D3.5 Opportunities for innovative ATM research (interim report)

Deliverable 3.5

| Engage | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| Grant: | 783287 |
| Call: | H2020-SESAR-2016-2 |
| Торіс: | SESAR-ER3-01-2016 Knowledge Transfer Network |
| Consortium coordinator: | University of Westminster |
| Edition date: | 26 July 2019 |
| Edition: | 01.02.00 |



Authoring & Approval

| Authors of the document | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------|--|--|
| Name/Beneficiary | Position/Title | Date | | |
| Dirk Schaefer / EUROCONTROL | Consortium member | 02 July 2019 | | |
| Marc Bourgois / EUROCONTROL | Consortium member | 02 July 2019 | | |
| Peter Hullah / EUROCONTROL | Consortium member | 02 July 2019 | | |

| Reviewers internal to the project | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|--|--|
| Name/Beneficiary | Position/Title | Date | | |
| Dirk Schaefer / EUROCONTROL | Consortium member | 16 July 2019 | | |
| Marc Bourgois / EUROCONTROL | Consortium member | 16 July 2019 | | |
| Peter Hullah / EUROCONTROL | Consortium member | 16 July 2019 | | |
| Graham Tanner / University of Westminster | Consortium member | 26 July 2019 | | |

Approved for submission to the SJU By — Representatives of beneficiaries involved in the project

| Name/Beneficiary | Position/Title | Date |
|--------------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Andrew Cook / University of Westminster | Project coordinator | 26 July 2019 |

Rejected By - Representatives of beneficiaries involved in the project

| Name/Beneficiary | Position/Title | Date |
|------------------|----------------|------|
| N/A | | |

Document History

| Edition | Date | Status | Author | Justification |
|----------|------------------|---------|-------------------|------------------------------------|
| 01.00.00 | 04 February 2019 | Release | Engage Consortium | New document for review by the SJU |
| 01.01.00 | 16 July 2019 | Release | Engage Consortium | Incorporating SJU comments |
| 01.02.00 | 26 July 2019 | Release | Engage Consortium | Incorporating SJU comments |

2 © – 2019 – University of Westminster, Innaxis, Università degli studi di Trieste, Univerzitet u Beogradu, Technische Universiteit Delft, Frequentis AG, EUROCONTROL, European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved. Licensed to the SESAR Joint Undertaking under conditions.



EUROPEAN UNION EUROCONTROL





THE SESAR KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER NETWORK

This deliverable is part of a project that has received funding from the SESAR Joint Undertaking under grant agreement No 783287 under European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme.



Abstract

This document reports on the topics and academic disciplines of past Exploratory Research projects, notably SESAR Workpackage E (long-term and innovative research) and SESAR Exploratory Research (ER) with a view of tracing the evolution of research as well as opportunities for future research. This analysis is complemented with relevant activities in Engage, such as the Engage thematic challenges.

The opinions expressed herein reflect the authors' views only. Under no circumstances shall the SESAR Joint Undertaking be responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained herein.



Table of Contents

| | Abstra | ct | | |
|---|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| | Execut | ive summary6 | | |
| 1 | Intr | oduction7 | | |
| | 1.1 | The Engage KTN7 | | |
| | 1.2 | Objectives of this document7 | | |
| | 1.3 | Scope of D3.5 | | |
| 2 | Ana | lysis of SESAR Exploratory Research8 | | |
| | 2.1 | Thematic Areas in SESAR WP-E and ER | | |
| 3 | ATN | 1 Scope, Scientific Disciplines and Validation Approach in SESAR WP-E and ER13 | | |
| | 3.1 | ATM scope | | |
| | 3.2 | Scientific disciplines | | |
| | 3.3 | Validation approach | | |
| | 3.4 | Conclusions | | |
| 4 | Cha | Ilenges identified by WP-E Scientific Networks | | |
| | 4.1 | ComplexWorld: Complexity Challenges in ATM 21 | | |
| | 4.2 | HALA! Automation Challenges | | |
| 5 | Eng | age Thematic Challenges24 | | |
| | 5.1 | Establishing thematic challenges | | |
| | 5.2 | Engage TC Workshop recommendations | | |
| 6 | Con | clusions | | |
| | 6.1 | Lessons learned | | |
| 7 | Refe | erences | | |
| 8 | Acro | onyms | | |
| A | ppendi | x A: Project Review – ATM Scope | | |
| A | Appendix B: Project Review – Scientific Disciplines | | | |
| A | ppendi | x C: Project Review – Validation Approach53 | | |





List of tables

| Table 1. SESAR Exploratory Research call thematic areas | 8 |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|---|
| Table 2. SESAR Exploratory Research projects and networks | 9 |

List of figures

| Figure 1. Number of Exploratory Research projects per thematic area | 12 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Figure 2. ATM Scope of WP-E and ER projects | 14 |
| Figure 3. Scientific disciplines of WP-E and ER projects | 16 |
| Figure 4. Validation approach of WP-E and ER projects | 18 |



Executive summary

Engage is the SESAR 2020 Knowledge Transfer Network (KTN). It is managed by a consortium of academia and industry to promote and facilitate the development of air traffic management research in Europe. Its focus is two-fold: inspiring new researchers and helping to align exploratory and industrial research, through a wide range of activities and financial support actions.

This document provides a review of previous SESAR Exploratory Research, not so much in order to synthesise their results and achievements (such an analysis is provided elsewhere) but with a view to obtaining a more global perspective of the subject matter and academic disciplines explored in these projects. A total of 40 SESAR WP-E projects and 35 SESAR ER projects from the ER1 and ER3 waves have been reviewed in such a fashion. The analysis is complemented with relevant findings from the WP-E *HALA! – Towards Higher Automation Levels in ATM –* and *ComplexWorld* networks and the *Engage* Knowledge Transfer Network.

© – 2019 – University of Westminster, Innaxis, Università degli studi di Trieste, Univerzitet u Beogradu, Technische Universiteit Delft, Frequentis AG, EUROCONTROL, European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved. Licensed to the SESAR Joint Undertaking under conditions.





1 Introduction

1.1 The Engage KTN

Engage is the SESAR 2020 Knowledge Transfer Network (KTN). It is managed by a consortium of academia and industry, with the support of the SESAR Joint Undertaking, to promote and facilitate the development of air traffic management research in Europe. Its focus is two-fold: inspiring new researchers and helping to align exploratory and industrial research, through a wide range of activities and financial support actions.

1.2 Objectives of this document

This document provides a systematic review of the scope and outcomes of previous European innovative/exploratory ATM research projects in order to illustrate progress made, changing objectives and avenues that could be explored further.

1.3 Scope of D3.5

The analysis provided in this document is based on a review of the following sources:

- SESAR WP-E (long-term and innovative research) projects following the first and second call;
- The SESAR WP-E HALA! Towards Higher Automation Levels in ATM and ComplexWorld networks;
- SESAR 2020 Exploratory Research projects following the ER1 and ER3 calls (call ER2 exclusively funded RPAS projects which were found less relevant for D3.5);
- The SESAR Knowledge Transfer Network, Engage, notably the Engage thematic challenges and the outcomes of the workshops held in Q4/2018.



2 Analysis of SESAR Exploratory Research

2.1 Thematic Areas in SESAR WP-E and ER

A series of Exploratory Research calls have been let by SESAR. Within SESAR 1, Workpackage E (longterm and innovative research) let two calls (2010 and 2012) resulting in two networks and a total of 40 research projects. Within SESAR 2020, Exploratory Research calls ER1 (2015) and ER3 (2017) led to a total of 35 projects and the Engage Knowledge Transfer Network. For all four calls, thematic areas were defined to focus the limited resources on areas which were expected to lead to greatest benefits. The thematic areas evolved slightly over time and are shown below; colours indicate related areas.

| WP-E First Call | WP-E Second Call | ER-1 Call | ER-3 Call |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | | | Knowledge Transfer Network |
| Toward Higher Levels of Automation in ATM | Toward Higher Levels of Automation in ATM | Automation, Robotics and Autonomy | |
| | | | Separation Management |
| | | Advanced Air Traffic Services | Trajectory Based Operations |
| Mastering Complex Systems Safely | Mastering Complex Systems Safely | Complexity, Data Science and Information Management | |
| | Information Management, Uncertainty And Optimisation | | , |
| Legal Aspects Of Paradigm Shift | Enabling Change In ATM | Economics, Legal and Regulation | |
| (Economics And Performance) | | | I |
| | - | Environment and meteorology in ATM | |
| 8 © – 2019 – University of Univerzitet u Beogradu, 7 EUROCONTROL, Europea the SESAR Joint Undertak | Westminster, Innaxis, Università de Fechnische Universiteit Delft, Frequ In Aviation Safety Agency. All rights king under conditions. | egli studi di Trieste, Ientis AG, reserved. Licensed to | Founding Members |

Table 1. SESAR Exploratory Research call thematic areas



| WP-E First Call | WP-E Second Call | ER-1 Call | ER-3 Call |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| | | Enabling Aviation Infrastructure | CNS for General Aviation |
| | | | CNS |
| | System Architecture and System Design | ATM Operations, Architecture, Performance and Validation | ATM Architecture, performance and validation |
| | | High Performing Airport Operations | |

Projects and networks covering the different thematic areas are shown below.

