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KDP-A Results & Action Summary

• KDP-A Outcome
  – Approved to proceed with the TC-C2 partnerships, ACAS Xu Flight Test 2 Partnership, and overall project formulation

• KDP-A Actions to be addressed at or before KDP-C per KDP-A memo
  – Assess whether IT&E should or shouldn’t be a Technical Challenge. Brief recommendation NLT KDP-C. [Project Tag-up with the AA on March 13, 2017]
  – Sharpen DAA and C2 TC wording along the lines of TC guidelines to clearly describe the technical barrier being addressed (see assessment and recommendations). Brief these, along with explanation of overarching applicability to community needs, NLT KDP-C. [Project Tag-up with the AA on March 13, 2017]
  – Prepare discussion material for a future Project Tag-up with the AA that addresses the following:
    • Describe the relationship between LVC-DE and the FAA Test Sites [Project Tag-up with the AA on December 5, 2016]; LVC-DE/SMART NAS meeting with ARMD Leadership [February 15, 2017]
      – Include any examples of LVC-DE use by other organizations
    • Offer current thoughts on what portion of the UAS industry we expect to benefit from our work in the next 5 years...Is there a real demand in that timeframe? [Pre-SPMR]
      – Has the current UAS focus excluded any vehicle classes?
  – Schedule and present at a KDP-C in the 2nd Quarter of FY17 [Today]
KDP-C ToR Overview

• During this review, the Project will address the terms of reference (ToR) intent and demonstrate readiness to proceed

• The project will be approved to move from formulation to implementation if the Project Management Team can effectively convey that the:
  1) Technical plans are relevant to the agency’s mission and vision as well as, the ARMD Strategic Implementation Plan, and customer/stakeholder needs
  2) Technical plans are feasible and executable
  3) Planned resources and schedule are adequate to meet the stated goals and objectives of the Project with the acceptable level of risk
  4) Management process updates and partnership approaches are sound for the proposed UAS-NAS Project

• Decision the Project is seeking today
  – Approval to proceed with execution of the baseline plan

These charts reflect removal of budget/resource information. Additionally, actions from brief will affect Baseline
# UAS-NAS Project Lifecycle

**Timeframe for impact: 2025**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>Phase 1 [FY14 - FY16]</th>
<th>Phase 2 [FY17 - FY20]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formulation Review</td>
<td>▶ KDP</td>
<td>△ KDP-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Start</td>
<td>△ KDP-A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Early Investment Activities

- **Formulation**
  - System Analysis: Concept of Operations (ConOps), Community Progress, etc.

## External Input

- Technical input from Project technical elements, NASA Research Announcements, Industry, Academia, Other Government Agencies, Project Annual Reviews, ARMD UAS Cohesive Strategy

## Key Decision Points

- SC-228 Deliverables, i.e. Minimum Operational Performance Standards (MOPS) Complete

## Key Milestones

- **Phase 1**
  - Initial Modeling, Simulation, & Flight Testing
  - Integrated Modeling, Simulation, & Flight Testing

- **Phase 2**
  - Integrated Modeling, Sim, & Flight Testing
  - Close-out

**Phase 1**

- **Formulation** (May 2011)

**Phase 2**

- KDP Formulation Review KDP-CKDP-A
- Project Start May 2011

**Technical Validated Research Findings to Inform Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Decision Making**

- P1 MOPS
- P2 MOPS
ARMD Strategic Plan Flow Down to UAS-NAS Project

**Thrust 1:** Safe Efficient Growth in Global Operations

- **Outcome (2025):** ATM+1 Improved NextGen operational performance in individual domains, with some integration between domains

**Research Theme:**
Airspace Operations Performance Enablers

**Thrust 6:** Assured Autonomy for Aviation Transformation

- **Outcome (2025):** Initial Introduction of aviation systems with bounded autonomy, capable of carrying out function-level goals

**Research Themes:**
- Implementation and Integration of Autonomous Airspace and Vehicle Systems
- Testing and Evaluation of Autonomous Systems

---

**AERONAUTICS STRATEGIC THRUST**

**AERONAUTICS OUTCOME**

**AERONAUTICS Technical Challenges**

**UAS-NAS Technical Challenges**

**Develop Operational Standards for UAS in NAS**

- Select, develop, and implement autonomy applications compatible with existing systems
- Develop policies, standards, & regulations framework of increasingly autonomous systems
- Test, evaluate & demonstrate selected small-scale applications of autonomy

---

**TC-C2: Command & Control**

**TC-DAA: Detect and Avoid**

**TC-SIO: System Integration & Operationalization**
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Manned and unmanned aircraft will be able to routinely operate through all phases of flight in the NAS, based on airspace requirements and system performance capabilities.
Emerging Commercial UAS Operating Environments (OE)

**IFR-LIKE**

Non-cooperative Traffic

UAS will be expected to meet certification standards and operate safely with traditional air traffic and ATM services. (Example Use Case: Communication Relay / Cargo Transport)

**VFR-LIKE**

Non-Cooperative Traffic

These UAS will operate at altitudes below critical NAS infrastructure and will need to routinely integrate with both cooperative and non-cooperative aircraft. (Example Use Case: Infrastructure Surveillance)

**BVLOS RURAL**

Low risk BVLOS rural operations with or without aviation services. (Example Use Case: Agriculture)

**BVLOS URBAN**

Must interface with dense controlled air traffic environments as well as operate safely amongst the traffic in uncontrolled airspace. (Example Use Case: Traffic Monitoring / Package Delivery)
The UAS Airspace Integration Pillars and Enablers

**UAS Technologies:**
- T01 - Airport Operations Technologies
- T02 - Airworthiness Standards
- T03 - Command, Control, Communications Technologies
- T04 - Detect & Avoid (DAA)
- T05 - Flight & Health Mngmt Systems
- T06 - Ground Control Station (GCS) Technologies
- T07 - Hazard Avoidance
- T08 - Highly Automated Architectures
- T09 - Navigation
- T10 - Power & Propulsion
- T11 - Weather Avoidance

**ATM Services & Infrastructure:**
- I01 - Airport Infrastructure
- I02 - Air Traffic Management (ATM) Infrastructure
- I03 - Non-FAA Managed Airspace Infrastructure
- I04 - Radio Frequency (RF) Spectrum Availability
- I05 - Test Ranges & Modeling & Simulation (M&S) Facilities

**Operational Regulations, Policies & Guidelines:**
- P01 - ATM Regulations / Policies / Procedures
- P02 - Airworthiness Regulations / Policies / Guidelines
- P03 - Operating Rules / Regulations / Procedures
- P04 - Safety Risk Mngmt & Methods of Compliance

**Public Acceptance & Trust:**
- A01 - Cyber Security Criteria & Methods of Compliance
- A02 - Legal & Privacy Rules / Guidelines
- A03 - Noise Reductions
- A04 - Physical Security Criteria & Methods of Compliance
- A05 - Public Safety Confidence

**UAS Airspace Integration Vision:**
Manned and unmanned aircraft will be able to routinely operate through all phases of flight in the NAS, based on airspace requirements and system performance capabilities.

**The UAS Airspace Integration Pillars enable achievement of the Vision**
• Each Operating Environment has unique considerations with respect to each Pillar

• Program and Project core competencies focus on Integrated Vehicle technologies

• “IFR-Like” and “VFR-Like” Operating Environments became the project focus due to considerations such as core competencies, TRL, other ARMD portfolio work, and community benefit

• KDP-A proposed Phase 2 TCs, i.e. detect and avoid (DAA) and command and control (C2), do not cover the broad needs for all Operating Environments or UAS Vehicle Technologies
NASA and FAA have determined DAA and C2 are the most significant barriers to UAS integration.

Project wrote TC statements that address the full barrier for DAA and C2 in the “VFR-Like” and “IFR-Like” Operating Environments.

Project identified the work required to complete the TCs and which aspects NASA should lead.

Project assessed and prioritized research to provide the greatest benefit to address the community barriers within resource allocations.

NASA well positioned to lead research addressing most significant barriers, DAA and C2, to UAS integration.

* Portions of Terrestrial C2 completed as part of Phase 1 project specific to “IFR-Like”, but work remains for “VFR-Like”
Project TC Definitions

• **Background**
  – Sets the stage for the current state of the UAS Community with respect to the element being discussed, i.e. Command and Control (C2), Detect and Avoid (DAA), or System Integration and Operationalization (SIO) for UAS

• **Barrier**
  – What’s needed to be overcome for the UAS Community to move forward

• **Community Objectives**
  – Decomposition of the barrier, i.e. what the Project and UAS Community hope to achieve

• **TC Statement**
  – Written for the full barrier for the “VFR-Like” and “IFR-Like” Operating Environments and what the UAS Community needs

• **Project Approach**
  – The work that the Project is doing to address the community need/barrier
  – Defines how the Project is working with the community to accomplish the community objectives
  – Defines the overarching approach on which the baseline content is based
Provide research findings, utilizing simulation and flight tests, to support the development and validation of DAA and C2 technologies necessary for integrating Unmanned Aircraft Systems into the National Airspace System.
UAS Detect and Avoid Operational Concepts and Technologies
Technical Challenge Statement

TC-DAA: UAS Detect and Avoid Operational Concepts and Technologies

Develop Detect and Avoid (DAA) operational concepts and technologies in support of standards to enable a broad range of UAS that have Communication, Navigation, and Surveillance (CNS) capabilities consistent with IFR operations and are required to detect and avoid manned and unmanned air traffic

- **Community Objectives:**
  - Develop and validate UAS DAA requirements for Low-SWaP airborne DAA systems to support standardization through the evaluation of commercial and engineering prototype DAA systems that enable a broader set of UAS operations
  - Implement state of the art DAA technologies into an UAS and test in operationally relevant scenarios
  - *Develop and validate UAS DAA requirements for Ground Based DAA systems to support standardization through the evaluation of commercially available radars integrated with airborne DAA architectures*
  - *Develop and validate human machine interface requirements to support human automation teaming and higher levels of autonomy for UAS DAA systems*

- **Project Approach:**
  - Develop Concept of Operations and performance standards in coordination with RTCA and FAA (including international)
  - Solicit industry partnerships to develop DAA technologies
  - Perform modeling and simulation to characterize the trade space of the DAA for critical areas such as well clear, collision avoidance interoperability, human machine interfaces, and others
  - Flight Test and V&V of DAA technologies for performance standard requirements and DAA system technology builds

*Bullets in italics are not covered by UAS-NAS P2 resource allocation*
Detect and Avoid (DAA) Performance Standard Operating Environments (OE)

Legend
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Phase 2 Research Areas (FY17 – FY20)
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Phase 1 Research Areas (FY14 – FY16)
Phase 2 Research Areas (FY17 – FY20)
Provide research findings, utilizing simulation and flight tests, to support the development and validation of DAA and C2 technologies necessary for integrating Unmanned Aircraft Systems into the National Airspace System
TC-C2: UAS Satcom and Terrestrial Command and Control and Control

Develop Satellite (Satcom) and Terrestrial based Command and Control (C2) operational concepts and technologies in support of standards to enable the broad range of UAS that have Communication, Navigation, and Surveillance (CNS) capabilities consistent with IFR operations and are required to leverage allocated protected spectrum

• Community Objectives:
  – Develop and validate UAS C2 requirements and radio spectrum allocation decisions to support C2 standardization through the evaluation of commercial and engineering prototype Ku/Ka Satcom radio systems
  – Develop and validate UAS C2 requirements to support C2 standardization through the evaluation of commercial and engineering prototype multiple access C-Band Terrestrial radio systems
  – Provide system design studies (payload and earth station) and system design requirements of C-band Satcom systems for C2 standardization

• Project Approach:
  – Develop Concept of Use to be leveraged for initial requirements for C2 partnerships, and coordination with RTCA and FAA
  – Jointly develop performance standards with RTCA and FAA (including international) throughout lifecycle of concept and technology development
  – Solicit industry partnerships to develop radio technologies in Satcom and terrestrial frequency bands
  – Performance assessment of satellite-based CNPC in existing Fixed Satellite Service bands
  – Flight Test and V&V of radio technologies for performance standard requirements and radio technology builds
Provide research findings, utilizing simulation and flight tests, to support the development and validation of DAA and C2 technologies necessary for integrating Unmanned Aircraft Systems into the National Airspace System.
System Integration and Operationalization for UAS
Technical Challenge Statement

TC-SIO: System Integration and Operationalization for UAS
Integrate state of the art DAA and C2 technologies into Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) to ensure sufficient aircraft level functional and operational requirements, and perform demonstrations in the NAS to inform Federal Aviation Administration creation of policies for operating UAS that have Communication, Navigation, and Surveillance (CNS) capabilities consistent with IFR operations

• Community Objectives:
  – Obtain FAA approval to demonstrate SC-228 Phase 1 DAA MOPS technologies on an unmanned aircraft in the NAS as an alternative means of compliance to FAR Part 91 “see and avoid” rules (i.e. No Chase COA)
  – Support coordination between DAA and C2 activities within RTCA
  – Perform operational demonstrations of integrated Phase 2 MOPS DAA and C2 technologies in their NAS operating environments to assist the FAA in developing the policies for UAS integration aircraft that will fly IFR

