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Take-away

• Today’s simulators are inadequate to meet NTSB recommendations for upset training
• Improvements in awareness, recognition & avoidance, recovery warranted
• Simulator improvements needed in the following areas:
  – startle factor
  – lateral/directional characteristics in the stall regime
  – motion cueing
The Problem
Fatalities by CAST/ICAO Common Taxonomy Team (CICTT)
Aviation Occurrence Categories

ICATEE’s target

Note: Principal categories as assigned by CAST.
What is the Problem?

• Loss of control is the leading cause of fatalities in the worldwide commercial jet fleet
• In early 2010, the NTSB recommended:
  – training centers develop and conduct training that incorporates stalls that are fully developed and unexpected
  – simulation model fidelity requirements to support an expanded set of stall recovery training requirements be defined and codified
What is the Problem?

- Industry Aircraft Upset Recovery Training Aid (1998)
- Provides academic training
  - Swept-wing jets
  - 100+ passengers
  - Non-regulated
  - Perhaps too large to absorb and recall at time of need
Today’s Upset Training Requirements

• FAA:
  Requires recoveries in the simulator from approach-to-stalls in the clean, takeoff, and landing configurations

• European Aviation Safety Agency
  Used to demonstrate ability to recover from full stall, although now it is typically a briefing

• Transport Canada
  Upset training is required for airline operations
iCATEE

- International Committee for Aviation Training in Extended Envelopes
- Formed in 2009 by Flight Simulation Group of the Royal Aeronautical Society
- AIM: Upset Prevention and Recovery
- MISSION: To deliver a complete and comprehensive long-term strategy to eliminate or reduce the rate of Loss of Control In-Flight accidents and incidents through enhanced Upset Prevention and Recovery Training (UPRT)
Deliverables (internal)
Participants

ICATEE
International Committee for Aviation Training in Extended Envelopes

Flight Simulation Group - Royal Aeronautical Society London, UK
### Deliverables (external)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Master Document</strong></th>
<th><strong>Recommended training practices:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What to train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How to train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Whom to train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How often to train</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Training &amp; Regulations</strong></th>
<th><strong>Regulatory recommendations:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upset Prevention (Awareness, Avoidance/Recognition, Recovery) Manuals:</td>
<td>• Approved Training Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Professional Pilot Licensing &amp; Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Qualification at appropriate licensing levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Instructor qualification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Research &amp; Technology</strong></th>
<th><strong>Adaptations to FSTD standards (e.g. ICAO 9625) to enhance qualification for UPRT in FSTD’s</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guideline for the use of alternative training devices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*subject to advice from ICAO
Training Needs

• Levels of mitigation
  – Awareness
  – Recognition and avoidance
  – Recovery
• Hazards
• Training criteria
• Training media
• Frequency of training
• Training matrix and challenges
# Simulator vs aircraft as training medium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training medium</th>
<th>Advantage available</th>
<th>Disadvantage or currently missing surmountable</th>
<th>Insurmountable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Aircraft**    | • continuous increased and decreased g-loads for awareness  
• realistic startle factors, fear/threat, aerodynamics  
• α-management  
• knowledge transferability - trainer aircraft to target environment  
• risk exposure from aircraft-based training  
• dissimilarity with target environment  
• cost to train several thousand pilots (initial & recurrent)  
• identical g-cueing  
• identical stress, fear, startle  
• expectations of trainee | | |
| **FFS**         | • type-specific environment  
• repeatable, measurable, safe  
• procedures  
• model limitations  
• less startle than aircraft  
• motion cueing (improvement)  
• lack of feedback on airplane envelope limits | | |
## Simulator vs aircraft as training medium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training medium</th>
<th>Advantage available</th>
<th>Disadvantage or currently missing surmountable</th>
<th>Disadvantage or currently missing insurmountable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Aircraft**    | • continuous increased and decreased g-loads for awareness  
                  • realistic startle factors, fear/threat/aerodynamics  
                  • α-management | • knowledge transferability - trainer aircraft to target environment  
                  • risk exposure from aircraft-based training | • dissimilarity with target environment  
                  • cost to train several thousand pilots (initial & recurrent) |
| **FFS**         | • type-specific environment  
                  • repeatable, measurable, safe  
                  • procedures | • model limitations  
                  • less startle than aircraft  
                  • motion cueing (improvement)  
                  • lack of feedback on airplane envelope limits | • identical g-cueing  
                  • identical stress, fear, startle  
                  • expectations of trainee |
Gaps and Improvements