Table 2. SESAR Exploratory Research projects and networks

| WP-E First Call | WP-E Second Call | ER-1 Call | ER-3 Call |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | Knowledge Transfer Network |
| Toward Higher Levels of | Toward Higher Levels of | Automation, Robotics | |
| Automation in ATM | Automation in ATM | and Autonomy | |
| HALA! Network | HALA! Network | ТаСо | |
| STREAM | AGATHA | MINIMA | |
| SUPEROPT | SAFECORAM | AGENT | |
| C-SHARE | NINA | STRESS | |
| ZeFMaP | MOTA | AUTOPACE | |
| ADAHR | 6th Sense | | |
| MUFASA | ERAINT | | |
| τες | Proga | | |
| SPAD | АСГ | | |
| of the | | | Separation Management |
| | | Advanced Air Traffic | Trajectory Based |
| | | Services | Operations |
| | | | |
| | | R-VVAKE | |
| | | COPTRA | COTTON |
| | | OptiFrame | |
| | | PARTAKE | |
| | | | |



© – 2019 – University of Westminster, Innaxis, Università degli studi di Trieste, Univerzitet u Beogradu, Technische Universiteit Delft, Frequentis AG, EUROCONTROL, European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved. Licensed to the SESAR Joint Undertaking under conditions.

| WP-E First Call | WP-E Second Call | ER-1 Call | ER-3 Call |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Mastering Complex Systems Safely ComplexWorld Network MAREA NEWO ONBOARD COMPASS ASHICS CASSIOPEIA POEM ELSA | Mastering Complex Systems Safely ComplexWorld Network TREE ComplexityCosts EMERGIA | Complexity, Data Science and Information Management BigData4ATM DART MALORCA BEST | |
| LLJA | Information Management, Uncertainty And Optimisation RobustATM SecureDataCloud IMET | | |
| Legal Aspects Of Paradigm Shift ALIAS | Enabling Change In ATM ACCESS SATURN ALIAS II ACCHANGE AFROGAME | Economics, Legal and Regulation COCTA COMPAIR Vista | |
| (Economics And Performance) | | | |
| | | Environment and meteorology in ATM | |
| | | TBO-MET PNOWWA ATM4E | |
| | | Enabling Aviation | CNS for General Aviation |
| | | SAPIENT NAVISAS | EMPHASIS |
| | | | CNS |
| | | | ENVISION GATEMAN |





| WP-E First Call | WP-E Second Call | ER-1 Call | ER-3 Call |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | System Architecture and System Design FLITE SCALES EMFASE | ATM Operations, Architecture, Performance and Validation APACHE INTUIT AURORA PACAS | ATM Architecture, performance and validation Domino EvoATM |
| | | High Performing Airport Operations RETINA MOTO | |

Although the maximum funding of projects in WP-E and ER1 and ER3 was slightly different (the maximum SESAR contribution was €600k in WP-E; €600k for ER1/ER3 Excellent Science and Outreach projects and €1M for ER1/ER3 Application-Oriented projects) the number of projects can be used as a rough indication of weight the different thematic areas had in WP-E and ER. Note that a better balance between these areas might have been desirable and the greater number of projects in certain areas is indicative of the greater number of (good) project proposals received.

Figure 1 shows the number of projects awarded in the different areas in WP-E and ER calls.





Figure 1. Number of Exploratory Research projects per thematic area





3 ATM Scope, Scientific Disciplines and Validation Approach in SESAR WP-E and ER

The SESAR Exploratory Research projects in the first and second WP-E calls, and SESAR 2020 ER1 and ER3 were analysed with regard to the ATM Scope, the academic discipline and the validation technique used by the projects. 73 projects were analysed (for two of the 75 projects documentation was not easily available in the required detail). General findings are reported here; a more detailed analysis can be found in Appendices A, B and C.

Despite the relatively large sample, there are a few methodological limitations:

- The review was carried out based on the publishable summary of the projects and are hence somewhat dependent on the project teams' views of their approach and achievements.
- The categories used to classify ATM Scope, academic discipline and validation technique evolved slightly during the analysis; revisiting the analysis might lead to slightly altered results and this could be considered for future editions of this document.
- The analysis reported here was carried out by experts external to the projects with general knowledge of ATM and scientific methods but not necessarily specific expertise on the validation techniques, academic disciplines or ATM operations explored in any specific project.
- The seven ER3 projects in this analysis have started but have not yet finished. This means that results are not fully available and the analysis had to refer to the projects' plans and ambitions rather than achievements.

The 73 projects studied covered four calls in the period from 2010 to the present day. Analysing the categories of each call separately and comparing them to trace an evolution might be an interesting endeavour. We still refrained from presenting such an analysis for a number of reasons:

- The projects awarded in each of the calls are a function of the scope of the call. For example, the scope of ER1 included excellent science (TRL0) and application-oriented (TRL1) research projects whilst ER3 only called for application-oriented proposals.
- Upon closure of each of the calls, a greater number of proposals were received in the more 'traditional' scope areas (such as automation) than in less common areas (such as legal and economics). As part of the selection process, the best proposals according to the selection criteria defined in the call were selected. This led to the situation that the number of proposals per topic was not necessarily balanced.
- Again, the ER3 projects are ongoing so that an analysis is very preliminary.



3.1 ATM scope



Figure 2. ATM Scope of WP-E and ER projects

Figure 2 shows the ATM Scope of WP-E and ER projects. Note that many projects were related to more than one of the categories defined for scope so that the sum of the individual categories is greater than 73, the number of projects reviewed. Note that the projects awarded following ER call 2 (UAV) were not included in the analysis – including the ER2 projects would have led to a different distribution of ATM Scope.





When reviewing the ATM Scope the following observations were made:

- ANSPs and the NM were the target stakeholders, with 48 projects looking at aspects of their work. 23 projects involved tasks performed by controllers, while 17 examined network operations, and 18 concerned trajectory-based operations.
- Airport operations were the subject of 17 projects while airline operations were involved in just eight of them.
- Only six projects had a relation to smaller aircraft and only four of those looked at the looming problem of integrating UAS into the airspace. The SESAR JU is managing other, less innovatory projects in this domain, however.
- The performance of the ATM system was either studied by, or could be improved by the results of, 26 projects.
- Eleven projects had a regard to the safety aspects of ATM, a fairly low number for a topic that is generally considered 'paramount'. Twelve were concerned with the resilience of the system.
- The legal and regulatory side of ATM was examined by 8 projects, with one of these looking also at legal/liability concerns.
- CNS was the topic of three projects, while three others touched on change management, economics, investment decisions and security.





3.2 Scientific disciplines

Figure 3. Scientific disciplines of WP-E and ER projects

Figure 3 shows the scientific disciplines of the investigated projects – note again that many projects were related to more than one category. The following observations were made:

• 17 projects used established optimisation techniques, with another seven using novel techniques of artificial intelligence (essentially machine learning and occasionally evolutionary computation).





- The use of agent-based models is now established, having been used in 14 projects.
- The use of formal methods and semi-formal models such as networks and graph models is also widespread with 25 projects using one or other of these techniques and three using both.
- 28 projects explore or rely mainly on statistical methods and data analysis techniques. However, the number of projects performing statistical analysis as a method is, as expected, much the higher of the two.
- A total of 18 projects explore examine the area of human factors which therefore seems a well-covered area.
- 13 projects are concerned with interaction and visualisation techniques. The true number of projects actually exploring these techniques is lower because these 12 projects include many that only use these techniques as a tool rather than a field of study.
- A small number of projects focus on socio-economics (7), cryptography and security (2), regulation and liability (2) and meteorology (2).

3.3 Validation approach

Figure 4 shows the validation approach followed by WP-E and ER projects. As before, the total number is greater than the number of projects since a combination of validation techniques was often used. The following observations were made:

- Three projects (4%) had no visible means of validation available. Of these "Emphasis" had very little information publicly available and "ACChange" made no reference to validation in its publishable summary.
- 59 projects used at least one of the following approaches for validation: experimental tools (simulators etc.) (42); experiments (30); or data and measurements (27) to validate their outcomes.
- 26 projects defined their validation as using the airspace, some defined which airspace they used; 34 defined operator roles which were evaluated during the validation.
- Uncertainties were a part of the validation of twelve projects, whereas eight of them used other techniques.





Figure 4. Validation approach of WP-E and ER projects

3.4 Conclusions

The analysis presented here is preliminary in nature and could be repeated or confirmed in future editions of this document, for example using a consistent set of categories and integrating the results of ER3 projects and future ER calls. However, despite some limitations in the approach a number of interesting conclusions can be drawn.

Very few projects actually 'fail' in the sense that they come to the conclusion that the concepts and ideas proposed when starting the project just do not work. This is surprising especially for





Exploratory Research where both costs and success rates (measured by the number of studies leading to implementation) are significantly lower than for example in industrial research or implementation. Not surprisingly, management theory on innovation suggests that the further concepts and ideas are from implementation (in the sense of concept or product maturity) the smaller the percentage that actually make all the way to implementation.

A number of observations come to mind:

- If most projects really do succeed in the sense that they deliver a concept or prototype that are implemented in downstream research then perhaps the calls have not been ambitious enough in the sense that they encourage exploring new and uncharted territory. Our very subjective and preliminary impression is that this has not been the case, since many projects did actually explore new areas.
- Demonstrating that a concept of approach does not work is, from a scientific point of view, just as satisfying as demonstrating that it does work yet very few projects, if any, document such conclusions. It might be that our research culture does not reward proven negative findings sufficiently. Publishing 'negative' findings should be encouraged, for example specifically encouraging scientific publications.
- In the absence of well-formulated hypotheses and a well-defined scientific method to confirm or refute their hypotheses the project team will gravitate towards calling their project a success rather than a failure. It is our impression that this explanation holds true not for the majority but at least for a fraction of the projects analysed. Failure to apply a correct scientific method must be discouraged. For example, the soundness of the scientific approach and the existence of a clear research/experimental/validation plan should be established as a criterion in the proposal selection and contract negotiation phase.
- Perhaps as a relatively small community, we shy away from making harsh judgements on our peers' results.
- The 'broken innovation pipeline' is often cited, meaning that the transfer and uptake of ideas and concepts that are successful on a lower TRLs to applied research could be improved. Involvement of players from more mature phases of R&D in exploratory research must be encouraged further and the SJU and Engage are putting in place a number of measures to do so.