• Project Approach:
  – Leverage Phase 1 DAA MOPS developed technologies to obtain an operational approval, in partnership with ATO, to fly the DAA system in the NAS with as few restrictions as possible (No Chase COA)
  – Develop C2-DAA interface requirements and Phase 2 DAA and C2 integrated ConOps

Note: SIO is foundational to Vehicle Technology elements from the UAS Cohesive Strategy

Bullets in italics are not covered by UAS-NAS P2 resource allocation
### Potential “IFR-Like” Transition to “Thin/Short Haul”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OE: IFR-Like</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY30</th>
<th>FY35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UAS Technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATM Services &amp; Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Regulations, Policies, &amp; Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Acceptance &amp; Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**
- **Blue** Covered under UAS-NAS Baseline
- **Orange** Not covered by P2
- **Red** Future ARMD Considerations

**Potential “IFR-Like” Transition to “Thin/Short Haul”**

- **P1 MOPS**
  - SC-228 P2 MOPS (GBDAA & SATCOM)
    - ACAS Xu
    - GBDAA
    - SATCOM

**UAS Vehicle Technologies**

- **Power and Propulsion**
- **High-Altitude ATM**

- **FAA Implementation Plan**
  - CA ARC
  - ARC Recommend to FAA
  - Industry SIO Agreements

- **Assured Autonomous Systems & Human Integration For Short/Thin Haul**

- **SIO Demo & “Industry IOC”**

- **Short/Thin Haul Technology Demo**

*Public Acceptance and Trust addressed by various elements above for this OE*
# Potential “VFR-Like” Transition to “Urban Air Mobility”

## OE: VFR-Like

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY30</th>
<th>FY35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UAS Technologies</td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td><strong>P1 MOPS</strong></td>
<td><strong>SC-228 P2 MOPS (ABDAA &amp; C2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>ABDAA FT5</strong></td>
<td><strong>ABDAA FT6</strong></td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATM Services &amp; Infrastructure</td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Regulations, Policies, &amp; Guidelines</td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Acceptance &amp; Trust</td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
<td> </td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UAS Vehicle Technologies

- **SIO Demo** & “Industry IOC”
- Assured Autonomous Systems & Human Integration For Urban Air Mobility (ODM)
- Urban Air Mobility (ODM) Technology Demo

### FAA Implementation Plan

- Undefined Implementation Path
- Or connections to SIO

*Public Acceptance and Trust addressed by various elements above for this OE

---

**Legend**

- Blue: Covered under UAS-NAS Baseline
- Orange: Not covered by P2
- Red: Future ARMD Considerations
Project Resource Overview

• Data Removed
Total Planned Budget ($K) by TC and Project Management

- Data Removed
Risk Mitigation Summary

• Data Removed
UAS-NAS Phase 2
Project Organization Structure

- Data Removed
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Technical Baseline Development

Technical Challenges (TC)
- Defined by UAS Community Needs

Technical Work Packages (TWP)
- Defined at KDP-A, Refined at KDP-C
- Subject areas of the Technical Challenges
- Required content to accomplish TCs
- Identified Resources (FTE/WYE/Procurement)
- Documented TWP Objectives in the Technical Baseline

Schedule Packages (SP)
- Described the Phase 2 technical content and significantly enhanced technical detail
- Defined by discrete activities and tasks necessary to accomplish a TWP; generally with research findings as the outcome
- Documented SP Objective, Approach, and Deliverable in Technical Baseline
- Project Milestones defined
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TC-DAA: Detect and Avoid Operational Concepts and Technologies

- Airspace Operations Performance Enablers
- Implementation and Integration of Autonomous Airspace and Vehicle Systems
- Develop Detect and Avoid (DAA) operational concepts and technologies in support of standards to enable a broad range of UAS that have Communication, Navigation, and Surveillance (CNS) capabilities consistent with IFR operations and are required to detect and avoid manned and unmanned air traffic
TC-DAA: Overview

Description: The Detect and Avoid (DAA) effort will lead the Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) community through concepts and technology development of DAA technologies applicable to a broad range of aircraft with low cost size, weight, and power (SWaP) availability. The DAA system will detect other aircraft in their vicinity, predict if the aircraft trajectories will be in conflict with each other, and determine the appropriate guidance to display to the UAS pilot in command. Pilot responses to the system will be assessed in order to validate standards being developed for UAS within RTCA SC-228. Robust safety and collision risk assessments, algorithm development, and ground control station display development will be performed in collaboration with other government agencies and industry stakeholders to support the broad needs of detect and avoid for the UAS community.

Objectives

- Develop and validate UAS DAA requirements for Low-SWaP airborne DAA systems to support standardization through the evaluation of commercial and engineering prototype DAA systems that enable a broader set of UAS operations
- Implement state of the art DAA technologies into an UAS and test in operationally relevant scenarios

Approach

- Develop Concept of Operations and performance standards in coordination with RTCA and FAA (including international)
- Solicit industry partnerships to develop DAA technologies
- Perform modeling and simulation to Characterize the trade space of the DAA system for critical areas such as well clear, collision avoidance interoperability, human machine interfaces, and others.
- Flight Test and V&V of DAA technologies for performance standard requirements, and DAA system technology builds

Deliverables

- RTCA Standards Inputs:
  - DAA Phase 2 MOPS
  - Sensor Phase 2 MOPS
  - ACAS Xu MOPS
- Technical papers & presentations to technical and regulatory organizations
- Candidate DAA guidance, displays, & alerting
- Integrated design documents for each integrated event
TC-DAA: DAA Subproject

Detect and Avoid Subproject
Subproject Manager
Jay Shively, ARC
Subproject Technical Leads
Confesor Santiago, ARC; Tod Lewis, LaRC; Lisa Fern, ARC

D.1 Alternative Surveillance Requirements
D.2 Well Clear/Alerting Requirements
D.3 ACAS Xu Interoperability
D.4 External Coordination
D.5 Integrated Events

D.1.10 / D.1.20 / D.1.30 / D.1.50
Tiger Team, Partnerships, ConOps, Display
D.1.40 / D.1.60 / D.1.80
Three Fast-time Sims
D.1.70 / D.1.90
Two HITL Sims

D.2.10
ConOps
D.2.20
Well Clear Definition
D.2.30 / D.2.70 / D.2.80
Three HITL Sims
D.2.40 / D.2.50 / D.2.60
Three Fast-time Sims

D.3.10 / D.3.40
Stakeholder Meeting, ConUse Review
D.3.20
Mini HITL Sim
D.3.30
Sensor Model Integration
D.3.50
HITL Sim 1

D.4.10 / D.4.20 / D.4.30 / D.4.40
SC-228 White Paper, Stakeholder Support

D.5.10 / D.5.20 / D.5.30
Support Three Flight Tests
D.5.40
Common Architecture Implementation
TC-DAA: IT&E Subproject

IT&E Subproject Manager
Heather Maliska, AFRC
Subproject Technical Leads
Jim Murphy, ARC; Sam Kim, AFRC

- T.6 Integration of Technologies into the LVC
  - T.6.10 Systems Engineering & Management
  - T.6.20 / T.6.30 / T.6.40 Integration Support
  - T.6.50 LVC-DE Improvements & Maintenance

- T.7 Simulation Planning & Testing
  - T.7.10 / T.7.20 / T.7.30 / T.7.40 Four HITL Simulations

- T.8 Integrated Flight Test
  - T.8.01 / T.8.02 Partner/Stakeholder Support
### TC-DAA: DAA Subproject Schedule Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>[TWP D.1] Alternative Surveillance Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP D.1.10] Tiger Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP D.1.20] Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP D.1.30] CONOPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP D.1.40] Foundational Fast-Time Simulation (FY17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP D.1.50] Display Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP 1.60] Unmitigated Fast-Time Simulation (FY18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP 1.70] HITL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP 1.80] Unmitigated/Mitigated Fast-Time Simulation (FY19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP 1.90] HITL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[TWP D.2] Well Clear/Alerting Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP D.2.10] CONOPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP D.2.20] Definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP D.2.30] Foundational Terminal Ops HITL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP D.2.40] Foundational Terminal Ops Fast-Time Simulation 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP D.2.50] Fast-Time Simulation 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP D.2.60] Fast-Time Simulation 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP D.2.70] HITL Simulation 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP D.2.80] HITL Simulation 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**L1 Program (IASP)  ▶️ L2 Project**
# TC-DAA: DAA Subproject Schedule Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP D.3.10] Stakeholder Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP D.3.20] Mini HiTL Simulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP D.3.30] Sensor Model Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP D.3.40] ACAS Xu ConUse Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP D.3.50] HITL Simulation 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- ★ L1 Program (IASP)
- ♦ L2 Project
TC-DAA: IT&E Subproject Schedule Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC - Detect and Avoid (DAA); Integrated Test &amp; Evaluation (IT&amp;E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[TWP T.6] Integration of Technologies into LVC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP T.6.10] Systems Engineering &amp; Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP T.6.20] ACAS Xu Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP T.6.30] DAA MOPS Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP T.6.40] Low SWaP Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP T.6.50] Improvements &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[TWP T.7] Simulation Planning &amp; Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP T.7.10] Foundational Terminal Ops HITL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP T.7.20] Alternative Surveillance HITL Simulation 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP T.7.30] ACAS Xu HITL Simulation 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP T.7.40] Alternative Surveillance HITL Simulation 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[TWP T.8] Integrated Flight Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP T.8.01] SC-228 Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP T.8.01] RTT Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP T.8.10] ACAS Xu Flight Test 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP T.8.30] Flight Test 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP T.8.40] Flight Test 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Progress Indicator Definition

- **Technical Challenge (TC) progress** is tracked by means of Progress Indicators
  - TC completion represented by both UAS-NAS Progress and Community Outcome sections

- **UAS-NAS Progress**
  - Represents the execution/data collection of elements for Project Schedule Packages (SP)

- **Assessed maturity of Project research portfolio** related to the technical challenge
  - High = 2, i.e. L1 Milestones and Flight Tests
  - Moderate = 1, i.e. HITLs, System Development Complete, and Demonstrations
  - Low = 0, Foundational activities, i.e. the rest

- Research portfolio maturity normalized on a 10 point scale represents Project progress towards TC completion

- **Tech Transfer**
  - Represents the data analysis and reporting elements for Project SP

- Progress is tracked against all SP tasks and UAS Community Outcomes using a color indicator
TC-C2: UAS Satcom and Terrestrial Command and Control and Control

- Airspace Operations Performance Enablers
- Implementation and Integration of Autonomous Airspace and Vehicle Systems
- Develop Satellite (Satcom) and Terrestrial based Command and Control (C2) operational concepts and technologies in support of standards to enable the broad range of UAS that have Communication, Navigation, and Surveillance (CNS) capabilities consistent with IFR operations and are required to leverage allocated protected spectrum.

**Technical Challenge-DAA:** Detect and Avoid (DAA)

**Technical Challenge-C2:** Command and Control (C2)

**Technical Challenge-SIO:** System Integration and Operationalization for UAS (SIO)
Description: The Command and Control (C2) effort will lead the UAS community through concept and technology development of Terrestrial and Satellite based C2 systems that are consistent with international/national regulations, standards, and practices. C2 will develop and analyze robust datalinks in designated spectrum and propose security recommendations for civil UAS control communications. All of the identified activities will be accomplished by collaborating with other government agencies and industry partners to address the technical barriers.

Objectives

- Develop and validate UAS C2 requirements and radio spectrum allocation decisions to support C2 standardization through the evaluation of commercial and engineering prototype Ku/Ka Satcom radio systems
- Develop and validate UAS C2 requirements to support C2 standardization through the evaluation of engineering prototype Networked C-Band Terrestrial radio systems
- Provide system design studies (payload and earth station) and system design requirements of C-band Satcom systems for C2 standardization

Approach

- Develop Concept of Operations to be leveraged for initial requirements for C2 partnerships, and coordination with RTCA and FAA
- Jointly develop performance standards with RTCA and FAA (including international) throughout lifecycle of concept and technology development
- Solicit industry partnerships to develop radios technologies in Satcom and terrestrial frequency bands.
- Performance assessment of satellite-based CNPC in existing Fixed Satellite Service bands
- Flight Test and V&V of radio technologies for performance standard requirements, and radio technology builds

Deliverables

- RTCA Standards Inputs
  - CNPC Link MASPS
  - Ku/Ka Satcom MOPS
  - C-Band Terrestrial MOPS Update
- Technical papers & presentations to technical and regulatory organizations
TC-C2: C2 Subproject

Command and Control Subproject
Subproject Manager
Mike Jarrell, GRC
Subproject Technical Lead
Jim Griner, GRC

C.5 Satellite-Based UAS Command and Control
C.6 Terrestrial-Based UAS Command and Control

C.5.10 / C.5.11 / C.5.30 / C.5.31
Ku-Band Evaluation System Development, Propagation Flights and Interference Analysis, Test, & Evaluation

C.5.20 / C.5.21
Ka-Band Evaluation System Development, Test, & Evaluation

C.5.40 / C.5.41
C-Band Design Study C-Band Verification and Validation Planning

C.6.10 / C.6.11
Terrestrial Evaluation System Development, Test, & Evaluation
## TC-C2: Schedule Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TC - Command and Control (C2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[TWP C.5] Satellite-Based UAS Command &amp; Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP C.5.01] FAA/NASA RTT Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP C.5.05] Establish NASA/Industry Cooperative Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP C.5.10] Ku-Band Spectrum Interference Evaluation System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP C.5.11] Ku-Band Propagation Flights and Interference Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP C.5.20] Ka-Band Evaluation System Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP C.5.21] Ka-Band Test and Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP C.5.30] Ku-Band Evaluation System Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP C.5.31] Ku-Band Test and Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP C.5.40] C-Band Design Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP C.5.41] C-Band Verification and Validation Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[TWP C.6] Terrestrial-Based UAS Command &amp; Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SP C.6.01] FAA/NASA RTT Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Community Outcomes

Tech Transfer

UAS-NAS Progress

Maturity

Fiscal Year

2017 2018 2019 2020

Technical Transfer Recipients: RTCA SC-228 C2 Working Group, FAA Spectrum Office and ICAO
Outline

- KDP-A Outcomes & KDP-C Overview
- UAS Community Overview and Technical Challenge Development
- Technical Baseline
  - Technical Baseline Overview
  - Technical Challenges
  - Emerging TC
- Project Summary
- Briefing Summary
**Description:** System Integration and Operationalization (SIO) addresses two primary areas required for the integration of UAS into the NAS. Developing robust performance standards that ensure a pathway to vehicle certification requires consideration of aircraft level functional and operational requirements. Integration of UAS into the National Airspace System (NAS) is a broad multi-faceted problem that requires operationalization of technologies into the NAS through partnership with industry and the FAA to inform timely policy creation.

