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Introduction / Multi-Sector-Planning

- New ATM concepts to increase air space capacity
- Airspace temporally and spatially enlarged
- Exceeds cognitive capabilities of air traffic controllers
- Controller needs support by conflict detection and resolution

Multi-Sector Planning:
- Medium-term traffic flow planning
- Optimizes traffic flow beyond existing sector boundaries
- Reduces conflict density
- Relieves sector controller
- Offers conflict solutions
Multi-Sector-Planner

- Working position for one controller (MSP-Controller) with two screens:
  - Air Situation Display
  - Negotiation Window
- 10 min up to 1 hour look ahead time exceeds the mental planning capacity of a controller
- Controller needs support for conflict detection and resolution by an assistance system
Conflict Resolution Assistance

- Low acceptance of conflict resolutions generated by mathematical search methods:
  - Less comprehensible solutions
  - Contradictory to controllers’ experiences

- Include controller knowledge to increase plausibility and acceptance of the system

- Hybrid model (cube model) by Oliver Späth (2003) classifies conflicts and generates solutions with heuristic search methods

- Essential criteria of the hybrid model:
  - Conflict type (conflict classification by Eurocontrol)
  - Distance to destination
  - Aircraft flight performance
  - Vertical distance to sector ceiling
Project Description

Project “Integration of controllers’ strategies into a Medium Term Conflict Resolution System“:

✧ Supported by the German research foundation DFG (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft)
✧ Project duration: January 2003 to December 2005
✧ Project team consists of a psychologist, an engineer and two students
✧ Milestones:
  ✓ Survey for data acquisition
  ✓ Implementation of the acquired controllers’ strategies into a conflict assistance system
  ✓ Evaluation of the assistance system with the Multi-Sector-Planner
    ▪ Evaluation of statistical and machine learning methods to adapt a model to air traffic controllers’ behavior
    ▪ Integration of the new model into the conflict assistance system and evaluation with the Multi-Sector-Planner
Hypotheses For Conflict Solution (1)

▷ First indications from examinations of Späth’s Hybrid/Cube Model and Eurocontrol CORA2

▷ Hypotheses:
  - If destination is far and climb is possible, then a climb is preferred
  - If destination is near, then a descent is preferred
Hypotheses For Conflict Solution (2)

- If climb or descent is impossible, then a lateral solution is preferred

- When an airplane descents (or climbs), it will either continue or suspend the descent (or climb), but it will never fly contrary to the current flight phase

- The conflict type has no influence on the preferred solution
Model Parameter

Model Parameter:

⇒ Input Parameter:
  - Distance to destination airport = \{near, far\}
  - Flight phase = \{climb, cruise, descent\}
  - Conflict type = \{head-on, crossing, catch-up\}
  - Climb solution possible due to aircraft performance and distance to the sector ceiling = \{yes, no\}

⇒ Output Parameter:
  - Solution category = \{climb, descent, stop-climb, stop-descent, lateral\}
First Survey – Realization

⇒ 24 en-route controllers of the German Civil Air Navigation Service Provider (DFS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sex:</td>
<td>6 female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age:</td>
<td>22 to 51 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work experience:</td>
<td>1 to 29 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Survey – Results - Resolution (1)

Results: preferred resolution over all criteria

![Bar chart showing preferred resolution over all criteria.](image)

- Vertical: 63.6%
- Lateral: 33.1%
- Speed: 0.5%
- Combination: 2.8%
First Survey – Results - Resolution (2)

Results: preferred resolution depends on conflict type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict type</th>
<th>Vertical Solution</th>
<th>Lateral Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catch-up</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head-on</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Survey – Results - Resolution (3)

Summarizing Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flight phase</th>
<th>climb</th>
<th>cruise</th>
<th>descent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance to destination</td>
<td>far</td>
<td>far</td>
<td>near</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climb solution</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop-Climb solution</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descent solution</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop-Descent solution</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral solution</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Survey – Discussion

Results from the first survey:

- Controllers preferred vertical solution
- For aircrafts in cruise ATC instructs to climb when destination is far and to descent when destination is near
- Aircrafts in climb or descent were instructed to interrupt their current flight phase
- The preferred solution depends also on the conflict type (contradictory to the hypotheses)
- Speed solutions are negligible for en-route control
- Combined solutions were given as a service idea, but can be reduced to single solutions
Controllers’ strategies are represented as decision tree:

- **Transition point between cruise and descent (TOD)**
  - **Distance to destination?**
  - **Climb or cruise?**
    - **Climb**
      - **Yes**
        - Head-on conflict?
          - **Yes**
            - Solutions: 1. lateral solution, 2. stop climb
          - **No**
            - Solutions: 1. lateral solution, 2. lateral solution
        - **No**
          - Solutions: 1. lateral solution, 2. lateral solution
    - **Cruise**
      - **Yes**
        - Climb possible?
          - **Yes**
            - Solutions: 1. lateral solution, 2. descend
          - **No**
            - Solutions: 1. lateral solution, 2. stop descent
        - **No**
          - Solutions: 1. lateral solution, 2. lateral solution
  - **Descent**
    - **Transition point between cruise and descent (TOD) is near**
      - **Distance to destination?**
      - **Cruise or descent?**
        - **Cruise**
          - **Yes**
            - Solutions: 1. lateral solution, 2. lateral solution
          - **No**
            - Solutions: 1. lateral solution, 2. lateral solution
        - **Descent**
          - **Yes**
            - Solutions: 1. lateral solution, 2. lateral solution
          - **No**
            - Solutions: 1. lateral solution, 2. lateral solution
Conflict Resolution Assistance – Solution Choice (2)