Elaborating further on the last bullet point and recognising that several projects within WP-E have led to interesting results: it is somewhat sobering to realise that not all of these were followed up as much as could have been possible. Problems that could potentially offer part of an explanation are:

- A process for following up on interesting findings, e.g. by granting an extension to successful research projects was, at least at the time of the projects reported here, not in place or very *ad hoc*. Note that delay in following up on interesting findings often means that know-how is lost as researchers have moved on to other fields.
- Perhaps not enough emphasis has been put on documenting and disseminating research results and, again, perhaps the processes for this were not well in place. We acknowledge that a period of six months after project closure is eligible for disseminating project results in the ER4 call; this was not the case for WP-E, ER1 and ER3.
- Perhaps the proposal selection process is not sufficiently punitive of research that repeats well-established existing work.



- The approach, culture and composition of project teams are quite different for exploratory and industrial research so that extending ER projects into industrial research is not a solution. A real transfer of the results is needed and this requires better exchange between earlier and later phases of the research cycle. Note that this transfer is bidirectional to ensure that (a) operational problems and constraints are sufficiently well understood by ER projects and (b) industrial research guides and 'owns' the potential of ER projects.
- Growing a community around successful concepts and projects might help counter attrition of expertise and exploiting their potential better. This is what the WP-E networks and the Engage thematic challenges attempt(ed) to do.
- The use of standard datasets, scenarios and validation approaches would increase the comparability and reproducibility of research results and hence benefit transfer.

We recognise that these problems are increasingly being addressed in the present (ER1, ER3) and future (ER4) set-up of Exploratory Research; for instance, 11 ER1 projects were identified as inputs for Wave 2 IR solutions, and many fundamental research projects were assessed to be mature enough to move to the applied research, and would have a chance of being selected for continuation.





4 Challenges identified by WP-E Scientific Networks

4.1 ComplexWorld: Complexity Challenges in ATM

The ComplexWorld Network, funded through SESAR WP-E (long-term and innovative research) between 2010 and 2016 identified the following challenges for future ATM research [7]:

<u>A. Developing and demonstrating new metrics in ATM:</u> New metrics should extend the range of flight-centric metrics (e.g. average departure delay) currently used by industry, and cover such performance aspects as cost, resilience, and passenger service delivery. The use of non-classical metrics (including complexity) is expected to continue to play an important role in many instances, although not necessarily required in all cases. Consideration of the complex sociotechnical nature of the air transportation system remains underexploited. Improved pathways towards industry adoption of appropriate new metrics are also important.

<u>B. Building resilience into systems design taking into account emergent behaviour:</u> A key challenge is how to make the ATM system more resilient regarding disturbances and disruptions. This resilience performance question is, however, only one side of the ATM performance medal; the other side consists of established key performance areas such as economy, capacity and safety. Therefore, we are in need of an ATM system design that is more resilient against disturbances and disruptions and at the same time maintains a good balance with other key performance areas. In support of a step change in future ATM design, this challenge concerns building resilience into systems design taking into account emergent behaviour.

<u>C. Understanding trade-offs through metrics:</u> Current (Key) Performance Indicators and the tradeoffs between them are not sufficiently understood, especially in terms of stakeholder impacts, such as costs. Some established work has been carried out by EUROCONTROL on the trade-offs between en-route capacity provision and ATFM delay, but this represents one of few such examples. Tradeoffs between monetised and non-monetised metrics are particularly challenging.

<u>D. Data science and managing and visualising (big) data</u>: Data science techniques together with complex systems theory and practice open a new approach in the study of the complexity of air transport. Significant research challenges in this field are data management, data processing, data sharing and protection, deep analytics or visualisation. For aviation to access and manage the datasets generated by the different agents, suitable data infrastructure paradigms need to be developed. Extracting knowledge from data that represent, predict and improve the behaviour of the system, requires collecting, validating, formatting, correcting and consolidating different datasets. Considering the heterogeneity of the data sources (aircraft, airlines, passengers, navigation services,



ground handling, retail sub-systems...) the management of big data can be considered a complex challenge in the aviation field. Even more, if we consider the volume, variety and velocity of the datasets. Other techniques barely explored in aviation, like data protection paradigms or data visualisation can be enormously helpful in the field of air transport, ensuring the analysis of the performance, the use of existing resources and the support to the decision-making processes can be improved several orders of magnitude.

<u>E. Integrating multi-agent systems into decision-support tools:</u> Multi Agent Systems (MAS) in Air Traffic Management (ATM) can have important advantages for policy makers as they allow evaluation during the design of a novel operation and they allow performing scenario simulations in terms of what-if studies through tuning the relevant parameters of the model. Moreover, MAS and Agent-Based Models (ABM) can be relevant for the investigation of the behaviour of the ATM main actors, as they can provide useful insights about the learning mechanisms on which the agents' behaviour is based. These features can be fruitfully exploited by using integrated decision-support tools (DST), based on MAS and ABM that will help in selecting the best policies and strategies to improve the general efficiency of the ATM system, building on the analysis of historical data.

<u>F. Integrating uncertainty into decision-support tools:</u> There are many scenarios in ATM where uncertainty plays an important role. Examples of these include scheduling of arrivals/departures, routing around adverse weather, trajectory prediction, conflict resolution, and flow management. In the past, most integrated decision-support tools (DST) that have been developed to help manage these scenarios commonly neglect uncertainty. However, including the effect of uncertainty in DSTs might help to improve their efficiency, thus benefiting the ATM system. There are many challenges in including uncertainty in a DST: for instance, it is not clear what type of statistical models should be used to realistically capture uncertainty; there is also a trade-off between robustness and performance: if one tries to accommodate too high levels of uncertainty, it might lead to excessive conservativeness in DST solutions. In addition, while in a deterministic setting an optimal solution is easy to define, this notion is not totally clear in an uncertain environment.

<u>G. Characterisation of meteorological uncertainty:</u> Optimum routes for air traffic have a strong dependency on meteorological parameters such as the position of the jet stream or the strength and/or direction of prevailing winds. Moreover, in a very few cases and limited areas, MET hazards can potentially perturb the nominal traffic (significant weather conditions); indeed, adverse weather continues to be a major cause of delays in air travel. However, accurate numerical weather prediction (NWP) forecast models continue to be challenging due to issues including uncertainty in observations used to initialise the forecasts and an incomplete understanding of the physical processes that occur in the atmosphere.

<u>H. Model-based identification of emergent behaviours at the design stage, including comparison with reality:</u> In support of a step change in future ATM design, this challenge concerns model-based identification of emergent behaviours from early design stage on, including comparison with reality. Established system design takes a conservative approach regarding emergent behaviour by trying to avoid it. However, this may be counterproductive because for a complex socio-technical system, it is impossible to identify and learn understanding emergent behaviour at all frequencies without conducting adequate simulations. As long as not all emergent behaviour is identified and understood it is unknown which are positive and which are negative. Though once understood, there is the possibility to adopt or strengthen positive emergent behaviour and to avoid or mitigate negative emergent behaviour. This means there is great design value in timely identifying positive and





negative emergent behaviours of future socio-technical designs at frequencies ranging from regular to extremely rare.

4.2 HALA! Automation Challenges

The SESAR WP-E research network HALA! – Towards Higher Automation Levels in ATM has reviewed challenges pertaining to ATM automation in their position paper [8, 9]. HALA! considers the need to align the research efforts into two challenging broad areas of special interest, from the research point of view, as crucial and complementary issues.

- aircraft trajectory hierarchal, spatial, and temporal cohesion among the different ATM organisations and agents, considered as part of a sociotechnical multi-agent system, as key elements for an efficient integrated ATM; and
- trajectory management, including trajectory optimisation, DCB, TS safety barriers, detect and avoid systems, autonomy of flight/vs, centralised services provision, latency effects on all kind of agents remotely controlled are, among others, key research issues, that involves especially remotely piloted aircraft systems (RPASs).

HALA! proposes to evolve toward higher level of automation ATM by providing decision tools delivering compatible and efficient trajectories for all airspace users, enhancing the hierarchical, spatial, and temporal cohesion among the different organisations/agents involved in the planning and operational phases of the trajectory management process. To this end, automation shall also provide decision tools within the trajectory management process itself focused on trajectory optimisation, traffic synchronisation, safety nets behaviour, and compatibility between autonomy of flights and centralised services provision.

Associated to the two HALA! general ATM oriented challenges presented previously, there are related scientific challenges dealing with specific issues associated to automation processes:

- 1. resilience and system degradation;
- 2. ability to formalise, understand, and model the system to be controlled in all possible normal and abnormal operational conditions, and to face possible unexpected situations;
- 3. the adequateness and correctness of the human role in the control system, in particular the ability to ensure human motivation, trust, and dependence on automation, and the ability to maintain situational awareness;
- 4. responsive and adaptive automation able to adapt the level of automation and allocation of functions to agents and performed by humans or machines depending on needs; and
- 5. change management when going towards higher levels of automation and introducing new technologies.



5 Engage Thematic Challenges

In order to facilitate the orientation of exploratory ATM research towards operational challenges the Engage network has let a call for thematic challenges. These challenges, once established, should provide a means for research and industry together, to develop and propose approaches to address the underlying problems. Funding available in a subsequent catalyst call should help address some of these. The selection process as well as the conclusions of a first series of workshops are documented in greater detail in Engage deliverables D3.4 (Thematic challenges priming report for first workshops) [3] and D2.5 (Annual combined thematic workshops progress report) [4] and will therefore only briefly be summarised here.