### Objectives

- Obtain FAA approval to **demonstrate** SC-228 Phase 1 DAA MOPS technologies on an unmanned aircraft in the NAS as an alternative means of compliance to FAR Part 91 “see and avoid” rules (i.e. No Chase COA)
- Support **coordination between** DAA and C2 activities within RTCA

### Approach

- Leverage Phase 1 DAA MOPS developed technologies on Ikhana to **obtain FAA approval to fly the DAA system in the NAS** with as few restrictions as possible (No Chase COA)
- Develop C2-DAA **interface requirements** and Phase 2 DAA and C2 integrated ConOps

### Deliverables

- No-Chase COA Application Package
- Phase 1 DAA Flight Demonstration
- Integrated ConOps
- Technical papers & presentations to technical and regulatory organizations
ETC-SIO: Organization

System Integration and Operationalization
<ETC-SIO>
IT&E Subproject Manager (SPM)
Heather Maliska, AFRC
IT&E Subproject Technical Leads
Sam Kim, AFRC, Jim Murphy, ARC

TWP: Integrated Flight Test

SP: No Chase COA
SP: System Engineering Activities

• TWP: Technical Work Package
• SP: Schedule Package
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- KDP-A Outcomes & KDP-C Overview
- UAS Community Overview and Technical Challenge Development
- Technical Baseline
- Project Summary
  - Phase 2 Milestone Overview
  - Budget
  - Risks
  - Other Collaborations
  - Process, Document, and Organization Changes
- Briefing Summary
# Phase 2 Milestone Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Comments to MOPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DAA White Paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[TC-C2]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C2 SatCom MOPS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ku/Ka-Band Satellite-Based UAS Command &amp; Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DAA MOPS Rev A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial-Based UAS Command &amp; Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C2 Terrestrial MOPS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[TC-DAA]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Surveillance Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Clear/Alerting Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACAS Xu Interoperability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAA Flight Tests</td>
<td></td>
<td>C2 White Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subprojects DAA / IT&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ETC-SIO]</td>
<td></td>
<td>DAA MOPS Rev A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-Chase COA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Combined subprojects have shared milestones.
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FAA UAS Integration Research Transition Team

- **FAA Coordination Background**
  - Phase 1: UAS-NAS Project and FAA coordinated research through shared objectives and quad charts
  - Phase 2: Increased formality of the relationship with the creation of a Research Transition Team (RTT)
    - Kick-off of UAS Integration RTT held on January 26, 2017

- **NASA and FAA determined need for four Working Groups (WG); each with NASA and FAA co-leads**
  - Operational and Advanced Concept
    - Develop the full global UAS integration ConOps and expand the current FAA UAS ConOps to incorporate both the concepts and plans for addressing existing barriers and gaps
  - DAA
    - Leverage Phase 2 MOPS development research for extended operations within Class D/E/G airspace by smaller, more diverse aircraft that lack the SWaP capabilities to accommodate a robust radar system onboard
  - C2
    - Leverage Phase 2 MOPS development research for both Terrestrial communications and Satcom
  - No Chase COA (NCC)
    - The WG will leverage Phase 1 MOPS research findings, in combination with the EIP to develop the concept of operations, requirements, and partnerships for the NCC

- **RTT Development Status and Next Steps**
  - Groups established, but FAA Co-Lead for Operational and Advanced Concept WG not yet identified
  - Executive status meeting planned for May 18, 2017 will address:
    - RTT Joint Management Plan (JMP) development
    - Working group status including objectives and Research Transition Products (RTPs)
Phase 2 Organization and Process Updates

• Organization Updates
  – Subproject Managers (SPM) vs Deputy Project Managers for (DPMf)
  – Chief Engineer (CE) vs Chief Systems Engineer (CSE)

• Process/Plan Updates
  – Technical Management
    • CE has incorporated additional oversight to the technical plans and execution
      – Establish a minimum set of project technical reviews required for all test activities
      – CE participation in Center reviews, if they can also address Project review requirements
    • Internal outbrief to CE of results from all technical activities
  – Technology Transfer Plan
    • Updated for Phase 2 Partners
  – Change Management
    • MRB Quorum
  – Risk Management
    • Dedicated Risk Manager
    • Concerns
  – Schedule Management
    • Addition of L3 Milestones
Success Criteria for Test Activities

- All test activities have objectives and test matrices that are reviewed through processes established in the Systems Engineering Management Plan (SEMP).

- As part of the planning process, the technical team defines the priorities within a test activity:
  - These are priority 1, 2, 3 elements associated with the matrix or priority across test objectives.
  - These are defined up front well before the test and agreed to by the test team/all parties:
    - Includes personnel involved with test execution and recipients of the results.
  - The priority 1 level defines the minimum success for the test:
    - Includes those things that must be accomplished in order to get anything useful out of the test.

- During the test:
  - The test team strives to achieve all objectives/the entire test matrix, i.e. full success.
  - As unforeseen things occur, the team can incrementally de-scope lower priorities until reaching the minimum success that was defined upfront.
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Briefing Summary

• KDP-C demonstrated:
  ✓ Technical plans are relevant to the agency’s mission and vision as well as, the ARMD Strategic Implementation Plan, and customer/stakeholder needs
  ✓ Technical plans are feasible and executable
  ✓ Planned resources and schedule are adequate to meet the stated goals and objectives of the Project with the acceptable level of risk
  ✓ Management process updates and partnership approaches are sound for the proposed UAS-NAS Project

• Request approval to proceed with execution of the baseline plan

Project is executing and managing performance against the proposed baseline and has high confidence of successful execution
Backup Slides
Overview Schedule to KDP-C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2 FY16</th>
<th>Q3 FY16</th>
<th>Q4 FY16</th>
<th>Q1 FY17</th>
<th>Q2 FY17</th>
<th>Q3 FY17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President’s Budget Released (ATP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY16 Annual Review</td>
<td>Last SP Complete</td>
<td>ARMD SPMR (UAS Cohesive Strategy Defined)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Closeout of P1 MOPS Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plans and processes Updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Refined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Org Decisions</td>
<td>Identify/Select SPMs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Select CE</td>
<td>Partnership Strategy/Schedule Developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Development</td>
<td>Template Development</td>
<td>Partnership Value/Benefit/Risk Defined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Portfolio Development (Cost-Benefit-Risk Assessment)</td>
<td>PPBE18</td>
<td>TCs/TWP Defined</td>
<td>Initial SPs Complete</td>
<td>Schedule Package Details Developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/Schedule/Risk</td>
<td>PPBE18</td>
<td>Next Phase Risks/IMS Framework Defined</td>
<td>IMS/Risks/Budget Distribution Finalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KDP-C Pre-Briefings</td>
<td></td>
<td>TC Tollgate Pre-Briefing</td>
<td>TC Tollgate Review (9/13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KDP-C Portfolio Baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UAS Community Overview and Technical Challenge Development Backup Slides
UAS Airspace Integration Pillars and Enablers

UAS Technologies:
T01 - Airport Operations Technologies
T02 - Airworthiness Standards
T03 - Command, Control, Communications Technologies
T04 - Detect & Avoid (DAA)
T05 - Flight & Health Mngmt Systems
T06 - Ground Control Station (GCS) Technologies
T07 - Hazard Avoidance
T08 - Highly Automated Architectures
T09 - Navigation
T10 - Power & Propulsion
T11 - Weather Avoidance

ATM Services & Infrastructure:
I01 - Airport Infrastructure
I02 - Air Traffic Management (ATM) Infrastructure
I03 - Non-FAA Managed Airspace Infrastructure
I04 - Radio Frequency (RF) Spectrum Availability
I05 - Test Ranges & Modeling & Simulation (M&S) Facilities

Public Acceptance & Trust:
A01 - Cyber Security Criteria & Methods of Compliance
A02 - Legal & Privacy Rules / Guidelines
A03 - Noise Reductions
A04 - Physical Security Criteria & Methods of Compliance
A05 - Public Safety Confidence

Operational Regulations, Policies & Guidelines:
P01 - ATM Regulations / Policies / Procedures
P02 - Airworthiness Regulations / Policies / Guidelines
P03 - Operating Rules / Regulations / Procedures
P04 - Safety Risk Mngmt & Methods of Compliance

The UAS Airspace Integration Pillars enable achievement of the Vision
Why Now?

- Phase 1 performance standards developed --> but, insertion of technologies into operational use requires type certification which can take several years
- Delaying standards development for critical technologies inserts significant risk into industry investment in certifiable aircraft development
  - ~2-3 years to develop a MOPS for complex technologies with critical interoperability considerations
  - At minimum, 2-3 years to build and certify vehicles. --> VFR-like vehicles have other major technology challenges that cannot be addressed procedurally

- Technical Standard • RTCA SC-228
- Certification Guidance • FAA TSO and AC
- Operational Approval • FAA SRM Panel
- Operational Use • Public User: NASA, DHS, ANG • Commercial User: Type Certificate
- International Harmonization • EUROCAE • JARUS • ICAO RPASP • NATO STANAG
Demand for UAS Integration

- Several civil/commercial markets are poised to take full advantage of the capabilities UAS offer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand Scenario</th>
<th>Automation Assisted</th>
<th>Highly Automated</th>
<th>Autonomous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Altitude Rural</td>
<td>Aerial Photography</td>
<td>Wildlife Surveillance</td>
<td>Precision Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFR-Like</td>
<td>Broad Area Surveillance</td>
<td>Cargo Transport</td>
<td>Communication Relay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Altitude Urban</td>
<td>Search and Rescue</td>
<td>Traffic Monitoring</td>
<td>Local Package Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFR-Like</td>
<td>Horizontal Infrastructure</td>
<td>Passenger Transport</td>
<td>Cargo Delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Unfortunately, the UAS market is not able to achieve this level of growth until the barriers and challenges, currently preventing full integration, are addressed

“For every year integration is delayed, the United States loses more than $10B in potential economic impact ($27.6M per day).” – AUVSI Economic Report 2013
Importance of Standardizing DAA and C2 Technologies

• The FAA’s UAS CONOPS and Roadmap establish the vision and define the path forward for safely integrating civil UAS operations into the NAS
  – These documents establish the importance of standards development; explicitly DAA and C2 standards
    • DAA Foundational Challenge: Sense & Avoid vs. See & Avoid
    • C2 Foundational Challenge: Robust and secure communication links

• Standards are essential for multiple stakeholders:
  – Regulators
  – UAS Operators
  – UAS Manufacturers
  – Avionics and Service Providers

• RTCA SC-203 was, and SC-228 now is, chartered by the FAA to establish UAS DAA and C2 Standards

“Therefore, it is necessary to develop new or revised regulations/procedures and operational concepts, formulate standards, and promote technological development that will enable manned and unmanned aircraft to operate cohesively in the same airspace. Specific technology challenges include two critical functional areas:
1. Detect and Avoid (DAA) capability
2. Control and Communications (C2) system performance requirements”

- FAA Integration of Civil UAS in the NAS Roadmap, First Edition 2013

Once the RTCA SC-228 ToR deliverables are approved and their requirements fulfilled, FAA well positioned to eliminate most of the DAA and C2 barriers for integration
Importance of NASA Involvement with DAA and C2 Technologies

- NASA has determined Detect and Avoid (DAA) and Command and Control (C2) are the most significant barriers to UAS integration
- NASA is capable of playing a significant role in addressing UAS airspace integration challenges
  - NASA’s long-standing history assisting the FAA with complex aviation challenges
  - NASA involvement instills confidence in industry standards development activities
- NASA held in high regard by others in UAS community due to our:
  - Prior research and contribution to standards development
  - Existing leadership role in ongoing efforts and working groups
  - Ability to leverage previous assets used for Phase 1 MOPS