• Need to do better to achieve startle in simulation
  – Some operators achieving this in clever ways
  – Create immersion by making simulator training environment more like airplane (e.g., wear uniforms, more realistic air traffic communication)
  – Increase workload by having instructor add distractions
  – Invoke a startling situation (e.g., wake upset) at the will of the instructor after distraction accomplished
Gaps and Improvements

• Reduction in lateral stability and control effectiveness typically not modeled adequately
  – Although some simulations account for these effects
  – Flight data past approach-to-stall often not part of the data package used to build simulator model
  – Sometimes data in this region exists, but is not comprehensive
  – Instead, extrapolated values used, which too often give pilots a false sense of security in recoveries (i.e., simulated aircraft is more stable and is more easily controlled than the aircraft)
  – Neither pilots nor instructors are informed when they are operating in the extrapolated region
  – To train confidently in the post approach-to-stall region, the above deficiencies need improvement
Modelling Gaps

![Graph depicting modelling gaps with axes for Angle of Attack and Angle of Sideslip, showing areas for data held constant, extrapolation, interpolation, and loss of control.]
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Modelling Gaps
courtesy Bihrlie Applied Research
Gaps and Improvements

• Need: Vibration indicative of stall buffet, degradations in pitch/roll control, show difficulty in arresting descent
• Motion cues need improvement, primarily vertical axis
• Important: Define and avoid negative cueing
  – Vertical accelerations in simulator are often on the order of 10% that experienced in the aircraft
  – Usually no feedback to the pilot or instructor as to how many g’s were pulled in the last maneuver
  – Instances of when excessive control might have compromised aircraft structural integrity not fed back to the pilot or instructor
Possible Tools for Upset Prevention & Recovery Training

- Maximum use of existing infrastructure
- Specialized devices to support our internal research goals
- Aerobatic-capable aircraft for basic-level training
- Modern tools for academics training:
  - content is the key, not necessarily the tools themselves
Pros and Cons of Possible Training Solutions

• Status quo
  – Pros: changes may result in unknown and unintended consequences
  – Cons: If we know we can do better, we should endeavor to do so

• Mandate use of Upset Recovery Training Aid
  – Pros: Tests show simulators can be used to improve recovery from upsets
  – Cons: May go outside simulator envelope. Also, lack of consensus on proper technique for envelope-protected aircraft
Pros and Cons of Possible Training Solutions

• Extend envelope in today’s simulators
  – Pros: Know how to make representative improvements, and in some cases flight data exist to check
  – Cons: The benefit/cost ratio may not support this approach, especially if near foolproof recognition and avoidance can be achieved

• Mandate upset recovery training in aircraft
  – Pros: There’s nothing like the real thing, and studies support this fact
  – Cons: Infrastructure does not exist to allow it now, and benefit/cost ratio may not support this approach
Pros and Cons of Possible Training Solutions

- Embrace scenario-based training for upset recovery
  - Pros: Invokes some surprise instead of using today’s scripted approach
  - Cons: Concerns about evaluating pilots on these events, as simulator may not be representative and probability of seeing such an in-flight scenario may be remote
- Cost-effective combination of previous solutions
  - Pros: Graduated approach is more comprehensive and allows strengths to be emphasized and weaknesses to be de-emphasized
  - Cons: Would prefer one way to skin a cat for simplicity instead of multiple ways
UPRT is not only a simulator problem

• Regulatory:
  – When in a career should UPRT occur?
• Instructional:
  – How do we enhance the instructor’s role?
• CRM:
  – Encourage teamwork in upset prevention and recovery
FAA Deliverables

• ICATEE has delivered to the FAA/Industry Stall/Stick-Pusher Working Group:
  – Recommendations on how to implement startle in simulation during UPRT
  – Recommendations on how to provide feedback via Instructor Operator Station on effective UPRT
Summary

• Today’s simulators are inadequate to meet NTSB recommendations for upset training
• Improvements in awareness, recognition & avoidance, recovery warranted
• Simulator improvements needed in the following areas:
  – startle factor
  – lateral/directional characteristics in the stall regime
  – motion cueing
• ICATEE is prioritizing recommendations from a mix of possible solutions
• Will propose recommendations through RAeS to FAA and ICAO