5.1 Establishing thematic challenges

Following the call, 54 proposals were received from 33 organisations, covering industry (including airspace users and ANSPs), research institutes, universities and consultancies. All 54 proposals were evaluated individually by eight members of the Engage Awards Board based on the following criteria:

- Operational relevance
- Focus of challenge
- Capability of network and/or proposer

As expected, there were several links between the 54 proposals; grouping these and ranking them in the order of the evaluations the related proposals received led to a prioritised list of themes. In this fashion, six themes were identified, from which the top four were selected; two remaining themes are maintained as candidate future themes. The four themes cover ten out of the top twelve individual proposals. The four selected themes have been established as the Engage thematic challenges; they are:

- Vulnerabilities and global security of the CNS/ATM system;
- Data-driven trajectory prediction;
- Efficient provision and use of meteorological information in ATM;
- Novel and more effective allocation markets in ATM.

The experts submitting the two to four top-scoring proposals leading to each of these challenges were invited to form a challenges team which was accompanied by one or two Engage members and invited to organise a thematic challenge workshop. Workshops were held in October and November 2018 for three out of the four challenges (Vulnerabilities and global security of the CNS/ATM system will hold a workshop in Q1/2019).





5.2 Engage TC Workshop recommendations

The three thematic challenge workshops involved a series of technical presentations and a subsequent facilitated session in which workshop participants brainstormed on:

- What specific types of follow-up research are likely to be useful to mature the state of the art (especially those that could be addressed by catalyst funding from the Engage KTN)?
- What are the measures of success that could be used to assess the progress of the challenge?
- What are the likely barriers to prevent progress towards maturing the challenge, and how might we overcome them?

The conclusions of the three workshops which took place in Q4/2018 are replicated here for completeness (a fuller description can be found in Engage deliverable D2.5 (Annual combined thematic workshops progress report) [4].

TC2: Data-driven trajectory prediction

The following have been identified as *example* ideas for potential further exploration:

- 1. Trajectory predictors supporting airborne self-separation: definition of requirements and concept development of enabling technologies;
- 2. Improved DCB: enhanced TPs integrating uncertainty assessment, robust planning and costefficiency assessment at network level;
- 3. Data-driven approaches for understanding and prediction of AU preferences and behaviours enabling improved NM operations;
- 4. Mapping requirements definition and concept development of data-driven TP in support of collaborative multi-sector CD&R;
- 5. Optimising and integrating local planning activities with a view to assess, contain and communicate their network effects;
- 6. Improving data-sharing and data access to satisfy AU, NM and ANSP technical and organisational requirements and expectations.

TC3: Efficient provision and use of meteorological information in ATM

The following have been identified as *example* ideas for potential further exploration:

1. Very high-resolution, very short-range forecasts using numerical weather prediction models and observational data assimilation;



- 2. Quantifying the sensitivity of operational processes to MET uncertainty, comparing these with other sources of uncertainty;
- 3. Incorporation of ensemble weather information into decision-support tools, adapted for different ATM stakeholders;
- 4. Accurate prediction of weather conditions (e.g. visibility, glide-path wind) influencing airport arrival and departure operations;
- 5. Consolidation of climate risk assessment methodologies for airports;
- 6. Creating a climate forecast 'baseline' for aviation from the IPCC UN panel report.

TC4: Novel and more effective allocation markets in ATM

The following have been identified as *example* ideas for potential further exploration:

- 1. Incorporating behavioural science methods into improved traffic demand and distribution predictor tools for ANSPs and UDPP;
- 2. Assessing if incentives or penalties work as better drivers of behaviour: whether social norms can be used to improve collaboration;
- 3. Predicting and avoiding undesirable behaviour, such as gaming, in ATM allocation mechanisms;
- 4. Building a better understanding of 'equity' and 'fairness', plus trade-offs across different stakeholders, and with 'flexibility';
- 5. Improving the assessment of uncertainty and disturbance, and of new mechanism implications for policy recommendations;
- 6. Running models and tools in shadow-mode, with practical user interfaces and value in output metrics (e.g. costs, overloads).





6 Conclusions

The analysis presented here is based on SESAR WP-E and ER project calls as well the HALA!, ComplexWorld and Engage networks. Despite its preliminary nature and its limitation, some interesting findings can be derived (and should perhaps be confirmed with a greater scope and more established methodology in future revisions of this document).

6.1 Lessons learned

1. Build the community.

SESAR Exploratory Research started with WP-E projects and networks in which areas such as automation, human factors and human-computer interaction were covered. From the beginning, attempts were made to include non-traditional areas and these attempts seem gradually have to come to fruition. For reasons explained in Section 3 we refrain from analysing the evolution of topic areas over time. Yet even without such an analysis one can observe that some areas such as complexity and data science, economics and legal aspects are now an integral part of Exploratory Research. Some observations:

- a) Projects in new areas have often been most successful when they involved experts from new fields, often naïve to ATM who teamed up with the experts from the ATM research community.
- b) The research community in new areas has to be built and strengthened over time and this cannot be achieved quickly. Conference attendance, invitations to workshops and project bids are stepping stones for involving players from new areas.

2. Transfer results of successful research projects.

The degree to which interesting results from Exploratory Research projects are picked up by subsequent projects and lead into higher maturity phases could certainly be improved. A number of avenues could be explored:

- a) Establish a process for slightly extending *successful* projects, for example, with a view to solving specific challenges identified in the project, exploring the potential of specific approaches and disseminating the results.
- b) Improve the transfer of knowledge, data and concepts between exploratory and industrial research in both directions, predominantly through involvement of industrial research members in Exploratory Research. Although we acknowledge that some progress has been made, this is still an area for improvement.



c) Establish a proposal selection process that is less forgiving of projects reproducing established findings (whilst encouraging the maturing of successful concepts to downstream research/higher TRLs).

3. Encourage reporting on unsuccessful concepts

Although we would expect the majority of Exploratory Research projects to conclude and demonstrate that the concepts or methods explored are not successful, very few projects actually document such 'negative' results. Such documented failure, unless due to flaws in the scientific methods, would be desirable and should be encouraged, for example by:

- a) Instilling a culture that rewards documenting negative as well as positive research results (a section could be added to the project report template that explicitly solicits findings about approaches that do not work).
- b) Not shying away from calling a failure by its name. Although the merit of a research project is difficult to establish, a somewhat subjective and very sensitive review of past projects shows some patterns. How these can be used to reward researchers with a good track record in the proposal selection process could be discussed.

4. Insist on the use of established scientific methods.

Not all projects reviewed in this document applied a sound scientific method leading to unclear, anecdotal or debatable results. Whilst we recognise that not all projects lend themselves to quantitative and statistical analyses, the use of a sound method leading to statistically significant results should be encouraged as far as possible.

5. Improve availability and use of standard scenarios and datasets.

Encourage the use of standard tools, datasets, scenarios, etc. to improve comparability and transferability of research results and thus benefit uptake through downstream research phases. Make such datasets and scenarios available to the community, solving problems of ownership and confidentiality.





7 References

- [1] Engage website, 2018. http://engagektn.com/.
- [2] Engage project, 2017. Grant Agreement 783287, Ref. Ares(2017)6114946 13/12/2017.
- [3] Engage project, 2018. D3.4 Thematic challenges priming report for first workshops, Edition 01.00.00, June 2018.
- [4] Engage project, 2019. D2.5 Annual combined thematic workshops progress report (priming wave 1), Edition 01.01.00, January 2019.
- [5] SESAR Joint Undertaking, 2010. Long-Term and Innovative Research WP-E Thematic Programme (document package first WP-E project call), Edition v2.8, February 2010.
- [6] SESAR Joint Undertaking, 2012. Long-Term and Innovative Research WP-E Thematic Programme (document package second WP-E project call), Edition v3.0, May 2012.
- [7] The ComplexWorld Network, 2016. Complexity Challenges in ATM.
- [8] HALA! SESAR Research Network, 2015. Towards Higher Levels of Automation in ATM, Position Paper.
- [9] Francisco Javier Saez Nieto, 2015. The long journey toward a higher level of automation in ATM as safety critical, sociotechnical and multi-agent system. Proc IMechE Part G: J Aerospace Engineering 0(0) 1–15 ! IMechE 2015, DOI: 10.1177/0954410015596763.
- [10] SESAR Exploratory Research Projects repository https://www.sesarju.eu/searchcontent/projects?_query=&field_projects_activity=16&field_projects_benefits=&field_projects_ key_areas=&field_projects_project_status=&field_projects_stakeholder_type=
- [11] SESAR Long-term and Innovative Research projects (enter WP E as search term) https://www.sesarju.eu/search-content/documents



8 Acronyms

| ABM | Agent-Based Models |
|-------|------------------------------------------------|
| AI | Artificial intelligence |
| ANSP | Air Navigation Service Provider |
| ATFM | Air Traffic Flow Management |
| ATM | Air traffic management |
| ATS | Air Traffic Services |
| AU | Airspace user |
| CD&R | Conflict detection and resolution |
| CNS | Communication, navigation, surveillance |
| CSA | Coordination and Support Action |
| DCB | Demand-capacity balancing |
| DST | Decision-support tools |
| EC | European Commission |
| ER | Exploratory Research |
| H2020 | Horizon 2020 research programme |
| HALA! | Higher Automation Levels in ATM (WP-E Network) |
| IPCC | Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change |
| KTN | Knowledge Transfer Network |
| MAS | Multi Agent Systems |
| MET | Meteorology/meteorological services |
| NM | Network Manager |
| NWP | Numerical weather prediction |
| PMP | Project management plan |
| RPAS | Remotely piloted aircraft systems |
| SESAR | Single European Sky ATM research |
| SIDs | SESAR Innovation Days |

SJU SESAR Joint Undertaking



^{30 © - 2019 -} University of Westminster, Innaxis, Università degli studi di Trieste, Univerzitet u Beogradu, Technische Universiteit Delft, Frequentis AG, EUROCONTROL, European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved. Licensed to the SESAR Joint Undertaking under conditions.