Full Integration study identified NASA as being well positioned to Lead the DAA (T02) and C2 (T04) airspace integration challenges
Project TC Definitions

• Background
  – Sets the stage for the current state of the UAS Community with respect to the element being discussed, i.e. Command and Control (C2), Detect and Avoid (DAA), or System Integration and Operationalization (SIO) for UAS

• Barrier
  – What’s needed to be overcome for the UAS Community to move forward

• Community Objectives
  – Decomposition of the barrier, i.e. what the Project and UAS Community hope to achieve

• TC Statement
  – Written for the full barrier for the “VFR-Like” and “IFR-Like” Operating Environments and what the UAS Community needs

• Project Approach
  – The work that the Project is doing to address the community need/barrier
  – Defines how the Project is working with the community to accomplish the community objectives
  – Defines the overarching approach on which the baseline content is based
TC-DAA: UAS Detect and Avoid Operational Concepts and Technologies

Technical Challenge-DAA: Detect and Avoid (DAA)

Technical Challenge-C2: Command and Control (C2)

Technical Challenge-SIO: System Integration and Operationalization (SIO)
UAS Detect and Avoid Operational Concepts and Technologies

Background

- Removal of the pilot from the cockpit has created a need for UAS pilots to meet existing FAA “See and Avoid” requirements

- From the Policy perspective:
  - [All OEs] DAA technologies are required across a majority of the NAS. DAA will be designed for UAS-UAS and UAS-Manned encounters, with considerations to a broad set of aircraft performance parameters and airspace integration requirements
  - [IFR/VFR-Like] DAA technologies for UAS will require a combination of cooperative and non-cooperative sensors to mimic See and Avoid requirements that are part of the NAS today. These technologies will be required to be interoperable with a complex NAS environment (i.e. TCAS II, ACAS X, and ATC).
  - [Low Altitude] DAA technologies for low Size, Weight, and Power (SWaP) UAS and are immature. Policy decisions depend significantly on the state of the art of surveillance technologies and the determination of how the airspace will be managed for UAS.

- From the Technology perspective:
  - [All OEs] There is not a one-size-fits-all solution to DAA for all aircraft. Combinations of active and passive Airborne and Ground Based surveillance sensors will be applicable across the trade space
  - [IFR/VFR-Like] DAA technologies have significant challenges in proving interoperability with manned aircraft and existing airspace regulations, and are expensive to develop. Although technologies and concepts exist, significant research will be required to achieve an integration solution and prove final safety cases.
  - [Low Altitude] UAS operating in uncontrolled, self managed, airspace will require lower size, weight, and power design and airworthiness. UTM architectures may allow removal of some of the sensor requirements from on-board the aircraft. There are many policy decisions that need to be made considering safety and proving airworthiness for DAA systems on board highly automated aircraft.

- The Project is focused on higher TRL technologies with increased likelihood of approval for IFR flight. Sensor and algorithm prototypes exist that can be developed and approved for IFR flight.
• Barrier:
  – Beyond the scope of Phase 1 MOPS (airborne DAA for vehicles capable of transitioning to class A airspace), certifiable DAA technologies do not exist for a broad set of UAS that will operate via IFR flight in the NAS
    • i.e. Phase 2 MOPS DAA standards must apply to a smaller vehicle class, and provide DAA capabilities in terminal airspace
  – System Performance requirements do not exist that are broadly applicable to all of industry, and will allow the FAA to create associated policy

• Community Objectives:
  – Develop and validate UAS DAA requirements for Low-SWaP airborne DAA systems to support standardization through the evaluation of commercial and engineering prototype DAA systems that enable a broader set of UAS operations
  – Implement state of the art DAA technologies into an UAS and test in operationally relevant scenarios
  – Develop and validate UAS DAA requirements for Ground Based DAA systems to support standardization through the evaluation of commercially available radars integrated with airborne DAA architectures
  – Develop and validate human machine interface requirements to support human automation teaming and higher levels of autonomy for UAS DAA systems

Bullets in italics are not covered by UAS-NAS P2 resource allocation
TC-DAA: UAS Detect and Avoid Operational Concepts and Technologies

Develop Detect and Avoid (DAA) operational concepts and technologies in support of standards to enable a broad range of UAS that have Communication, Navigation, and Surveillance (CNS) capabilities consistent with IFR operations and are required to detect and avoid manned and unmanned air traffic

- Project Approach:
  - Develop Concept of Operations in coordination with RTCA and FAA
  - Solicit industry partnerships to develop DAA technologies
  - Perform modeling and simulation to characterize the trade space of the DAA for critical areas such as well clear, collision avoidance interoperability, human machine interfaces, and others
  - V&V of DAA technologies for performance standard requirements, and DAA system technology builds
  - Jointly develop performance standards with RTCA and FAA throughout lifecycle of concept and technology development
  - Validation and proposed modification of national and international standards for DAA
Detect and Avoid (DAA) Performance Standard Operating Environments (OE)

Legend
Phase 1 Research Areas (FY14–FY16)
Phase 2 Research Areas (FY17–FY20)
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TC-C2:
UAS Satcom and Terrestrial Command and Control

Technical Challenge-DAA: Detect and Avoid (DAA)

Technical Challenge-C2: Command and Control (C2)

Technical Challenge-SIO: System Integration and Operationalization (SIO)
UAS Satcom and Terrestrial Command and Control Background

• Removing the pilot from the cockpit has created a need for robust command and control (C2) between the ground and a UAS

• From the Policy perspective:
  - **[All OEs]** UAS do not have spectrum identified and analyzed that can solve C2 issues across any specific OE, let alone being appropriate across all UAS OE
  - **[IFR/VFR-Like]** Terrestrial and Satcom spectrum have been allocated during WRC11 and WRC15, but is specific to aircraft that might be approved to operate in controlled airspace, be certified, and leverage protected spectrum
  - **[Low Altitude]** Spectrum for aircraft that may operate outside of traditional aviation protected spectrum bands still need to be identified as viable (i.e. LTE) and accepted to be sufficient for specific ConOps

• From the Technology perspective:
  - **[All OEs]** Lack of Policy direction creates a significant risk to C2 technology development as broad technology acceptance may not occur for radios in any particular frequency band
  - **[IFR/VFR-Like]** WRC allocated spectrum studies are needed to prove viability for highly capable aircraft. Due to the high risk nature of that spectrum being officially designated, industry is hesitant to invest in technology solutions on their own.
  - **[Low Altitude]** Technology solutions for aircraft that will operate outside of traditional aviation protected spectrum are being developed by the low altitude UAS community. These technologies have similarly high risks to implementation.

• The UAS-NAS project works with higher TRL technologies with increased likelihood of approval for IFR flight. WRC spectrum allocations align with these criteria due to the international credibility (although the risk of technology acceptance is still extremely high).
Barrier:
– Outside of Phase 1 Terrestrial MOPS, certifiable C2 concepts and technologies do not exist that apply to allocated WRC spectrum, and will operate in the NAS
– System Performance requirements do not exist that are broadly applicable to all of industry, and will allow the FAA to create associated policy

Community Objectives:
– Develop and validate UAS C2 requirements and radio spectrum allocation decisions to support C2 standardization through the evaluation of commercial and engineering prototype Satcom radio systems
– Develop and validate UAS C2 requirements to support C2 standardization through the evaluation of commercial and engineering prototype multiple access C-Band Terrestrial radio systems
– Provide system design studies (payload and earth station) and system design requirements of C-band Satcom systems for C2 standardization
TC-C2: UAS Satcom and Terrestrial Command and Control and Control

Develop Satellite (Satcom) and Terrestrial based Command and Control (C2) operational concepts and technologies in support of standards to enable the broad range of UAS that have Communication, Navigation, and Surveillance (CNS) capabilities consistent with IFR operations and are required to leverage allocated protected spectrum

• Project Approach:
  – Develop Concept of Use to be leveraged for initial requirements for C2 partnerships, and coordination with RTCA and FAA
  – Solicit industry partnerships to develop radios technologies in Satcom and terrestrial frequency bands
  – Performance assessment of satellite-based CNPC in existing Fixed Satellite Service bands
  – V&V of radio technologies for performance standard requirements, and radio technology builds
  – Jointly develop performance standards with RTCA and FAA throughout lifecycle of concept and technology development
  – Validation and proposed modification of National and International standards for CNPC
UAS Satcom and Terrestrial Command and Control Operating Environments (OE)

Legend
Phase 1 Research Areas (FY14- FY16)
Phase 2 Research Areas (FY17 – FY20)
TC-SIO:
System Integration and Operationalization for UAS

Technical Challenge-DAA: Detect and Avoid (DAA)

Technical Challenge-C2: Command and Control (C2)

Technical Challenge-SIO: System Integration and Operationalization (SIO)
System Integration and Operationalization for UAS
Background

• Projects, technologies, and standards have been focused on specific technological aspects of UAS Integration into the NAS, such as DAA and C2

• From the Policy perspective:
  - [All OEs] UAS Operationalization: Integration of UAS is a broad multi-faceted problem that requires a systems level approach for implementation of technologies into the NAS, with a focus on ensuring FAA policy is created in a timely manner
  - [IFR/VFR-Like] Creation of standards largely benefits the Aviation Safety line of business at the FAA, but does not ensure broad FAA policy for operational approvals will follow
    • Risks of inconsistent operational approval policies are significantly reduced by standards, but in order for policies to be created in time for industry operations the FAA needs ongoing efforts consistent with those that were leveraged to develop the standards
    • The high risk nature of system implementation without policy guidance creates an environment of opportunity for federal entities to assume some of this risk

• From the Technology perspective:
  - [All OEs] Integrated Testing of Systems: Development of vehicle technologies (i.e. DAA, C2, and others) is insufficient to close complex integrated system gaps. Technologies must be integrated into vehicle systems and systematically tested in a relevant operational environment.
  - [IFR/VFR-Like] Creation of standards typically leverage RTCA guidance for drafting performance standards includes expectations of meeting aircraft level functional and operational requirements

• The UAS-NAS project will focus on system level integration and operationalization of vehicle technologies developed in conjunction with UAS community standards
System Integration and Operationalization for UAS TC Supporting Information

• Barrier:
  – State of the art UAS vehicle technologies and airspace integration concepts have not been integrated and tested in their actual operating environments
  – Initiatives for the FAA to create a complete set of appropriate policies have not been fully planned or executed

• Community Objectives:
  – Obtain FAA approval to demonstrate SC-228 Phase 1 DAA MOPS technologies on an unmanned aircraft in the NAS as an alternative means of compliance to FAR Part 91 “see and avoid” rules (i.e. No Chase COA)
  – Perform operational demonstrations of integrated Phase 2 MOPS DAA and C2 technologies in their NAS operating environments to assist the FAA in developing the policies for UAS integration aircraft that will fly IFR

Bullets in italics are not covered by UAS-NAS P2 resource allocation
System Integration and Operationalization for UAS
Technical Challenge Statement

**TC-SIO: System Integration and Operationalization for UAS**

Integrate state of the art DAA and C2 technologies into Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) to ensure sufficient aircraft level functional and operational requirements, and perform demonstrations in the NAS to inform Federal Aviation Administration creation of policies for operating UAS that have Communication, Navigation, and Surveillance (CNS) capabilities consistent with IFR operations.

- **Project Approach:**
  - Leverage Phase 1 DAA MOPS developed technologies to obtain an operational approval, in partnership with ATO, to fly the DAA system in the NAS with as few restrictions as possible (No Chase COA).
  - Develop C2-DAA interface requirements and Phase 2 DAA and C2 integrated ConOps.

*Note: SIO is foundational to Vehicle Technology elements from the UAS Cohesive Strategy.*
Human Automation Teaming

- Data Removed
Ground Based Detect and Avoid

• Data Removed
• Data Removed
Not Covered by UAS-NAS P2 Resource Allocation Center Rollup

- Data Removed
Not Covered by UAS-NAS P2 Resource Allocation
TC-DAA: Human Automation Teaming

• Data Removed
Not Covered by UAS-NAS P2 Resource Allocation
TC-DAA: Ground Based Detect and Avoid System Standards

- Data Removed
• Data Removed
Technical Baseline
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LVC-DE Status

- LVC-DE will be leveraged by UAS-NAS Project to complete P2 MOPS research needs, but not upgraded to support future projects
  - The FAA UAS Test Sites are not currently required to be used to support the P2 MOPS research portfolio and the LVC-DE connection with the test sites will not be maintained

- LVC-DE will be prepared for a formal transition to SMART NAS (or other projects with similar test requirements)
  - SMART NAS Testbed already uses LVC-DE for virtual aircraft connection
  - Final documentation of LVC-DE in baseline plan

- Working with SMART NAS Testbed team to integrate the LVC-DE and formalize hand-off
  - Documenting dependencies between the LVC-DE and SMART NAS
  - SMART NAS is documenting simulation capability needs for future projects, and determining how SMART NAS can be leveraged

Baseline project includes plans for LVC-DE transition at the end of the project
Developing the Project

There is an increasing need to fly UAS in the NAS to perform missions of vital importance to National Security and Defense, Emergency Management, and Science. There is also an emerging need to enable commercial applications such as cargo transport (e.g. FedEx).