View of the vertical flight path with controllers’ strategies:

- **Top of Descent (TOD)**
- **Top of Descent far**
- **Top of Descent near**

Decision tree:

1. **Head-on conflict?**
   - **Yes**
     - **Climb not possible**
     - Solutions:
       1. Lateral solution
       2. Stop climb
   - **No**
     - **Climb possible**
     - Solutions:
       1. Lateral solution
       2. Stop climb

2. **Head-on conflict?**
   - **Yes**
     - Solutions:
       1. Lateral solution
       2. Descent
   - **No**
     - Solutions:
       1. Lateral solution
       2. Stop descent
Model Implementation

- Redesign of the existing assistance system “LOTEC” with highly sophisticated object orientated software engineering methods
- COCOS (COnrollers’ strategies integrated into a COnflict resolution System)

COCOS:
- Integration of the acquired controller strategies
- Object orientated analysis and design with the Unified Modeling Language (UML)
- Implemented in the programming language C++
- Network based communication between MSP and the COCOS component
Example For a Conflict Situation
Second Survey – Evaluation

- Evaluation with real-time simulation
- Scenarios based on real traffic data
- Measurement of:
  - subjective workload with questionnaires
  - behavior with system event logging
  - visual attention with an eye-tracking system
- Three comparing conditions:
  - **Baseline condition**: To control the traffic with conflict detection and without conflict resolution
  - **Prior system condition**: To control the traffic with conflict detection and resolution **without** integrated controllers’ strategies
  - **COCOS condition**: To control the traffic with conflict detection and resolution **with** integrated controllers’ strategies
Second Survey – Realization

- 27 en-route controllers of the German Civil Air Navigation Service Provider (DFS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sex:</td>
<td>3 female, 24 male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age:</td>
<td>23 to 49 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work experience:</td>
<td>0 to 24 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second Survey – Results (1)

- **Handling Time per Conflict:**

  - LOTEC: 103.95 s
  - COCOS: 78.23 s

- **Unsolved Conflicts (Controller could not find suitable solution):**

  - LOTEC: 14.03%
  - COCOS: 4.35%

- **Workload (NASA Task Load Index (TLX)):**

  - Training: 29.35
  - Baseline Condition: 31.39
  - LOTEC: 33.43
  - COCOS: 28.06
Second Survey – Results (2)

Evaluation showed:
⇒ Integration of air traffic controllers’ knowledge leads to:
  - Shorter handling times
  - Less unsolved conflicts
  - Better retrieval of the preferred solutions
  - Higher subjective plausibility and acceptance

Acceptance of the solution system

- COCOS better (with controller strategies) 56%
- LOTEC better (without controller strategies) 7%
- both systems equal 37%
Model Improvement (1)

Model improvement approach:

- Infer probabilities for the conflict solutions from the input variables by induction from training examples
- Show most probable solutions to the air traffic controller

Objective:

- Set of examples $E$
  - Discrete input vector $x$
  - Discrete response variable $y \in \{\text{climb, descent, stop-climb, stop-descent, lateral}\}$
- Infer hypotheses $H$ from the examples $E$
- Probability $P$ for a value of the response variable $y$ conditioned by the input vector $x$ and hypotheses $H$ is searched: $P(y|x,H)$

- Classification (Pattern Recognition)
Model Improvement (2)

Classification (pattern recognition):

- Learning model consists of:
  - Input vector $x$ drawn from an unknown probability $P(x)$
  - Output vector $y$ corresponding to the input $x$, according to unknown conditional probability $P(y|x)$
  - Learning machine with a set of functions $f(x, \alpha)$, where $\alpha$ is an element of a set of parameters

- Objective: Choose a function from the function space which response to the output vector in the best possible way
  - Discrepancy or loss between the response $y$ to the input $x$ can be measured by the loss function $L(y, f(x, \alpha))$
  - Find a function which minimizes the risk functional $R(\alpha)$
    \[ R(\alpha) = \int L(y, f(x, \alpha)) \, dP(x, y) \]
  - Learning model provides the statistical model $\hat{y} = f(x, \alpha)$, which is an estimate for the model $y = f(x)$
Model Improvement (3)

Problem:

- Air traffic controllers assign different solution types to the same conflict situation
- Using only the most probable solution in a conflict situation results in an lowest achievable error rate of about $\text{Err}=0.194$ (95% confidence interval: $[0.168, 0.220]$)

Solution:

- Using the smallest solution subset with the highest accumulated probabilities, which is greater equal a given threshold (e.g. $\theta=0.8$)
Conclusion And Outlook

- Acceptance of a conflict assistance system could be increased by integrating air traffic controllers’ knowledge.
- Use of more than the four presented parameters will bring only a small increase in agreements between the model and controller’s behavior.
- Presenting the most probable solution results in a residual value, which can be overcome by using a solution set of the most probable solutions.

- Evaluation of learning methods to solve the stated problem with Bayesian Belief Networks or Probabilistic Logic Learning.
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