| ТВО | Trajectory-based operations |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| ТС | Thematic challenge |
| ТР | Trajectory predictor/prediction |
| TRL | Technology Readiness Level |
| UAS | Unmanned aircraft system |
| UAV | Unmanned aerial vehicle |
| UDPP | User-Driven Prioritisation Process |
| UN | United Nations |
| WP | Workpackage |
| WP-E | SESAR Workpackage E (long-term and innovative research) |



Appendix A: Project Review – ATM Scope

| Project | SUPEROPT | NEWO | STREAM | ONBOARD | ASHICS | POEM | TESA | MUFASA |
|------------------|------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------|-------------|
| controller tasks | conflict | | conflict | | | | risk-based | conflict |
| | resolution | | detection and | | | | conflict | resolution |
| | strategies | | resolution | | | | resolution | strategies |
| airport ops | | departures | | | | | | |
| | | prioritisation | | | | | | |
| trajectory-based | | | exploiting shared | | | | trajectory | |
| ops | | | business | | | | prediction | |
| | | | trajectories | | | | | |
| network ops | | | | ATM system | | | | |
| | | | | predictability | | | | |
| airline ops | | | | | | | | |
| UAS and GA | | | | | | | | |
| CNS | | | | | | | | |
| safety analysis | | | | | automated | | | |
| | | | | | hazard analysis | | | |
| Performance | | delay | | ATM | | flight-centred; | | individual |
| /metrics | | propagation | | performance; | | passenger- | | performance |
| | | | | delay; knock-on | | centred | | variability |
| | | | | effects | | | | |
| resilience | | | | weather | | | | |
| legal | | | | | | | | |
| regulation | | | | | | | | |
| other | | | | | | | | |





| Project | ADAHR | MAREA | C-SHARE | COMPASS | ALIAS | CASSIOPEI | UTOPIA | ZEFMAP |
|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| | | | | | | A | | |
| controller tasks | | | | resolution incl. | | | | tower workflow: |
| | | | | knock-on | | | | electronic flight strips; |
| | | | | effects | | | | hand-over points |
| airport ops | airport operation | | | | | night | | integrated arrival |
| | centre | | | | | curfew | | management and |
| | automation | | | | | | | taxiing |
| trajectory- | | | shared | | | | trajectory | |
| based ops | | | representation; | | | | synchronisation; | |
| | | | route | | | | required time of | |
| | | | advisories | | | | arrival; aircraft intent | |
| network ops | airspace | | | | | en-route | , | |
| • | organisation and | | | | | slot swaps | | |
| | management: | | | | | | | |
| | automation | | | | | | | |
| airline ons | | | | | | dynamic | | |
| | | | | | | cost | | |
| | | | | | | indexing | | |
| UAS and GA | | | | | | Indexing | | |
| CNS | | | | | | | | |
| safety analysis | | exploiting | | safety patterns | | | | failure mode analysis |
| | | hazard | | salety patterns | | | | |
| | | database | | | | | | |
| Performance | | uuuuuuu | | | | | | |
| /metrics | | | | | | | | |
| rosilionco | | human | | | | | | |
| resilience | | flovibility and | | | | | | |
| | | menitoring | | | | | | |
| lasel | | monitoring | | lia hilitu | | | | |
| iegai | | | | liability | Automation in socio- | | | |
| | | | | | technical systems - | | | |
| | | | | | legal aspects | ļ | | |
| regulation | | | | national; | | | | |

Founding Members



| | | supra-national | | |
|-------|--|----------------|--|--|
| other | | | | |

| Project | SPAD | ELSA | ROBUSTATM | AGATHA | SAFECORAM | NINA | ALIAS2 | MOTA |
|-------------|--------------|-------------------------|--------------------|-------------|------------------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| controller | AMAN | conflict resolution | | | sharing of authority | sharing of tasks | sharing of liability | |
| tasks | | strategies; ATCo | | | between automation | between | between | |
| | | workload | | | and humans | automation and | automation and | |
| | | | | | | humans | humans | |
| airport ops | | | Runway utilisation | | | | | automated |
| | | | and planning | | | | | taxiing |
| | | | stability | | | | | |
| trajectory- | | | | seamless | | | | |
| based ops | | | | integration | | | | |
| network ops | | Predictability of | pre-tactical | | | | | |
| | | last-filed flight plan; | planning | | | | | |
| | | sector capacity mgt | | | | | | |
| airline ops | | | | | | | | |
| UAS and GA | RPAS with | | | GA | | | | |
| | self- | | | | | | | |
| | separation | | | | | | | |
| CNS | | | | | | | | |
| safety | | correlation between | | | | | | |
| analysis | | STCAs; critical | | | | | | |
| | | navpoints | | | | | | |
| Performance | productivity | satisfaction | | | delay; fuel burn; | | | environmental |
| /metrics | | | | | pollution; airport | | | impact |
| | | | | | capacity; airline | | | |
| | | | | | capacity | | | |
| resilience | degradation | | | | resilience engineering | | | |
| | propagation | | | | | | | |
| legal | | | | | | | | |
| regulation | | | | | | | | |
| other | | | | | | | | |





| Project | 6SENSE | FLITE | SCLOUD | TREE | ACCESS | SCALES | ACCHANGE | EMFASE |
|------------------|----------------|---------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|----------|
| controller tasks | ground control | | | | | | | |
| airport ops | | runway capacity; | slot trading | | slot allocation | | | |
| | | satellite airports; | | | | | | |
| | | intermodality | | | | | | |
| trajectory-based | | separation in | | | | | | |
| ops | | TMA | | | | | | |
| network ops | | | | | | | | |
| airline ops | | | | slot swapping; | | | | |
| | | | | cancellation | | | | |
| UAS and GA | | | | | | | | |
| CNS | | | | | | | | |
| safety analysis | | | | | | early warning | | |
| Performance | | | delay | reactionary | | | | |
| /metrics | | | | delays | | | | |
| resilience | resilience | | | bad weather | | resilience | | |
| | | | | | | abilities | | |
| legal | | | | | | | | |
| regulation | | | | | slot regulation | | | |
| other | | | | | | | (No validation | security |
| | | | | | | | activity | |
| | | | | | | | discussed) | |

Founding Members



| Project | SATURN | ERAINT | COMPLEXITYCOSTS | PROGA | AEROGAME | EMERGIA | AGENT | AUTOPACE |
|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| controller tasks | | | increased sector ops | | | fully automated tactical control | separation management; collision avoidance | greater automation and performance |
| airport ops | | | advanced CDM | | | | | |
| trajectory-based ops | | flight intent | | flight intent | Transition to 4D trajectory-based ATM | conflict-free; strategic and tactical | Trajectory options for collision avoidance | |
| network ops | | | | | | | | |
| airline ops | | | dynamic cost indexing; passenger re-accommodation | | | | cooperative collision avoidance | |
| UAS and GA | | RPAS integration | | | | | RPAS/UAS integration | |
| CNS | | | | | | | | |
| safety analysis | | | | safety assessment | | | maintained levels of safety | preliminary safety assessment |
| Performance /metrics | | | cost of delay; flight- centred; passenger- centred | | | | | |
| resilience | | | local disturbances; network-wide disturbances | | | | | |
| legal | | | | | | | | |
| regulation | charging mechanisms | | | | | | | |
| other | | | | | investment decisions | | | |





| Project | MINIMA | TACO | STRESS | BIGDATA4ATM | DART | MALORCA | BEST | ATM4E |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|------------|---------|--------------|-----------------|
| controller tasks | greater | human- | Controller | | | CPDLC | | |
| | automation and | automation | vigilance; | | | | | |
| | out-of-the-loop | handover | Human-in-the- | | | | | |
| | phenomena; | | loop; ATC | | | | | |
| | vigilance | | automation | | | | | |
| airport ops | | Surface | | | | | | |
| | | movement | | | | | | |
| | | optimisation; | | | | | | |
| | | control of | | | | | | |
| | | automation | | | | | | |
| trajectory-based | | | | | trajectory | | | |
| ops | | | | | prediction | | | |
| network ops | | | | passenger | DCB | | SWIM | traffic flows |
| | | | | behaviour | | | applications | |
| airline ops | | | | | | | | flight planning |
| UAS and GA | | | | | | | | |
| CNS | | | | | | | | |
| safety analysis | | | | | | | | |
| Performance | preliminary | | | delay | | | | environmental |
| /metrics | safety | | | | | | | impact |
| | assessment | | | | | | | |
| resilience | | non-nominal | | | | | | |
| | | conditions | | | | | | |
| legal | | | | | | | | |
| regulation | | | | | | | | |
| other | | | | | | | | |





| Project | PNOWWA | TBO-MET | COCTA | COMPAIR | VISTA | мото | RETINA | COPTRA |
|------------------|-----------------|------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| controller tasks | | | | | | | | |
| airport ops | ground | | | Competition in | | remote tower | tower in low | |
| | operations | | | Airport services | | | visibility | |
| trajectory-based | | trajectory | | | | | | probabilistic |
| ops | | planning | | | | | | prediction |
| network ops | | | DCB | Competition in | ATM cost | | | DCB |
| | | | | ATM services | efficiency | | | |
| airline ops | | | | | | | | |
| UAS and GA | | | | | | | | |
| CNS | | | | | | | | |
| safety analysis | | | | | | | | |
| Performance | delay | | flexibility | efficiency | Trade-offs | | | predictability |
| /metrics | | | | | between KPAs; | | | |
| | | | | | Departure delay; | | | |
| | | | | | Cost efficiency | | | |
| resilience | adverse weather | | | | | | | |
| legal | | | | | | | | |
| regulation | | | route charges; | route charges; | market | | | |
| | | | market | market | competition | | | |
| | | | competition | competition | | | | |
| other | | | | | | | | |