Provide research findings, utilizing simulation and flight tests, to support the development and validation of DAA and C2 technologies necessary for integrating Unmanned Aircraft Systems into the National Airspace System.
RTCA SC-228 MOPS Terms of Reference

• RTCA SC-228 Terms of Reference (ToR) defined a path forward to develop Minimum Operational Performance Standards (MOPS)
  – Phase 1 MOPS were addressed by UAS-NAS (FY14 – FY16) Portfolio
  – Phase 2 MOPS included in the original ToR, but had several TBDs
    • ToR development team established to ensure DAA & C2 scope broad enough to fully enable the operating environments relevant UAS were expected to leverage (e.g. Manned Like IFR and Tweeners)

• Phase 2 MOPS ToR Scope
  – C2: Use of SATCOM in multiple bands and terrestrial extensions as a C2 Data Link to support UAS and address networking interoperability standards for both terrestrial and satellite systems
  – DAA: Extended UAS operations in Class D, E, and G, airspace, and applicability to a broad range of civil UAS capable of operations Beyond Visual Line of Sight (BVLOS)

• SC-228 Final Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAA MOPS (to be published 2017)</td>
<td>C2 SATCOM Data Link MOPS (Jul 2019*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAA Air to Air Radar MOPS (to be published 2017)</td>
<td>C2 Terrestrial Data Link MOPS Rev A (Jul 2020)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| DAA MOPS Rev A (Sep 2019) | Non-Cooperative Sensor MOPS & DAA MOPS Rev B (Sep 2020) |

* Date under discussion within RTCA SC-228
RTCA SC-228 Phase 1 MOPS Terms of Reference

RTCA SC-228 Terms of Reference (ToR) has defined a path forward to develop Minimum Operational Performance Standards (MOPS)

- **Phase 1 MOPS** are addressed by UAS-NAS Current (FY14 – FY16) Portfolio
  - Command and Control (C2) Data Link MOPS – Performance Standards for the C2 Data Link using L-Band Terrestrial and C-Band Terrestrial data links
  - Detect and Avoid (DAA) MOPS – Performance standards for transitioning of a UAS to and from Class A or special use airspace, traversing Class D and E, and perhaps Class G airspace

- **SC-228 Deliverables**
  - C2 & DAA White Papers (Dec 2013) - Assumptions, approach, and core requirements for UAS DAA and C2 Equipment
  - C2 & DAA MOPS for Verification and Validation (July 2015) – Preliminary MOPS including recommendations for a Verification and Validation test program
  - C2 & DAA MOPS (July 2016) – Final MOPS
## FAA Designated Airspace Classes

### Class E
- IFR/ VFR Allowed
- VFR-ATC Control Not Required

### Class E & G
- General Aviation Aircraft

### LAX Type Airport

### ORF Type Airport

### Other Towered Airports

### FL 600 MSL 18,000
- Commercial Transport Aircraft

### CLASS A
- Transponder
- Under ATC Control
- IFR Required

### CLASS B

### CLASS C

### CLASS D

### CLASS G

#### MSL – mean sea level
#### AGL – above ground level
#### FL – flight level
TC-DAA: Backup Slides
DAA Tiger Team
Alternative Sensor vs. GBSAA

• Data Removed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Baseline Number</th>
<th>Technical Baseline Title</th>
<th>Reference SP Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TB-#</td>
<td>Alternative Surveillance and Well Clear/Alerting Requirements Research ConOps</td>
<td>SP D.1.30, SP D.2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB-#</td>
<td>Alternative Surveillance: Foundational Fast-time Simulation (FY17)</td>
<td>SP D.1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB-#</td>
<td>Alternative Surveillance: Display Requirements</td>
<td>SP D.1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB-#</td>
<td>Alternative Surveillance: Unmitigated Fast-time Simulation (FY18)</td>
<td>SP D.1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB-#</td>
<td>Alternative Surveillance: HITL 1 (FY18)</td>
<td>SP D.1.70, SP T.7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB-#</td>
<td>Alternative Surveillance: Unmitigated/Mitigated Fast-time Simulation (FY19)</td>
<td>SP D.1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB-#</td>
<td>Alternative Surveillance: HITL 2 (FY19)</td>
<td>SP D.1.90, SP T.7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Baseline Number</td>
<td>Technical Baseline Title</td>
<td>Reference SP Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB-#</td>
<td>Well Clear/Alerting Requirements: Fast-time Simulation 1 (FY17)</td>
<td>SP D.2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB-#</td>
<td>Well Clear/Alerting Requirements: Simulation 2 (FY18)</td>
<td>SP D.2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB-#</td>
<td>Well Clear/Alerting Requirements: Terminal Operations HITL Simulation 1 (FY18)</td>
<td>SP D.2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB-#</td>
<td>Well Clear/Alerting Requirements: Terminal Operations HITL Simulation Terminal Operations 2 (FY19)</td>
<td>SP D.2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB-#</td>
<td>ACAS-Xu: Mini HITL</td>
<td>SP D.3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB-#</td>
<td>ACAS-Xu: HITL 1</td>
<td>SP D.3.40, SP D.7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB-#</td>
<td>ACAS-Xu: HITL 2</td>
<td>SP D.3.50, SP T.7.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TC-DAA: Technical Baseline Elements (3/3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Baseline Number</th>
<th>Technical Baseline Title</th>
<th>Reference SP Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TB-#</td>
<td>Integrated Event: ACAS-Xu FT2</td>
<td>SP D.5.10, SP T.8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB-#</td>
<td>Integrated Event: Flight Test 5</td>
<td>SP D.5.20, SP T.8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB-#</td>
<td>Integrated Event: Flight Test 6</td>
<td>SP D.5.30, SP T.8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB-#</td>
<td>No-Chase Certificate of Waiver or Authorization Flight Demonstration</td>
<td>SP T.8.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective: Develop a ConOps describing the scope of DAA alternative surveillance and Well Clear Definition research to support the development of DAA Phase 2 MOPS

Approach:

- The UAS-NAS Project DAA Technical Challenge includes several Technical Baseline Elements related to alternative surveillance technology (specifically a low size, weight, and power radar) and expanded operational environments (airspace classes) that support the development of the Phase 2 MOPS.

- The ConOps will describe the scope of research related to 1) alternative surveillance and 2) the Phase 1 MOPS Well Clear definition applicability in the Phase 2 MOPS operational environment. The ConOps may include description of the operational environment, unmanned aircraft missions, operational procedures, expected intruder traffic patterns, etc. The ConOps will be developed in collaboration with RTCA DAA Working Group and other Stakeholders.

- The UAS-NAS Project Alternative Surveillance and Well Clear/Alerting Requirements ConOps (which may be one ConOps when completed) will be closely related to two SC-228 DAA Working white papers (Well Clear; Low-size, weight, power surveillance).

Deliverables:

- Type: Paper(s)
- Recipients: RTCA SC-228 DAA Working Group, FAA, UAS Community
Research: Alternative Surveillance: Foundational Fast-time Simulation (FY17)

• <Technical Baseline Element number>; SP D.1.40

• Objective: Estimate the target performance of alternative surveillance within UAS operations associated with Phase 2 MOPS

• Approach:
  – The UAS-NAS Project DAA Technical Challenge includes several Technical Baseline Elements related to alternative surveillance technology (specifically a low size, weight, and power radar) and expanded operational environments (airspace classes) that support the development of the minimum operational performance standards
  – Conduct an Airspace Concept Evaluation System simulation to inform DAA requirements for alternative surveillance, inform understanding of the interactions between these alternative sensor requirements and existing or proposed DAA alerting and guidance requirements, and understanding the interactions of sensor range and aircraft performance
  – The simulation requirements/design will be defined in collaboration with RTCA DAA Working Group and other Stakeholders. The Airspace Concept Evaluation System software will be updated. Experiment data will be collected and analyzed

• Deliverables:
  – Type: Briefing
  – Recipients: RTCA SC-228 DAA Working Group, FAA, UAS Community
Research: Alternative Surveillance: Display Requirements

• <Technical Baseline Element number>; SP D.1.50

• **Objective:** Define DAA system display requirements for UAS with alternative surveillance systems within UAS operations associated with Phase 2 MOPS

• **Approach:**
  – The UAS-NAS Project DAA Technical Challenge includes several Technical Baseline Elements related to alternative surveillance technology (specifically a low size, weight, and power radar) and expanded operational environments (airspace classes) that support the development of the minimum operational performance standards
  – Collaborate with Stakeholders, Human Factors, and UAS Community experts to define DAA display requirements (guidance and alerting) for low size, weight, and power surveillance systems associated with lower performing aircraft in expanding airspace operations relative to the Phase 1 DAA MOPS
  – Lab mock-ups of display features will be used to expand understanding of display features and requirements

• **Deliverables:**
  – Type: Briefing
  – Recipients: RTCA SC-228 DAA Working Group, UAS Community
Research: Alternative Surveillance: Unmitigated Fast-time Simulation (FY18)

- <Technical Baseline Element number>; SP D.1.60

- **Objective:** Verify DAA alerting and surveillance performance with surveillance uncertainties and updated DAA well clear definition within UAS operations associated with Phase 2 MOPS

- **Approach:**
  - The UAS-NAS Project DAA Technical Challenge includes several Technical Baseline Elements related to alternative surveillance technology (specifically a low size, weight, and power radar) and expanded operational environments (airspace classes) that support the development of the minimum operational performance standards
  - Conduct an Airspace Concept Evaluation System simulation experiment to inform draft alternative surveillance requirements. The simulation will incorporate the new DAA Well Clear definition and alternative surveillance uncertainty. The simulation will not include ownship maneuvering in response to DAA alerting and guidance
  - The simulation requirements/design will be defined in collaboration with RTCA DAA Working Group and other Stakeholders. The Airspace Concept Evaluation System software will be updated. Experiment data will be collected and analyzed

- **Deliverables:**
  - Type: Briefing
  - Recipients: RTCA SC-228 DAA Working Group, FAA, UAS Community
Objective: Verify UAS pilot performance of an UAS DAA system with low size, weight, and power sensors, interoperability of low size, weight, and power sensor requirements with DAA alerting, guidance, and display requirements, and identify modifications to alerting, guidance and display requirements for low size, weight, and power sensors as needed

Approach:

- The UAS-NAS Project DAA Technical Challenge includes several Technical Baseline Elements related to alternative surveillance technology (specifically a low size, weight, and power radar) and expanded operational environments (airspace classes) that support the development of the minimum operational performance standards
- Conduct a human-in-the-loop simulation to verify pilot performance with a DAA system for smaller/slower UAS equipped with a low size, weight, and power non-cooperative sensor within the Phase 2 Minimum Operational Performance Operational Environment
- The simulation requirements/design will be defined in collaboration with RTCA DAA Working Group and other Stakeholders. The human-in-the-loop simulation infrastructure will be updated. Scenarios will be developed and the simulation system will be verified and validated prior to data collection. Experiment data will be collected and analyzed

Deliverables:

- Type: Briefing
- Recipients: RTCA SC-228 DAA Working Group, UAS Community
Research: Alternative Surveillance: Unmitigated/Mitigated Fast-time Simulation (FY19)

- Objective: Inform/verify the final Phase 2 MOP with fast-time simulation data on DAA alerting, guidance, and surveillance performance with surveillance uncertainties, updated DAA well clear definition, and DAA pilot model

- Approach:
  - The UAS-NAS Project DAA Technical Challenge includes several Technical Baseline Elements related to alternative surveillance technology (specifically a low size, weight, and power radar) and expanded operational environments (airspace classes) that support the development of the minimum operational performance standards
  - Conduct an Airspace Concept Evaluation System simulation experiment to inform draft alternative surveillance requirements. The simulation will incorporate the new DAA Well Clear definition and alternative surveillance uncertainty. The simulation will include ownship maneuvering is response to DAA alerting and guidance
  - The simulation requirements/design will be defined in collaboration with RTCA DAA Working Group and other Stakeholders. The Airspace Concept Evaluation System software will be updated. Experiment data will be collected and analyzed

- Deliverables:
  - Type: Briefing
  - Recipients: RTCA SC-228 DAA Working Group, UAS Community
Research: Alternative Surveillance: HITL 2 (FY19)

• Objective: V&V pilot performance of UAS DAA with low SWAP sensors, interoperability of low SWAP sensor requirements with DAA alerting, guidance, and display requirements and the final Phase 2 MOPS

• Approach:
  – The UAS-NAS Project DAA Technical Challenge includes several Technical Baseline Elements related to alternative surveillance technology (specifically a low size, weight, and power radar) and expanded operational environments (airspace classes) that support the development of the minimum operational performance standards
  – Conduct a human-in-the-loop simulation to serve as final validation for alternative surveillance requirements and interoperability with a DAA system for smaller/slower UAS equipped with a low size, weight, and power non-cooperative sensor and updated alerting and guidance within the Phase 2 Minimum Operational Performance Operational Environment
  – The simulation requirements/design will be defined in collaboration with RTCA DAA Working Group and other Stakeholders. The human-in-the-loop simulation infrastructure will be updated. Scenarios will be developed and the simulation system will be verified and validated prior to data collection. Experiment data will be collected and analyzed

