cooperation with our Lido/Flight 4D customers based on preloaded data and rules in the dynamic Lido/Flight database utilizing statistical upper air data.
- Lufthansa Systems is implementing a new optimization algorithm developed together with the ZUSE Institute and will continue the research on special algorithms for Free Route.
- Lufthansa Systems is committed to deploy 4D trajectory filing. Intensive test have already been performed within the SESAR 1 and SESAR2020 program together with NM and and other (key) stakeholders and will soon be also commenced in the context of the Eurocontrol FPFDE task force in view of FF-ICE/FIXM.
- Lufthansa Systems sees the urgent need to improve ATM systems to a more automated way of handling normal flight operations to achieve an actual Free Route environment and is therefore cooperating with major FMS manufacturers on integrated solutions for the cockpit.

04 - System Evolution



- > Sabre has been part of the SESAR program and worked on EFPL enablement
- ➤ This continues with the Sabre participation on SESAR Deployment (INEA program) to support deployment of 4D trajectory with the FF-ICE implementation (FIXM), rolling ASM/ATFCM as a part of AFUA concept and
- > Sabre will continue evolution of the flight planning product, being one part of our entire Airline solution suite, in alignment with the global aviation industry development and requirements
- ➤ We see a potential, benefits and urgent need of the further ASM/ATFCM enhancement, however there are sometimes challenges, (i.e. all parties alignment, insufficient specification, gaps and changes in requirements, etc.) which prevents efficient and early adoption of such enhancements

Summary

- ➤ CFSPs are key enablers for AOs to generate the best plannable route and profile for a flight based on their operational needs and commercial interest.
- Close cooperation between all stakeholders is essential to design, develop, test and deploy new procedures and regulations.
- ➤ Variety and complexity of FRA, rules and restrictions (RAD) need to be reduced, keep it simple and keep it consistent!
- Further harmonization between the different FRA implementations is required!







Thank you for your attention!