| Project | OPTIFRAME | PARTAKE | R-WAKE | SALSA | NAVISAS | SAPIENT | APACHE | AURORA | INTUIT |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|------------|--------------|
| controller | | departure | wake vortex | CPDLC | | | | | |
| tasks | | clearances | separation | | | | | | |
| airport ops | | | | | | | | | |
| trajectory- | pre-tactical | interdependen | | | | | trajectory | | |
| based ops | | cies | | | | | planning | | |
| network ops | | DCB; capacity | | | | | dynamic | | |
| | | management; | | | | | airspace | | |
| | | decision | | | | | configuration; | | |
| | | support | | | | | free routes; | | |
| | | | | | | | DCB | | |
| airline ops | | | | | | | cruise climb | | |
| UAS and GA | | | | | small aircraft | BVLOS UAS | | | |
| CNS | | | | ADS-B for non- | satellite | CNS; Air- | | | |
| | | | | radar airspace | navigation | ground | | | |
| | | | | | | datalink | | | |
| safety analysis | | | separation | | | | airspace | | |
| | | | schemes | | | | complexity | | |
| Performance | predictability; | Airspace | | | | | trajectory | flight | Trade-offs |
| /metrics | flexibility | optimisation | | | | | optimisation | efficiency | between KPAs |
| resilience | | | | | | datalink | | | |
| | | | | | | resilience | | | |
| legal | | | | | | | | | |
| regulation | | | | | | | | | |
| other | | | | | | | | | |

Founding Members



| Project | PACAS | DOMINO | EMPHASIS | COTTON | GATEMAN | ADAPT | ENVISION | EvoATM |
|------------------|------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|
| controller tasks | | | | | | | | |
| airport ops | | E-AMAN | | | | | Surface | |
| | | | | | | | surveillance | |
| trajectory-based | | | | effectiveness of | | | | |
| ops | | | | capacity | | | | |
| | | | | management | | | | |
| | | | | processes in TBOs | | | | |
| network ops | | UDPP | | Dynamic airspace | | traffic prediction; | | |
| | | | | configuration; | | flight information | | |
| | | | | capacity | | sharing & flexibility | | |
| | | | | management | | to mitigate | | |
| | | | | | | network | | |
| | | | | | | congestion | | |
| airline ops | | Dynamic cost | GA/Rotorcraft | | | | | |
| | | indexing | and UAS | | | | | |
| | | | integration | | | | | |
| UAS and GA | | | | | | | | |
| CNS | | | | | | | | |
| safety analysis | | | | | | | | |
| Performance | | impact of applying | | | | | | performance- |
| /metrics | | new mechanisms; | | | | | | ATM design |
| | | coupling of systems | | | | | | relationship |
| resilience | | | | | managing | | | |
| | | | | | threats to GNSS | | | |
| legal | | | | | | | | |
| regulation | | | | | | | | |
| other | change | | | | | | | |
| | management | | | | | | | |





| Project | ACF | IMET |
|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| controller tasks | | |
| airport ops | RWY and TXY | |
| | terminal security | |
| trajectory-based | | probabilistic |
| ops | | prediction |
| network ops | | |
| airline ops | | Flight planning |
| UAS and GA | | |
| CNS | | |
| safety analysis | | |
| Performance | Capacity | fuel burn and |
| /metrics | forecasting | flight duration |
| resilience | Disrupted | |
| | operations | |
| legal | | |
| regulation | | |
| other | | |





Appendix B: Project Review – Scientific Disciplines

| Project | SUPEROPT | NEWO | STREAM | ONBOARD | ASHICS | POEM | TESA | MUFASA |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| optimisation techniques & control systems | mixed-integer linear programming; global, non- linear | | linear time algorithm? | integer programming; disturbance feedback | random-hill climbing | | | |
| artificial intelligence | | | | | evolutionary computation; search harness | | | |
| agent-based modelling | | | | | | | | |
| network/graph models | | mesoscopic model; dynamic graphs | | aggregate flow model | | factor analysis for data reduction; granger causality for time series | | |
| formal methods | | | | | | | | |
| statistics & data analysis | | | | | | factor analysis for data reduction; granger causality for time series | trajectory prediction from data analysis | |
| interaction & | constraint | | | | | | | |
| visualisation | visualisation | | | | | | | |
| human factors | | | | | | | | automation acceptance and bias |

42 © – 2019 – University of Westminster, Innaxis, Università degli studi di Trieste, Univerzitet u Beogradu, Technische Universiteit Delft, Frequentis AG, EUROCONTROL, European Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved. Licensed to the SESAR Joint Undertaking under conditions.



Founding Members



| Project | SUPEROPT | NEWO | STREAM | ONBOARD | ASHICS | POEM | TESA | MUFASA |
|-----------------|----------|------|--------|---------|--------|------|------|--------|
| socio-economics | | | | | | | | |
| cryptography / | | | | | | | | |
| security | | | | | | | | |
| other | | | | | | | | |





| Project | ADAHR | MAREA | C-SHARE | COMPASS | ALIAS | CASSIOPEIA | UTOPIA |
|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------|--------------|
| optimisation | | | | | | | |
| techniques & | | | | | | | |
| control systems | | | | | | | |
| artificial | | | | | | | |
| intelligence | | | | | | | |
| agent-based | | ABM; multi-agent | | | | ABM modelling | |
| modelling | | dynamic risk | | | | architecture | |
| | | modelling | | | | | |
| network/graph | | | | | | | |
| models | | | | | | | |
| formal methods | | critical | functional model | | flow diagrams; risk | | language for |
| | | observability + | | | trees | | trajectory |
| | | compositional | | | | | modelling |
| | | bisimulation; | | | | | |
| | | hybrid system | | | | | |
| | | modelling | | | | | |
| statistics & data | | | | time-based pattern | | game theory | |
| analysis | | | | detection; | | | |
| | | | | synchronisation | | | |
| | | | | likelihood | | | |
| interaction & | | | | | | | |
| visualisation | | | | | | | |
| human factors | automation | reuse of cognitive | joint cognitive | | fair treatment of | | |
| | acceptance; trust; | modelling | system design | | operators | | |
| | situational | constructs | | | | | |
| | awareness; | | | | | | |
| | workload | | | | | | |
| socio-economics | | | | | | | |
| cryptography / | | | | | | | |
| security | | | | | | | |
| other | | | | | argument-based | | |
| | | | | | case structure; | | |
| | | | | | doctrinal analysis | | |





| Project | ZEFMAP | SPAD | ELSA | ROBUSTATM | AGATHA | SAFECORAM | NINA |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| optimisation | | | | robust | | graph-based | adaptive |
| techniques & | | | | optimisation; | | optimisation | automation |
| control systems | | | | stochastic | | | |
| | | | | optimisation/ | | | |
| | | | | mixed-integer | | | |
| | | | | linear | | | |
| | | | | programming | | | |
| artificial | | | | | | | |
| intelligence | | | | | | | |
| agent-based | | | multi-layered: | | | | |
| modelling | | | tactical and | | | | |
| | | | strategic | | | | |
| network/graph | | graph-based route | | | | | |
| models | | network | | | | | |
| formal methods | workflow process | multi-viewpoint | | | | functional models; | state-classifier |
| | modelling; failure | models: FRAM; | | | | flow diagram | algorithm |
| | mode, effects and | HAIVISTERS | | | | | |
| | criticality method | | | | | | |
| statistics & data | (FIVIECA) | | community | | | | |
| | | | detection | | | | |
| didiysis | norformanco | | uelection | | | | |
| visualisation | visualisation | | | | | | |
| Visualisation | visualisation | | | | | tack allocation | |
| numan factors | operator | | | | | | assessing cognitive |
| | productivity | | | | | | framework |
| socio oconomics | | | | | | | Indifference |
| socio-economics | | | | | | | |
| cryptography / | | | | | | | |
| other | | | | | (wireless CNS | | |
| Uner | | | | | technologies) | | |
| 1 | | | 1 | 1 | (echinologies) | | 1 |

Founding Members



| Project | ALIAS2 | MOTA | 6SENSE | FLITE | SCLOUD | TREE | ACCESS | SCALES |
|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| optimisation | | graph-based | | | | | | |
| techniques & | | optimisation | | | | | | |
| control systems | | | | | | | | |
| artificial | | | machine learning; | | | | | |
| intelligence | | | pattern recognition | | | | | |
| agent-based | | multi-agent | | | | Datatree-driven | Agent-based | |
| modelling | | models | | | | ABM | modelling | |
| network/graph | | | | | | | | semantic wiki |
| models | | | | | | | | |
| formal methods | workflow models | | | | | | | multi-viewpoint |
| | | | | | | | | enterprise |
| | | | | | | | | architecture; |
| | | | | | | | | EATMA |
| statistics & data | | learning effects | outlier detection | Unspecified | data | Datatrees | asymmetry of | |
| analysis | | | | "analysis" of | confidentiality | | information | |
| | | | | future | and sensitivity; | | | |
| | | | | scenarios | benchmarking | | | |
| interaction & | | ground-control | eye tracking; voice | | | | | |
| visualisation | | interface | recognition; | | | | | |
| | | | gesture control; | | | | | |
| | | | time-series | | | | | |
| | | | visualisation | | | | | |
| human factors | user-centred | trust in | human error; | | | | | |
| | design | automation | stress | | | | | |
| socio-economics | | | | | sealed-bid | | combinatorial | |
| | | | | | auctions; | | auctions; | |
| | | | | | elections | | bounded | |
| | | | | | | | rationality | |
| cryptography / | | | | | secure multi- | | | |
| security | | | | | party | | | |
| | 1. 1. 1. 1. | | | | computation | | | |
| other | Liability | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 |