• Deliverables:
  – Type: Briefing
  – Recipients: RTCA SC-228 DAA Working Group, UAS Community
Research: Well Clear/Alerting Requirements: Fast-time Simulation 1 (FY17)

• Objective: Determine the appropriateness of an initial DAA Well Clear definition in Class D and E terminal airspace with an operating Airport Traffic Control Tower and no surveillance capability limitations

• Approach:
  – The UAS-NAS Project DAA Technical Challenge includes several Technical Baseline Elements related to alternative surveillance technology (specifically a low size, weight, and power radar) and expanded operational environments (airspace classes) that support the development of the minimum operational performance standards
  – Conduct a fast-time simulation to collect empirical data to address issues associated to the application of the DAA Phase 1 MOPS Well Clear definition to the Phase 2 MOPS alternative surveillance and operational environment
  – The simulation requirements/design will be defined in collaboration with RTCA DAA Working Group and other Stakeholders. The fast-time simulation infrastructure will be updated. Experiment data will be collected and analyzed

• Deliverables:
  – Type: Briefing
  – Recipients: RTCA SC-228 DAA Working Group, UAS Community
• Objective: Determine the appropriateness of the Phase 1 MOPS Well Clear definition in lower-altitude, Class E and G non-terminal airspace, including low-size, weight, and power surveillance sensor limitations

• Approach:
  – The UAS-NAS Project DAA Technical Challenge includes several Technical Baseline Elements related to alternative surveillance technology (specifically a low size, weight, and power radar) and expanded operational environments (airspace classes) that support the development of the minimum operational performance standards
  – Conduct either a fast-time or human-in-the-loop simulation to collect empirical data to address issues associated to the application of the DAA Phase 1 MOPS Well Clear definition in lower-altitude, Class E and G non-terminal airspace, including low-size, weight, and power surveillance sensor limitations
  – The simulation requirements/design will be defined in collaboration with RTCA DAA Working Group and other Stakeholders. The simulation infrastructure will be updated. Experiment data will be collected and analyzed

• Deliverables:
  – Type: Briefing
  – Recipients: RTCA SC-228 DAA Working Group, UAS Community
• <Technical Baseline Element number>; SP D.2.50

• **Objective:** Verify pilot and controller performance of Class D and E terminal area operations and Verify DAA algorithm configurable parameters for Class D and E terminal area operations

• **Approach:**
  
  – The UAS-NAS Project DAA Technical Challenge includes several Technical Baseline Elements related to alternative surveillance technology (specifically a low size, weight, and power radar) and expanded operational environments (airspace classes) that support the development of the minimum operational performance standards
  
  – Conduct a human-in-the-loop simulation to collect data to verify expected pilot and controller performance with a DAA system is achieved, to verify expected DAA system performance with human interaction is achieved, and to update DAA algorithm configurable parameters
  
  – The simulation requirements/design will be defined in collaboration with RTCA DAA Working Group and other Stakeholders. The human-in-the-loop simulation infrastructure will be updated. The DAA algorithm configurable parameters will be initially set for the latest Phase 2 MOPS Well Clear definition. Experiment data will be collected and analyzed

• **Deliverables:**
  
  – Type: Briefing
  
  – Recipients: RTCA SC-228 DAA Working Group, UAS Community
• Objective: Verify pilot and controller performance of Class E and G terminal area operations with no operating Airport Traffic Control Tower and Verify DAA algorithm configurable parameters for Class E and G terminal area operations with no operating Airport Traffic Control Tower

• Approach:
  – The UAS-NAS Project DAA Technical Challenge includes several Technical Baseline Elements related to alternative surveillance technology (specifically a low size, weight, and power radar) and expanded operational environments (airspace classes) that support the development of the minimum operational performance standards
  – Conduct a human-in-the-loop simulation to collect data to verify expected pilot and controller performance with a DAA system is achieved, to verify expected DAA system performance with human interaction is achieved, and to update DAA algorithm configurable parameters
  – The simulation requirements/design will be defined in collaboration with RTCA DAA Working Group and other Stakeholders. The human-in-the-loop simulation infrastructure will be updated. The DAA algorithm configurable parameters will be initially set for the latest Phase 2 MOPS Well Clear definition. Experiment data will be collected and analyzed

• Deliverables:
  – Type: Briefing
  – Recipients: RTCA SC-228 DAA Working Group, UAS Community
Research: ACAS-Xu: Mini HITL

- Objective: Determine that the Ames Research Centers Human Autonomy Teaming Laboratory components are installed properly for Project Phase 2 research (Primary) and provide data on alerting, display and/or guidance Phase 1 DAA MOPS (Secondary)

- Approach:
  - The UAS-NAS Project DAA Technical Challenge includes several Technical Baseline Elements related to the interoperability of DAA Remain Well Clear alerting and guidance and the FAA’s Airborne Collision Avoidance System For Unmanned Aircraft (ACAS Xu) Remain Well Clear and Collision Avoidance functionalities that support minimum operational performance standards for integrated collision avoidance and Remain Well Clear alerting, guidance, and displays
  - Conduct a human-in-the-loop simulation to ensure the Ames Research Centers Human Autonomy Teaming Laboratory is operating properly to allow Phase 2 DAA research. The experiment design will also provide relevant data to further refine/validate alerting, display and/or guidance Phase 1 DAA MOPS
  - The simulation requirements/design will be defined in collaboration with the RTCA DAA Working Group, SC-147 ACAS Xu Working Group, and other Stakeholders. The Ames Research Center’s Human Autonomy Teaming Laboratory will be updated. Scenarios will be developed and the simulation system will be verified and validated prior to data collection. Experiment data will be collected and analyzed

- Deliverables:
  - Type: Briefing
  - Recipients: RTCA SC-228 DAA Working Group, RTCA SC-147 ACAS Xu Working Group, FAA, UAS Community
Research: ACAS-Xu: HITL 1

• Objective: Investigate highest priority interoperability issues related to the impact of ACAS Xu integrated DAA Remain Well Clear and collision avoidance alerting and guidance on pilot performance

• Approach:
  – The UAS-NAS Project DAA Technical Challenge includes several Technical Baseline Elements related to the interoperability of DAA Remain Well Clear alerting and guidance and the FAA’s Airborne Collision Avoidance System For Unmanned Aircraft (ACAS Xu) Remain Well Clear and Collision Avoidance functionalities that support minimum operational performance standards for integrated collision avoidance and Remain Well Clear alerting, guidance, and displays
  – Conduct a human-in-the-loop simulation to investigate the highest priority interoperability issues related to integrated Remain Well Clear and collision avoidance alerting, guidance and displays providing data to inform requirements for ACAS Xu collision avoidance logic/functionality (SC-147) and updates to Phase 1 DAA requirements for Remain Well clear (SC-228)
  – The simulation requirements/design will be defined in collaboration with the RTCA DAA Working Group, SC-147 ACAS Xu Working Group, and other Stakeholders. The Ames Research Center’s Human Autonomy Teaming Laboratory will be updated. Scenarios will be developed and the simulation system will be verified and validated prior to data collection. Experiment data will be collected and analyzed

• Deliverables:
  – Type: Briefing
  – Recipients: RTCA SC-228 DAA Working Group, RTCA SC-147 ACAS Xu Working Group, FAA, UAS Community
Research: ACAS-Xu: HITL 2

- Objective: Validate the SC-228 DAA and SC-147 ACAS Xu MOPS requirements for the integrated ACAS Xu Remain Well Clear and collision avoidance alerting, guidance and displays

- Approach:
  - The UAS-NAS Project DAA Technical Challenge includes several Technical Baseline Elements related to the interoperability of DAA Remain Well Clear alerting and guidance and the FAA’s Airborne Collision Avoidance System For Unmanned Aircraft (ACAS Xu) Remain Well Clear and Collision Avoidance functionalities that support minimum operational performance standards for integrated collision avoidance and Remain Well Clear alerting, guidance, and displays
  - Conduct a human-in-the-loop simulation to validate DAA and ACAS Xu MOPS requirements for an integrated ACAS Xu Remain Well Clear and collision avoidance alerting, guidance and display system by evaluating whether pilot performance is equivalent to, or better than observed during NASA Phase 1 Part Task 6 Verification and Validation human-in-the-loop simulation effort
  - The simulation requirements/design will be defined in collaboration with the RTCA DAA Working Group, SC-147 ACAS Xu Working Group, and other Stakeholders. The Ames Research Center’s Human Autonomy Teaming Laboratory will be updated. Scenarios will be developed and the simulation system will be verified and validated prior to data collection. Experiment data will be collected and analyzed

- Deliverables:
  - Type: Briefing
  - Recipients: RTCA SC-228 DAA Working Group, RTCA SC-147 ACAS Xu Working Group, FAA, UAS Community
Research: Integrated Event: ACAS-Xu FT2

- Objective: Evaluate interoperability between FAA ACAS Xu and NASA’s DAA algorithms (compare alerting and guidance)

- Approach:
  - The UAS-NAS Project DAA Technical Challenge includes several Technical Baseline Elements related to the interoperability of DAA Remain Well Clear alerting and guidance and the FAA’s Airborne Collision Avoidance System For Unmanned Aircraft (ACAS Xu) Remain Well Clear and Collision Avoidance functionalities that support minimum operational performance standards for integrated collision avoidance and Remain Well Clear alerting, guidance, and displays.
  - Conduct a flight test to collect data to evaluate Live, Virtual, and Constructive Distributed Environment enhancements including new ownship/intruder state and ACAS Xu messaging, better understand the differences/similarities between ACAS Xu and NASA’s algorithm Remain Well Clear alerting and guidance, and to evaluate ACAS Xu Remain Well Clear and collision avoidance functional interoperability.
  - While the primary flight test requirements/design will be defined by the FAA, a portion of them will be defined by NASA in collaboration with the SC-228 DAA Working Group and other Stakeholders. Flight test infrastructure and test/support aircraft will be modified. Flight test environment will be verified and validated prior to data collection. Scripted encounters will be defined. Flight data will be collected and analyzed.

- Deliverables:
  - Type: Briefing
  - Recipients: RTCA SC-228 DAA Working Group, RTCA SC-147, FAA, UAS Community.

• <Technical Baseline Element number>; SP D.5.10, SP T.8.10
Research: Integrated Event: Flight Test 5

- Objective: Conduct a flight test providing data to support development of the RTCA SC-228 Phase 2 Detect and Avoid and Alternative Surveillance Minimum Operational Performance Standards

- Approach:
  - The UAS-NAS Project DAA Technical Challenge includes several Technical Baseline Elements related to alternative surveillance technology (specifically a low size, weight, and power radar) and expanded operational environments (airspace classes) that support the development of the minimum operational performance standards
  - Conduct a flight test on a mid-sized unmanned vehicle implementing detect and avoid (alerting, guidance) and alternative surveillance systems to provide data contributing to the development, verification, and validation of models and simulations, and development of Phase 2 Detect and Avoid and Alternative Surveillance Minimum Operational Performance Standards
  - The flight test requirements/design will be defined in collaboration with the RTCA DAA Working Group. Flight test infrastructure and test/support aircraft will be modified. Flight test environment will be verified and validated prior to data collection. Encounters will be defined. Flight data will be collected and analyzed

- Deliverables:
  - Type: Briefing
  - Recipients: RTCA SC-228 DAA Working Group, RTCA SC-147, FAA, UAS Community
Research: Integrated Event: Flight Test 6

- <Technical Baseline Element number>; SP D.5.30, SP T.8.40

**Objective:** Conduct a flight test providing data to support development, verification, and validation of the RTCA SC-228 Phase 2 Detect and Avoid and Alternative Surveillance Minimum Operational Performance Standards

**Approach:**
- The UAS-NAS Project DAA Technical Challenge includes several Technical Baseline Elements related to alternative surveillance technology (specifically a low size, weight, and power radar) and expanded operational environments (airspace classes) that support the development of the minimum operational performance standards
- Conduct a flight test on a mid-sized unmanned vehicle implementing detect and avoid (alerting, guidance) and alternative surveillance systems to provide data contributing to the development, verification, and validation of models and simulations, and Phase 2 Detect and Avoid and Alternative Surveillance Minimum Operational Performance Standards
- The flight test requirements/design will be defined in collaboration with the RTCA DAA Working Group. Flight test infrastructure and test/support aircraft will be modified. Flight test environment will be verified and validated prior to data collection. Encounters will be defined. Flight data will be collected and analyzed

**Deliverables:**
- Type: Briefing
- Recipients: RTCA SC-228 DAA Working Group, RTCA SC-147, FAA, UAS Community
Research: No-Chase Certificate of Waiver or Authorization
Flight Demonstration

- <Technical Baseline Element number>; SP.8.20

- **Objectives:** Conduct unmanned aircraft flight demonstration as described in an FAA approved No Chase Certificate of Waiver or Authorization

- **Approach:**
  - Establish a progressive approach with the FAA leading to a demonstration flight with developmental DAA (remain well clear, collision avoidance) and non-cooperative sensor (radar) equipment that satisfy Phase 1 DAA and Radar MOPS transiting through as many Classes of airspace (including A, D, E and G) as pertinent
  - Collaborate with FAA on development of operational approach and safety criteria for a no-chase Certificate of Waiver or Authorization. Develop a “Safety Case” if needed. Request FAA approval of a No Chase Certificate of Waiver or Authorization
  - Conduct UAS flight demonstration as outlined in FAA approved No Chase Certificate of Waiver or Authorization
  - Document UAS flight demonstration results

- **Deliverables:**
  - Type: Data, No Chase Certificate of Waiver or Authorization, Report
  - Recipients: NASA, FAA, DAA Subproject, SC-228 DAA Working Group, UAS Community
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CNPC Prototype Radio Evolution

• Generation 1
  – L-Band only, single aircraft, single ground station

• Generation 2
  – Added C-Band, added multiple ground stations; single aircraft
  – Hand-offs between ground stations

• Generation 3
  – Multiple aircraft, multiple ground stations

• Generation 4
  – Update of data rates to perform testing/analysis for preliminary C2 MOPS

• Generation 5
  – Updates to radio to align with final C2 MOPS
  – Used to perform C2 MOPS Verification & Validation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Baseline Number</th>
<th>Technical Baseline Title</th>
<th>Reference SP Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TB-#</td>
<td>Ku-Band Spectrum Interference Evaluation System Development</td>
<td>SP C.5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB-#</td>
<td>Ku-Band Propagation Flights and Interference Analysis</td>
<td>SP C.5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB-#</td>
<td>Ka-Band Evaluation System Development and Test and Evaluation</td>
<td>SP C.5.20, SP C.5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB-#</td>
<td>Ku-Band Evaluation System Development</td>
<td>SP C.5.30,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB-#</td>
<td>Ku-Band Test and Evaluation</td>
<td>SP C.5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB-#</td>
<td>C-Band Design Study, Verification &amp; Validation Planning</td>
<td>SP C.5.40, SP C.5.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research: Ku-Band Spectrum Interference Evaluation System Development

• <Technical Baseline Element number>; SP C.5.10

• Objective: Develop the Ku-Band interference evaluation system

• Approach:
  – The UAS-NAS Project C2 Technical Challenge includes several Technical Baseline Elements to transfer Ku-Band technology and interference research data for C2 links between the UAS and the Ground Control System that support the required performance of the unmanned aircraft in the NAS, ensures that the pilot maintains a threshold level of control of the aircraft, and is robust to both environmental or technological issues ultimately contributing to the development and validation of standards for Satcom C2 Links
  – A Ku-band Satcom propagation evaluation system will be developed by the UAS-NAS C2 Subproject Project for research of possible interference between UAS Satcom C2 links and fixed point-to-point earth stations still operating outside the United States. The Ku-band Satcom propagation evaluation system will be capable of operation within the expected operational parameters
  – The Ku-band Satcom propagation evaluation system will be used in subsequent flight tests

• Deliverables:
  – Type: Papers, Briefings
  – Recipients: RTCA SC-228 C2 Working Group, FAA Spectrum Office, ICAO
Objective: Transfer technology and interference research data for the development and validation of standards for Ku-Band Satcom C2 data link

Approach:

- The UAS-NAS Project C2 Technical Challenge includes several Technical Baseline Elements to transfer Ku-Band technology and interference research data for C2 links between the UAS and the GCS that support the required performance of the unmanned aircraft in the NAS, ensures that the pilot maintains a threshold level of control of the aircraft, and is robust to both environmental or technological issues ultimately contributing to the development and validation of standards for Satcom C2 Links

- Flight tests of a Project developed Ku-band Satcom propagation evaluation system will be conducted to research possible interference between UAS Satcom C2 links and fixed point-to-point earth stations still operating outside the United States. Research data will be acquired within expected operational parameters according to approved test plans and procedures

- Results will be made available for the definition, development, and validation of a civil UAS Beyond Line of Sight (BLOS) satellite-based C2 system and the establishment of necessary performance parameters for the Ku-Band satellite spectrum bands

Deliverables:

- Type: Papers, Briefings
- Recipients: RTCA SC-228 C2 Working Group, FAA Spectrum Office, ICAO
Research: Ka-Band Evaluation System Development and Test and Evaluation

- **Objective:** Develop the Ka-Band interference evaluation system and transfer technology and research data for the development and validation of standards for Ka-Band Satcom C2 data link

- **Approach:**
  - The UAS-NAS Project C2 Technical Challenge includes several Technical Baseline Elements to transfer Ka-Band technology research data for C2 links between the UAS and the GCS that support the required performance of the unmanned aircraft in the NAS, ensures that the pilot maintains a threshold level of control of the aircraft, and is robust to both environmental or technological issues ultimately contributing to the development and validation of standards for Satcom C2 Links
  - A commercial off-the-shelf Ka-band Satcom evaluation system comprising flight/ground elements, interfaces, and representative C2 messages will be used for laboratory and flight tests. Performance variables may be limited to trade-offs between Committed Information Rate (Quality of Service) Customer Service Plans although other non-consumer variables may be possible through the NASA/Industry partnership agreement. Research data will be acquired according to approved test plans and procedures
  - Results will be made available for the definition, development, and validation of a civil UAS Beyond Line of Sight (BLOS) satellite-based C2 system and the establishment of necessary performance parameters for the Ka-Band satellite spectrum bands

- **Deliverables:**
  - Type: Papers, Briefings
  - Recipients: RTCA SC-228 C2 Working Group, FAA Spectrum Office, ICAO

- `<Technical Baseline Element number>; SP C.5.20, SP C.5.21`
Research: Ku-Band Evaluation System Development

• Objective: Develop the Ku-Band evaluation system

• Approach:
  – The UAS-NAS Project C2 Technical Challenge includes several Technical Baseline Elements to transfer Ka-Band technology research data for C2 links between the UAS and the GCS that support the required performance of the unmanned aircraft in the NAS, ensures that the pilot maintains a threshold level of control of the aircraft, and is robust to both environmental or technological issues ultimately contributing to the development and validation of standards for Satcom C2 Links
  – A Ku-band Satcom evaluation system will be developed by the UAS-NAS Subproject within the proposed Ka spectrum bands comprising flight/ground elements, interfaces, and representative C2 messages. Development of a “flexible” prototype unit and C2 test support environment will allow key performance parameters to be varied enabling verification and validation of the UAS Satcom MOPS being developed by RTCA SC-228. The Ku-band Satcom evaluation system will be capable of operation within the expected operational parameters
  – The Ku-band Satcom evaluation system will be used in subsequent flight tests

• Deliverables:
  – Type: Papers, Briefings
  – Recipients: RTCA SC-228 C2 Working Group, FAA Spectrum Office, ICAO
Research: Ku-Band Test and Evaluation

• <Technical Baseline Element number>; SP C.5.31

• Objective: Transfer technology and research data for the development and validation of standards for Ku-Band Satcom C2 data link

• Approach:
  – The UAS-NAS Project C2 Technical Challenge includes several Technical Baseline Elements to transfer Ka-Band technology research data for C2 links between the UAS and the GCS that support the required performance of the unmanned aircraft in the NAS, ensures that the pilot maintains a threshold level of control of the aircraft, and is robust to both environmental or technological issues ultimately contributing to the development and validation of standards for Satcom C2 Links
  – Laboratory and flight tests will be conducted using a Project developed Ku-Band Satcom system. Key performance parameters will be varied enabling verification and validation over a range of operating conditions. Research data will be acquired within expected operational parameters according to approved test plans and procedures
  – Results will be made available for the definition, development, and validation of a civil UAS Beyond Line of Sight (BLOS) satellite-based C2 system and the establishment of necessary performance parameters for the Ku-Band satellite spectrum bands

• Deliverables:
  – Type: Papers, Briefings
  – Recipients: RTCA SC-228 C2 Working Group, FAA Spectrum Office, ICAO
Objective: Transfer research data for the development and validation of standards for C-Band Satcom C2 data link

Approach:

- The UAS-NAS Project C2 Technical Challenge includes several Technical Baseline Elements to transfer C-Band research data for C2 links between the UAS and the GCS that support the required performance of the unmanned aircraft in the NAS, ensures that the pilot maintains a threshold level of control of the aircraft, and is robust to both environmental or technological issues ultimately contributing to the development and validation of standards for Satcom C2 Links.
- A C-Band C2 paper study will be conducted with results leading to the development of design parameters within the C-Band AMS(R)S frequency allocation and the broader determination of operational feasibility of a C-Band satellite-based C2 system.
- Study results will be made available for the development and validation of C2 standards.

Deliverables:

- Type: Papers, Briefings
- Recipients: RTCA SC-228 C2 Working Group, FAA Spectrum Office, ICAO
Objective: Develop a Terrestrial C2 data link radio system and transfer technology and research data for the development and validation of standards for Terrestrial C2 data link

Approach:

- The UAS-NAS Project C2 Technical Challenge includes several Technical Baseline Elements to transfer Terrestrial C2 technology research data for C2 links between the UAS and the GCS that support the required performance of the unmanned aircraft in the NAS, ensures that the pilot maintains a threshold level of control of the aircraft, and is robust to both environmental or technological issues ultimately contributing to the development and validation of standards for Satcom C2 Links

- Multiple generations of a Terrestrial C2 evaluation system will be developed through a NASA/industry cooperative agreement. The Terrestrial C2 evaluation system will be developed within the proposed Terrestrial spectrum bands comprising flight/ground elements, interfaces, and representative C2 messages. The Terrestrial C2 evaluation system will be capable of operation within the expected operational parameters. Laboratory and flight tests will be conducted using a Terrestrial C2 system. Research data will be acquired within expected operational parameters according to approved test plans and procedures

- Results will be made available for the definition, development, and validation of a civil UAS Terrestrial C2 system and the establishment of necessary performance parameters for the Terrestrial C2 spectrum bands

Deliverables:

- Type: Papers, Briefings
- Recipients: RTCA SC-228 C2 Working Group, FAA Spectrum Office, ICAO
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Phase 2 Flight and Simulation Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flight / Sims Series</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 11 12</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>5 6 7 8</td>
<td>9 10 11 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terrestrial-Based Version 6 Flight Testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[TC-DAA]</td>
<td>Foundational Fast-Time Sim</td>
<td>Unmitigated /Mitigated Fast-Time Sim</td>
<td>HITL Sim 1</td>
<td>HITL Sim 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Surveillance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HITL Sim 1</td>
<td>HITL Sim 2</td>
<td>HITL Sim 3</td>
<td>HITL Sim 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Clear/Alerting Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foundational Terminal Ops HITL 1</td>
<td>Fast-Time Simulation 1</td>
<td>HITL Sim 1</td>
<td>HITL Sim 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HITL Sim 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HITL Sim 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACAS Xu</td>
<td>Mini HITL Sim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interoperability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAA Flight Tests</td>
<td>8/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subprojects DAA / IT&amp;E</td>
<td>9/28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ETC-SIO]</td>
<td>NCC Demonstration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Chase COA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Red Status Line Date 4/26/17
External Influences on Technical Objectives defined at PPBE18

- Data Removed
Reserve Strategy

• Data Removed
Project Processes

• **Change Management**
  – Standard process utilizing Change Requests (CR) to manage changes to the following elements:
    • L1 and L2 Milestones
    • Project Goals, Objectives, and Technical Challenges
    • Technical Baseline, i.e. SP objective, approach, deliverables
    • Budget

• **Risk Management**
  – Utilizes a Continuous Risk Management (CRM) process to identify, analyze, plan, track, and control risks
    • Risk Workshops and Risk Review meetings conducted monthly
    • Risks are communicated in IASP UAS-NAS Risk Review Board, AFRC & Partner Center

• **Resource Management**
  – TWP, Budget roll up, and travel spreadsheets used in conjunction with standard tools (PMT, Business Warehouse, and SAP) to generate phasing plans and monitor status

• **Management Review Board (MRB)**
  – Monthly meeting where CRs and Risks are assessed/approved and resource status and schedule status are presented
# UAS-NAS Risk Summary Card

## Likelihood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
<th>Controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Very High</td>
<td>Nearly certain to occur. Controls have little or no effect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 High</td>
<td>Highly likely to occur. Controls have significant uncertainties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Moderate</td>
<td>May occur. Controls exist with some uncertainties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Low</td>
<td>Not likely to occur. Controls have minor limitations /uncertainties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Very Low</td>
<td>Very unlikely to occur. Strong Controls in Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Consequence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSEQUENCE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>≤ 1% Total Project Yearly Budget (≤ $300K)</td>
<td>1% - 5% Total Project Yearly Budget ($300K - $1.5M)</td>
<td>5% - 10% Total Project Yearly Budget ($1.5M - $3M)</td>
<td>10% - 15% Total Project Yearly Budget ($3M – $4.5M)</td>
<td>&gt;15% Total Project Yearly Budget (&gt; $4.5M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule *</td>
<td>Level 2 Milestone(s): &lt; 1 month impact</td>
<td>Level 2 Milestone(s): ≥ 1 month impact</td>
<td>Level 1 Milestone(s): ≤ 1 month impact Level 2 Milestone(s): ≤ 2 month impact</td>
<td>Level 1 Milestone(s): &gt; 1 month impact Level 2 Milestone(s): &gt; 2 month impact</td>
<td>Level 1 Milestone(s): &gt; 2 month impact Level 2 Milestone(s): ≥ 3 month impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: L1 = IASP  L2 = Project
Project Processes
Schedule Management Flow