| Project | ACCHANGE | EMFASE | SATURN | ERAINT | COMPLEXITYCOSTS | PROGA | AEROGAME |
|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| optimisation | | | stackelberg games | | | | |
| techniques & | | | | | | | |
| control systems | | | | | | | |
| artificial | | | | | | | |
| intelligence | | | | | | | |
| agent-based | network | | | | | | serious games |
| modelling | congestion game | | | | | | |
| network/graph | economic network | | | | stochastic layered | barriers and | |
| models | model | | | | network model | precursors diagram | |
| formal methods | | EOCVM | | | | functional hazard | |
| | | | | | | analysis | |
| statistics & data | asymmetry of | | | Analysis by human- | | statistical | |
| analysis | information | | | in-the-loop | | characterisation of | |
| | | | | simulation | | nominal behaviour | |
| interaction & | | textual and visual | | | | cockpit displays | board game; |
| visualisation | | risk assessment | | | | | electronic score |
| | | methods | | | | | board |
| human factors | | cognitive fit theory; | | | | situational | learning effect |
| | | actual vs perceived | | | | awareness | |
| | | effectiveness | | | | | |
| socio-economics | incentives; price- | | pricing | | early adopters and | | last-mover |
| | caps; vertical | | mechanisms | | followers | | advantage |
| | integration; fore- | | | | | | |
| | runners for tech- | | | | | | |
| | nology adoption; | | | | | | |
| | labour union | | | | | | |
| | model; public | | | | | | |
| | utility model | | | | | | |
| cryptography / | | threat catalogues | | | | | |
| security | | | | | | | |
| other | economic | method evaluation | | | | | |
| | regulation | method | | | | | |

Founding Members



| Project | EMERGIA | AGENT | AUTOPACE | MINIMA | TACO | STRESS | BIGDATA4ATM | DART | MALORCA |
|----------------|--------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|--------|------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------|
| optimisation | | | | | gaming | | | | |
| techniques & | | | | | | | | | |
| control | | | | | | | | | |
| systems | | | | | | | | | |
| artificial | | | | | | | | reinforcement | machine |
| intelligence | | | | | | | | learning | learning |
| agent-based | agent-based | intelligent | | | | | | ABM | |
| modelling | safety | agents | | | | | | | |
| | assessment | | | | | | | | |
| network/grap | petri models | | | | | | | | |
| h models | | | | | | | | | |
| formal | | | | | | | | | |
| methods | | | | | | | | | |
| statistics & | | | | | | | data mining | Data-driven | |
| data analysis | | | | | | | | trajectory | |
| | | | | | | | | prediction | |
| interaction & | | | | | | | | | speech |
| visualisation | | | | | | | | | recognition |
| human factors | | | cognitive | out-of-the- | | controller | | | |
| | | | model; out-of- | loop; dynamic | | cognitive | | | |
| | | | the-loop; | vigilance; | | state | | | |
| | | | automation | attention | | | | | |
| | | | acceptance | | | | | | |
| | | | and bias; | | | | | | |
| | | | training | | | | | | |
| socio- | | | | | | | | | |
| economics | | | | | | | | | |
| cryptography / | | | | | | | | | |
| security | | | | | | | | | |
| other | | | | | | | | | |





| Project | BEST | ATM4E | PNOWWA | TBO-MET | COCTA | COMPAIR | VISTA | мото | RETINA |
|----------------|--------------|------------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|---------------|-------------|------------------|------------------|
| optimisation | | | | stochastic | | | | | |
| techniques & | | | | optimisation | | | | | |
| control | | | | | | | | | |
| systems | | | | | | | | | |
| artificial | | | | | | | | | |
| intelligence | | | | | | - | | | |
| agent-based | | | | | | | | | |
| modelling | | | | | | | | | |
| network/grap | | | | probabalistic | | economic | | | |
| h models | | | | trajectory | | network model | | | |
| | | | | prediction | | | | | |
| formal | semantic | | | | | | | | |
| methods | technologies | | | | | | | | |
| statistics & | | | nowcasting | nowcasting | trade-off | | trade-off | | |
| data analysis | | | | | analysis | | analysis | | |
| interaction & | | | | | | | | virtual reality; | augmented |
| visualisation | | | | | | | | head-mounted | reality; see- |
| | | | | | | | | display; tactile | through head- |
| | | | | | | | | stimulus; | mounted display; |
| | | | | | | | | auditory | conformal head- |
| | | | | | | | | stimulus | up displays |
| human factors | | | | | | | | situational | |
| | | | | | | | | awareness; | |
| | | | | | | | | workload | |
| socio- | | | | | | market-based | | | |
| economics | | | | | | design; | | | |
| | | | | | | unbundling | | | |
| cryptography / | | | | | | | | | |
| security | | | | | | | | | |
| other | | climate | meteorology | meteorology | | | model | | |
| | | chemistry modelling | | | | | development | | |

Founding Members



| Project | COPTRA | OPTIFRAME | PARTAKE | R-WAKE | SALSA | NAVISAS | SAPIENT | APACHE | AURORA |
|----------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| optimisation | model-driven | multi- | constraint logic | | system-of- | | | pareto front | |
| techniques & | state | objective | programming | | systems | | | | |
| control | estimation | optimisation | | | | | | | |
| systems | | | | | | | | | |
| artificial | | | | | | | | | |
| intelligence | | | | | | | | | |
| agent-based | | | | | | | | | |
| modelling | | | | | | | | | |
| network/grap | | | petri nets | | | | | multi-scale | |
| h models | | | | | | | | models | |
| formal | | | | dynamic risk | | | | | |
| methods | | | | model; | | | | | |
| | | | | conditioned | | | | | |
| | | | | individual risk | | | | | |
| statistics & | | trade-off | Spatio-temporal | | | | | | Data analytics |
| data analysis | | analysis | interdependency | | | | | | |
| | | | analysis | | | | | | |
| interaction & | | | | | | | | | |
| visualisation | | | | | | | | | |
| human factors | | | | | | | | | |
| socio- | | | | | | | | | |
| economics | | | | | | | | | |
| cryptography / | | | | | | | | | |
| security | | | | | | | | | |
| other | | | | | | (technology | System | | |
| | | | | | | evaluation) | architecture | | |
| | | | | | | | development | | |





| Project | INTUIT | PACAS | DOMINO | EMPHASIS | COTTON | GATEMAN | ADAPT | ENVISION | EvoATM |
|-------------------------|------------------|---------|---------|-------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------|-----------|--------------|
| optimisation | | | | | | | | | |
| techniques & control | | | | | | | | | |
| systems | | | | | | | | | |
| artificial intelligence | machine | | | | | | | Machine | evolutionary |
| | learning | | | | | | | learning | computing |
| agent-based | | serious | ABM | | | | | | ABM |
| modelling | | games | | | | | | | |
| network/graph | | | | | | | Percolation | | |
| models | | | | | | | | | |
| formal methods | | | | | Baysian | | | | |
| | | | | | network | | | | |
| | | | | | modelling | | | | |
| statistics & data | data-driven | | complex | | Complexity | | Percolation | | sensitivity |
| analysis | modelling | | network | | science; | | | | analysis |
| | techniques | | science | | Uncertainty | | | | |
| interaction & | visual analysis; | | | | | | | video | |
| visualisation | interactive | | | | | | | analytics | |
| | dashboard | | | | | | | | |
| human factors | | | | | | | | | |
| socio-economics | | | | | | | | | |
| cryptography / | | | | | | | | | |
| security | | | | | | | | | |
| other | | | | (No | | GNSS interference | | | |
| | | | | information | | mitigation barrier | | | |
| | | | | found) | | development | | | |





| Project | ACF | IMET |
|----------------|-------------|----------|
| optimisation | | |
| techniques & | | |
| control | | |
| systems | | |
| artificial | | |
| intelligence | | |
| agent-based | | |
| modelling | | |
| network/grap | | |
| h models | | |
| formal | | |
| methods | | |
| statistics & | Probability | Ensemble |
| data analysis | trees | methods |
| interaction & | dashboard | GUI |
| visualisation | | |
| human factors | | |
| socio- | | |
| economics | | |
| cryptography / | | |
| security | | |
| other | | |





Appendix C: Project Review – Validation Approach

| Project | SUPEROPT | NEWO | STREAM | ONBOARD | ASHICS | POEM | TESA | MUFASA |
|--------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------|------|-------------------|
| experimental | demonstrator; | | numerical | multi-agent | numerical ATC | numerical | | mock-up? |
| tool | what-if scenarios | | simulator | simulator | simulator | simulator | | |
| airspace | multi-sector | at specific | from pre- | | | n/a | all | en-route sector? |
| | Wales and NW | airports at | departure to | | | | | |
| | England | specific times | execution | | | | | |
| roles | en-route | departure mgr | | network | en-route | passenger | | en-route |
| | controller | | | manager; airline | controller | journeys | | controller? |
| | | | | ops mgr | | | | |
| experiments | | numerical | | incl. knock-on | | re- | | varying traffic |
| | | experiments | | reactionary | | accommodation | | complexity, level |
| | | | | delays | | rules; trade-offs | | of automation, |
| | | | | | | | | level of |
| | | | | | | | | conformance |
| data & | | low equipage | | | | 50 largest | | |
| measurements | | rates | | | | airports in | | |
| | | | | | | Europe; busy day | | |
| | | | | | | in September | | |

Founding Members



| Project | SUPEROPT | NEWO | STREAM | ONBOARD | ASHICS | POEM | TESA | MUFASA |
|-------------|----------|------------|------------------|-----------------|--------|------|--------------------|--------|
| uncertainty | | thru noise | perturbations in | due to weather; | | | along-track and | |
| | | | along track | due to | | | cross-track wind | |
| | | | error; | unscheduled | | | estimates; initial | |
| | | | perturbations in | demand | | | mass | |
| | | | estimated time | | | | | |
| | | | of departure | | | | | |
| | | | error | | | | | |
| other | | | | | | | | |





| Project | ADAHR | MAREA | C-SHARE | COMPASS | ALIAS | CASSIOPEIA | UTOPIA | ZEFMAP | SPAD |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| experimental tool | serious gaming mock-up and platform | monte-carlo petri-net simulator | human-in-the- loop simulator with different levels of automation | numerical simulator | case template | multi-agent simulator | demon- strator | human-in- the-loop simulator | demon- strator |
| airspace | planning phase | all | | en-route sectors | | n/a | major hub; TMA | airports | en-route sectors (generic, 3) |
| roles | airport agent; airline ops mgr; network mgr; local traffic mgr; A- CDM mgr | controller | | en-route controller | | | | tower controller | en-route controller; remote pilot |
| experiments | 5 experts; 60 students; 2 iterations | thought experiments with experts; one numerical scenario | expert workshop (7p); expert workshop (16p); 8 scenarios (3p); 1 scenario (12p) | | expert workshops | baseline current ops with current traffic; scenario current ops with future traffic; scenario future ops with future traffic | | 5 experts | few experts |
| data & measurements | | half hazard set reserved for validation | | historical data for 44 days | | | heterogen- eous traffic | Hamburg airport | |
| uncertainty | | | | | | | due to wind prediction; due to bad weather cells | | |
| other | | | | | | | | | |

Founding Members



| Project | ELSA | ROBUSTATM | AGATHA | SAFECORAM | NINA | ALIAS2 | MOTA |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| experimental tool | numerical | monte-carlo | | agent-based | human-in-the-loop | | human-in-the-loop |
| | simulator for | simulator | | simulator at | simulator; | | simulator |
| | tactical and | | | mesoscale | controlled | | |
| | strategic layers | | | | experiments | | |
| airspace | en-route sectors | runway movements | | | | | ground movements |
| roles | en-route controller; network manager; airline ops manager | Pre-tactical and tactical slot allocation | private pilots; professional pilots; controllers | | controllers; controller students | end-users and stakeholders; ACAS and RPAS experts | controllers; autonomous tugs; aircraft; taxiways |
| experiments | expert workshops | | expert panels; mental exercises; interviews | expert workshops | expert observations; questionnaires and interviews with 37 subjects | interviews | 3 iterations; 18 experts; 35 mins scenarios |
| data & | ? | 200 flights at large | | 2050 and beyond | system logs; neuro- | | CDG airport; |
| measurements | | German airport | | | physiologic | | different equipage |
| | | | | | indicators | | ratios; different traffic density |
| uncertainty | perturbations of different size | gamma distribution for departure and arrival delay | | | | | non-nominal events |
| other | | | | | | training development; achieved V3 | |





| Project | 6SENSE | FLITE | SCLOUD | TREE | ACCESS | SCALES | ACCHANGE | EMFASE |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| experimental tool | human-in-the- loop simulator | numerical simulator | cloud prototype | numerical simulator; what- if scenarios | agent-based simulator | demonstrator | | human-in-the- loop experiments; controlled experiments |
| airspace | terminal area? | terminal area | | | network | | | |
| roles | | | | aircraft; passengers; crews | slot coordinator; airlines; airports; passengers | experts for 4 cases | | ATM experts; security experts; students |
| experiments | few experts; 8 * 60 mins; observations; auto-reporting (stress) | | | | 2 stakeholder workshops; 100p | interviews and observations | | demographic questionnaires; focus groups; 7 iterations |
| data & measurements | Hamburg airport; physiological measurements | traffic up to 2050 | synthetic data | 1d delay data; 140d traffic data | | | | |
| uncertainty | noise in sensors | | | stochastic connection probability | | | | |
| other | | achieved TRL4 | | | | achieved TRL2 | (No validation information available) | training |

Founding Members



| Project | SATURN | ERAINT | COMPLEXITY- COSTS | PROGA | AEROGAME | EMERGIA | AGENT | AUTOPACE |
|--------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| experimental | numerical | numerical | numerical | demonstrator; | human-in-the- | numerical | open | |
| tool | simulation | simulations | simulations | human-in-the- | loop | simulations | demonstrator | |
| | | | | loop simulations | experiments | | | |
| airspace | network | en-route; | network | | | en-route | U-space | |
| | | terminal area | | | | | | |
| roles | regulators; | controllers | ANSPs; | pilots | several | | | |
| | airports; airlines; | | passengers; | | | | | |
| | ANSPs | | airline ops mgr; | | | | | |
| | | | airport ops mgr | | | | | |
| experiments | stakeholder WS; | 100 runs with 8 | | expert WS | 4 experts; 3 | | | preliminary |
| | 100p | subjects | | | iterations; | | | hazard |
| | | | | | questionnaires; | | | assessment; |
| | | | | | observations; | | | qualitative |
| | | | | | group discussion | | | performance |
| | | | | | | | | assessment |
| data & | 1 busy nominal | extended BADA | 1 busy nominal | from France and | | | | |
| measurements | day | for RPAS | day | Netherlands | | | | |
| uncertainty | | | local or network- | | | | | |
| | | | wide | | | | | |
| | | | disturbances | | | | | |
| other | | | | | | | RPAS | training |





| Project | MINIMA | TACO | STRESS | BIGDATA4ATM | DART | MALORCA | BEST | ATM4E | PNOWWA |
|--------------|-----------------|----------|---------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|------------|-------------|-----------|----------|
| experimental | | | human-in-the-loop | | | human-in- | | numerical | |
| tool | | | simulator | | | the-loop | | simulator | |
| | | | | | | simulator | | | |
| airspace | | | | | | Vienna and | | | |
| | | | | | | Prague | | | |
| roles | 15 controllers; | ATCo | ATCos | | | ATCos | | | airport |
| | tool testing | feedback | | | | | | | feedback |
| experiments | | | vigilance, attention, | | | | | | |
| | | | workload, stress and | | | | | | |
| | | | type of cognitive control | | | | | | |
| | | | during execution of | | | | | | |
| | | | operational tasks | | | | | | |
| data & | neuro- | | neuro-physiological | Comparison with | Comparison | | | | |
| measurements | physiological | | indictors | official statistics; | with other | | | | |
| | indictors | | | case studies | predictions and | | | | |
| | | | | | real data | | | | |
| uncertainty | | | | | | | | | |
| other | | gaming; | | | | | Prototyping | | |
| | | up to | | | | | | | |
| | | TRL1 | | | | | | | |

Founding Members



| Project | TBO-MET | COCTA | COMPAIR | VISTA | МОТО | RETINA | COPTRA | OPTIFRAME |
|--------------|----------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|
| experimental | human-in-the- | | | | | human-in-the- | | |
| tool | loop simulator | | | | | loop simulator | | |
| airspace | | | regional airports | | | | | |
| | | | in Sweden, UK, | | | | | |
| | | | Spain and | | | | | |
| | | | Germany | | | | | |
| roles | | Expert (NM) | | | | airport | Judgemental | |
| | | evaluation | | | | controller | techniques using | |
| | | | | | | | Barcelona ACC | |
| experiments | | | | use cases | | | | |
| data & | | | | | impact of these | | | trade-off |
| measurements | | | | | stimuli, in terms | | | analysis |
| | | | | | of workload, | | | |
| | | | | | performance, | | | |
| | | | | | sense of | | | |
| | | | | | presence and | | | |
| | | | | | situational | | | |
| | | | | | awareness | | | |
| uncertainty | | | | | | | | |
| other | | | | | | | | |





| Project | PARTAKE | R-WAKE | SALSA | NAVISAS | SAPIENT | APACHE | AURORA | INTUIT | PACAS |
|--------------|------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|------------|--------------|---------------|-----------|--------------|
| experimental | | human-in-the- | human-in-the- | | Simulation | | | | |
| tool | | loop simulator | loop simulator | | | | | | |
| airspace | London TMA | | | | | | | | |
| | data | | | | | | | | |
| roles | | | | | | | | | |
| experiments | | safety & | | | | | | | testing with |
| | | robustness | | | | | | | SESAR |
| | | analysis | | | | | | | solutions |
| data & | | | | | | case studies | "validated by | use cases | |
| measurements | | | | | | | airlines" | | |
| uncertainty | | | | | | | | | |
| other | | | | (No | | | | | |
| | | | | operational | | | | | |
| | | | | validation | | | | | |
| | | | | performed) | | | | | |

Founding Members



| Project | DOMINO | EMPHASIS | COTTON | GATEMAN | ADAPT | ENVISION | EvoATM |
|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| experimental tool | | | | | | | |
| airspace | | | | | network-wide | two demonstration | |
| | | | | | tactical assessment | airports | |
| roles | | | | | flight-centred | | |
| | | | | | tactical assessment | | |
| experiments | investigative and | | | Physical testing | | | |
| | adaptive case | | | | | | |
| | studies | | | | | | |
| data & | | | | | | | known scenarios |
| measurements | | | | | | | and quantitative |
| | | | | | | | indicators |
| uncertainty | | | uncertainty | | | | |
| | | | characterisation | | | | |
| other | | (No information | | | | | |
| | | available) | | | | | |





| Project | ACF | IMET |
|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| experimental tool | mock-up | exploiting |
| | | numerical weather |
| | | prediction |
| | | forecasts |
| airspace | | |
| roles | airport actors | flight planning |
| experiments | 2 expert WSs | |
| data & | AMS airport, 2y | large sample of |
| measurements | | meteo |
| | | measurements 36h |
| | | before take-off |
| uncertainty | Meteo; capacity | ensemble forecasts |
| | distributions | |
| other | | |





-END OF DOCUMENT-