• Project weekly status is the primary means of information flow, schedule status, and updates

• Schedule Packages and Milestones are the primary means of reporting at the project weekly status

• The version controlled IMS contains change managed Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative TC Task</th>
<th>M/S Level</th>
<th>Begin Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Status/Progress/Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Package N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical, Schedule, Accomplishments, and Issues and Concerns Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Task1</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/01/14</td>
<td>02/15/14</td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Task2</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/20/14</td>
<td>02/28/14</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Task3</td>
<td></td>
<td>02/01/14</td>
<td>03/31/14</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable</td>
<td></td>
<td>03/15/14</td>
<td>03/15/14</td>
<td>Date slipped 03/21/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestone</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>04/01/14</td>
<td>04/01/14</td>
<td>On track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Schedule management process is formally documented in the SMP
Milestone Definitions

- **L1 Milestones**
  - Associated with end of execution of major research activities (simulations & flight tests) of significant complexity
  - Consolidated comments/FRAC period comments to final SC-228 (White Papers & MOPS)

- **L2 Milestones New Criteria**
  - Start of test execution
  - Final reviews supporting simulations or flight tests associated with a L1 milestone, e.g. Test Readiness Review, Flight Test Tech Brief
  - Test plans associated with L1 execution milestones
  - Subproject FRAC comments to MOPS
  - Technology Transfer (Briefings, Reports, Papers, etc)
    - Note: Completion date is not change managed
  - System Design/Delivery Complete (in house activities; not partner activities)
  - Partnership Contract Award

- **L3 Milestones**
  - At the discretion of the SPM (used by the SPM to manage their schedules)
  - Potential Criteria for SPM consideration
    - Some previous L2s no longer captured by the new L2 criteria, e.g. FRR, SRR, Stakeholder Feedback reports, Configuration Freezes, Independent Reviews, Non-L1 Test Plans

- **Implementation Guidance**
  - Notionally should not exceed 3 L1s per TC per FY
  - L3 Milestones are not change managed at the PO level, i.e. MRB
  - IASP may elevate a L2 to L1 and the Project may elevate a L3 to L2
Addition of Project Chief Engineer (CE) introduces additional technical oversight of technical plan and execution

- Project Concept of Operations establishes baseline description of UAS operations for Phase 2 Operational Environments within NASA Project scope and serves as key message for community outreach
- IT&E Subproject Software Management Plan expands to address multi-center common DAA simulation architecture
- For multi-center integration activities, the CE will coordinate with Safety & Mission Assurance authorities across the participant centers to achieve the project objectives
- Each Flight Test will have a designated Principal Investigator (PI) from the research Subproject (DAA and/or C2) who jointly owns the Flight Test with the Flight Test Subproject (IT&E or C2)
- Periodic technical discussions scheduled between CE and Technical Leads
- All technical activities will require an internal brief out of the results to the CE
Phase 2 Technical Management Process Updates (cont.)

• Technical Review Process Changes
  – Establishes a baseline minimum set of technical reviews that are required by the Project for all test activities
    • Technical reviews are established based on the test type
  – Test types include
    • Modeling Analysis/Simulations without Human participants
    • Human-in-the-Loop Simulations
    • Flight Test
  – The CE will also assess the risks for each test to determine if the standard reviews are sufficient
    • In some limited cases, more or less reviews may be required
  – After determining the required reviews for a test, the CE will assess planned review processes at each participant center to determine which of the project’s technical reviews can be satisfied by the centers’ own reviews in order to reduce the duplication of reviews
  – Leadership of Reviews:
    • When a center review is deemed sufficient to replace a project review, the center shall lead the review per standard center processes and the CE, or their designee, will be a required participant in the center review
    • If the CE determines that a review must be called by the Project because a center does not plan to conduct their own relevant review, then the CE, or their designee, will chair the review
Current Active Collaborations/Partnerships Status

• Data Removed
• Data Removed
Grants and Agreements - Current

• Data Removed
• Data Removed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controlled Documents</th>
<th>Document Number</th>
<th>Document Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Plan Phase 1</td>
<td>UAS-PRO-1.1-001-003</td>
<td>07-29-13</td>
<td>Baselined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 (FY17-FY20) Technology Development Project Plan</td>
<td>UAS-PRO-1.1-012-001</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Revision in process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Includes Risk Management Process]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Baseline Document</td>
<td>UAS-PRO-1.1-013-001</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Being drafted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Engineering Management Plan (SEMP)</td>
<td>UAS-PRO-1.1-007-002</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Revision in process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Management Plan (CMP)</td>
<td>UAS-PRO-1.1-002-005</td>
<td>02-21-17</td>
<td>Signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Management Plan (SMP)</td>
<td>UAS-PRO-1.1-008-001</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Revision in process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Transfer Plan (TTP)</td>
<td>UAS-PRO-1.1-006-002</td>
<td>02-21-17</td>
<td>Ready to be signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records Retention Schedule</td>
<td>UAS-PRO-1.1-003-006</td>
<td>01-25-17</td>
<td>Signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach Plan</td>
<td>UAS-OR-7.1-001-001</td>
<td>05-08-14</td>
<td>Signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAA Subproject Implementation Plan</td>
<td>UAS-DAA-4.7-001-001</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Revision in process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Subproject Implementation Plan</td>
<td>UAS-C2-4.8-001-001</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Revision in process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT&amp;E Subproject Implementation Plan</td>
<td>UAS-ITE-5.2-001-001</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Revision in process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Associate Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAVP</td>
<td>Advanced Air Vehicles Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABDAA</td>
<td>Airborne Detect and Avoid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Aircraft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACAS</td>
<td>Airborne Collision Avoidance System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACAS Xu</td>
<td>Airborne Collision Avoidance System for Unmanned Aircraft Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACSS</td>
<td>Aviation Communication &amp; Surveillance Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADD</td>
<td>Architecture Description Document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADS-B</td>
<td>Automatic Dependent Surveillance - Broadcast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRC</td>
<td>Armstrong Flight Research Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRL</td>
<td>Air Force Research Lab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFSR</td>
<td>Airworthiness and Safety Flight Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGL</td>
<td>Above Ground Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>Airspace Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt</td>
<td>Altitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMS(R)S</td>
<td>Aeronautical Mobile-Satellite (R) Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANG</td>
<td>Air National Guard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOL</td>
<td>Airspace Operation Laboratory at NASA Ames</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOSP</td>
<td>Airspace Operations and Safety Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>Ames Research Center or Aviation Rule-Making Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARD</td>
<td>Aeronautics Research Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMD</td>
<td>Aeronautics Research Mission Directorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC</td>
<td>Air Traffic Controller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATO</td>
<td>Air Traffic Organization-FAA Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATOL</td>
<td>Air Traffic Operations Lab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUVSI</td>
<td>Association for Unmanned Vehicle Systems International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOS</td>
<td>Beyond Line of Sight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRLOS</td>
<td>Beyond Radio Line of Sight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVLOS</td>
<td>Beyond Visual Line of Sight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-UAS</td>
<td>Center for UAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Command and Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>Cooperative Agreement Notice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Collision Avoidance System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Chief Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMC</td>
<td>Center Management Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMP</td>
<td>Change Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNPC</td>
<td>Control and Non-Payload Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNS</td>
<td>Communication, Navigation, and Surveillance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COA</td>
<td>Certificate of Authorization or Waiver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONOPS</td>
<td>Concept of Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Change Request or Continuing Resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRDA</td>
<td>Cooperative Research and Development Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>Continuous Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>Chief Systems Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAA</td>
<td>Detect and Avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATR</td>
<td>Dryden Aeronautical Test Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Department of Homeland Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIP</td>
<td>Early Implementation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETC</td>
<td>Emerging Technical Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROCAE</td>
<td>European Organization for Civil Aviation Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExCom</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td>Federal Aviation Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFRDC</td>
<td>Federally Funded Research and Development Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAC</td>
<td>Final Review and Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Flight Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Full Time Equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTP</td>
<td>Flight Test Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTRD</td>
<td>Flight Test Requirements Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>General Aviation or General Atomics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-ASI</td>
<td>General Atomics Aeronautical Systems Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBDAA</td>
<td>Ground Based Detect and Avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBSAA</td>
<td>Ground Based Sense and Avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCS</td>
<td>Ground Control Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>Glenn Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALE</td>
<td>High Altitude Long Endurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAT</td>
<td>Human Autonomy Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF</td>
<td>Human Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HITL</td>
<td>Human in the loop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HW</td>
<td>Hardware or Honeywell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSI</td>
<td>Human Systems Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAA</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASP</td>
<td>Integrated Aviation Systems Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAW</td>
<td>In accordance with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAO</td>
<td>International Civil Aviation Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDIQ</td>
<td>Indefinite-Delivery, Indefinite-Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFR</td>
<td>Instrument Flight Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHITL</td>
<td>Integrated Human in the loop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMS</td>
<td>Integrated Master Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOC</td>
<td>Initial Operating Capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRT</td>
<td>Independent Review Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT&amp;E</td>
<td>Integrated Test and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITU</td>
<td>International Telecommunication Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITU-R</td>
<td>International Telecommunication Union-Radiocommunication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JADEM</td>
<td>Java Architecture for Detect and Avoid Extensibility and Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JARUS</td>
<td>Joint Authorities for Rule Making on Unmanned Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMP</td>
<td>Joint Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KDP</td>
<td>Key Decision Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaRC</td>
<td>Langley Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Line of Sight or Loss of Separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTE</td>
<td>Long Term Evolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVC</td>
<td>Live Virtual Constructive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVC-DE</td>
<td>Live Virtual Constructive- Distributed Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;S</td>
<td>Modeling &amp; Simulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS&amp;A</td>
<td>Modeling, Simulation and Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASPS</td>
<td>Minimum Aviation System Performance Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT-LL</td>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology Lincoln Labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITRE</td>
<td>MITRE Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOA</td>
<td>Memorandum of Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOPS</td>
<td>Minimum Operational Performance Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRB</td>
<td>Management Review Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSL</td>
<td>Mean Sea Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS</td>
<td>National Airspace System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NASA</td>
<td>National Aeronautics and Space Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO</td>
<td>North Atlantic Treaty Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCC</td>
<td>No Chase COA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NextGen</td>
<td>Next Generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGC</td>
<td>Northrop Grumman Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLT</td>
<td>No later than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF</td>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBE</td>
<td>Overcome by Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODM</td>
<td>On Demand Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>Operational Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORD</td>
<td>Objectives and Requirements Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORF</td>
<td>Norfolk International Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Progress Indicator or Principal Investigator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Project or Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMT</td>
<td>Project Management Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>Project Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPBE</td>
<td>Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTO</td>
<td>Permit to Operate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>Radio Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFI</td>
<td>Request for Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Request for Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGCS</td>
<td>Research Ground Control Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMP</td>
<td>Risk Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPAS</td>
<td>Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>Research Transition Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTT</td>
<td>Research Transition Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVLT</td>
<td>Revolutionary Vertical Lift Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAA</td>
<td>Space Act Agreement or Sense and Avoid or See and Avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAAP</td>
<td>Sense and Avoid Processor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF</td>
<td>Standalone Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP</td>
<td>Systems Applications and Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARP</td>
<td>Science and Research Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satcom</td>
<td>Satellite Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Special Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>System Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDD</td>
<td>Software Design Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMP</td>
<td>Systems Engineering Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIO</td>
<td>System Integration and Operationalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>Subject Matter Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMP</td>
<td>Schedule Management Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>State of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Schedule Package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPM</td>
<td>Subproject Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPMR</td>
<td>Strategic Portfolio Management Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>System Requirements Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRR</td>
<td>System Requirements Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANAG</td>
<td>Standard Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STM</td>
<td>Surveillance Tracking Module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td>Software Test Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWaP</td>
<td>Size, Weight and Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWRD</td>
<td>Software Requirements Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACAN</td>
<td>Tactical Air Navigation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>Technical Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Test Conductor/Technical Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCAS</td>
<td>Traffic Alert and Collision Avoidance System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>Technical Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRL</td>
<td>Technology Readiness Level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TSO</td>
<td>Technical Standard Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTP</td>
<td>Technology Transfer Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWP</td>
<td>Technical Work Package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS</td>
<td>Unmanned Aircraft Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS-NAS</td>
<td>UAS Integration in the NAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF</td>
<td>United States Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTM</td>
<td>Unmanned Aerial System (UAS) Traffic Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V&amp;V</td>
<td>Verification and Validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDD</td>
<td>Version Description Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFR</td>
<td>Visual Flight Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLL</td>
<td>Very Low Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSCS</td>
<td>Vigilant Spirit Control Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRC</td>
<td>World Radio Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYE</td>
<td>Work Year Equivalent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>