

# Doc 9625

# Manual of Criteria for the Qualification of Flight Simulation Training Devices

Volume 1 — Aeroplanes Fourth Edition, 2015



Approved by and published under the authority of the Secretary General

## INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION



# Doc 9625

# Manual of Criteria for the Qualification of Flight Simulation Training Devices

Volume 1 — Aeroplanes Fourth Edition, 2015

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

Published in separate English, Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian and Spanish editions by the INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION 999 Robert-Bourassa Boulevard, Montréal, Quebec, Canada H3C 5H7

For ordering information and for a complete listing of sales agents and booksellers, please go to the ICAO website at www.icao.int

Second edition 2003 Third edition 2009 Fourth edition 2015

**Doc 9625, Manual of Criteria for the Qualification of Flight Simulation Training Devices Volume I — Aeroplanes**  Order Number: 9625-1 ISBN 978-92-9249-761-3

© ICAO 2015

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, without prior permission in writing from the International Civil Aviation Organization.

#### **AMENDMENTS**

Amendments are announced in the supplements to the *Publications Catalogue;* the Catalogue and its supplements are available on the ICAO website at www.icao.int. The space below is provided to keep a record of such amendments.

#### **RECORD OF AMENDMENTS AND CORRIGENDA**



## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**













## **Foreword**

This manual addresses the use of Flight Simulation Training Devices (FSTDs) representing aeroplanes (Volume I) and helicopters (Volume II). The methods, procedures and testing standards contained in this manual are the result of the experience and expertise provided by Civil Aviation Authorities (CAA) and aeroplane and FSTD operators and manufacturers.

#### **First Edition**

From 1989 to 1992 a specially convened international working group held several meetings with the stated purpose of establishing common test criteria that would be recognized internationally. The criteria that resulted from the activities of this working group were presented to a Conference held in London, United Kingdom, in January 1992. These criteria were contained in the appendices to the first edition of this manual. Appendix A described the minimum requirements for qualifying aeroplane flight simulators of two levels (Levels I and II). The validation and functional tests associated with the particular level of flight simulator were contained in Appendices B and C.

#### **Second Edition**

During 2001, a working group under the joint chairmanship of the US Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the European Joint Aviation Authorities (JAA) held two meetings to review and modernize the standards contained within this manual. The second edition of this manual updated the minimum standards for aeroplane flight simulator qualification. This reflected the changes in both simulation technology and the understanding of the process of flight simulator qualification in the previous ten years. As a result of technology changes and operational tasks, this manual only defined the highest level of flight simulator. Changes were made to the standards and testing requirements in each appendix. These changes were introduced with great care being exercised to avoid increasing the burden of testing unnecessarily. As before, Appendix A described the minimum requirements for qualifying flight simulators. The validation and functions tests were contained in Appendices B and C. Finally, Attachments A through H were added as information and explanatory material to provide advice and guidance for all interested parties.

#### **Third Edition**

The technical standards defined within the second edition now formed the basis for the highest level of aeroplane flight simulator in both FAA 14 CFR Part 60 – Flight Simulation Training Device Initial and Continuing Qualification and Use and JAR–FSTD A — Aeroplane Flight Simulation Training Devices. The FAA, the JAA and other CAA had developed their own standards for the complete range of FSTDs for both aeroplanes and helicopters. Most recently, ICAO's Flight Crew Licensing and Training Panel additionally identified the need for four levels of aeroplane FSTDs to support the multi-crew pilot licence (MPL).

At the Flight Simulation Conference of the Royal Aeronautical Society (RAeS) held in London in November 2005, the FAA requested that the RAeS consider leading an international working group to review the technical criteria contained within the second edition of this manual and to expand these criteria to include all flight simulation training devices for both aeroplanes and helicopters.

In response, the RAeS Flight Simulation Group established in March 2006 an International Working Group (IWG) to review the technical criteria contained within the second edition of this manual and to expand these accordingly. The IWG also decided that a fundamental review was necessary to establish the simulation fidelity levels required to support each of the required training tasks for each type of pilot licence, qualification, rating or training type. The goal of the IWG was to develop a manual that, through ICAO, would form the basis for all national and international standards for a complete range of FSTDs.

The IWG comprised members from the regulatory community, pilot representative bodies, the airlines, and the training and flight simulation industry, and developed a unified set of technical criteria and training considerations.

#### **Fourth Edition**

In 2009, the International Committee for Aviation Training in Extended Envelopes (ICATEE) was established by the RAeS to develop training mitigations for accidents resulting from loss of control in flight. In 2012, ICAO sponsored meetings which brought together experts addressing this issue, including regulators and the respective FAA Aviation Rulemaking Committee. The Loss of Control Avoidance and Recovery Training Initiative evolved from these meetings and worked with industry, the FAA Aviation Rulemaking Committee and ICATEE to produce guidance material to support new licensing and training requirements. Such guidance material includes the qualification of FSTDs for upset prevention and recovery training (UPRT) introduced in this edition.

In addition, various specialist working groups developed new or updated guidance material for this edition as follows:

- updated simulated air traffic control environment related material which aligns with ARINC provisions;
- updated objective motion cueing tests to reduce motion system tests' reliance on subjective evaluations and improve harmonization of motion system fidelity;
- updates that reflect the industry's progress in technology; and
- editorial and technical changes to improve the document.

The guidance material for inclusion in the fourth edition was produced by the Training Device Work Stream of the International Pilot Training Consortium<sup>1</sup> that currently manages Doc 9625 updates, in coordination with ICAO.

Comments on this manual would be appreciated. They will be taken into account in the preparation of subsequent editions. Comments concerning the manual should be addressed to:

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  , where  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  , where  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  , where  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

The Secretary General International Civil Aviation Organization 999 Robert-Bourassa Boulevard Montréal, Quebec Canada H3C 5H7

 $\overline{a}$ <sup>1</sup> See www.icao.int/NACC/Documents (eDOCS, FS, FS-Flyer\_US-Letter\_ANB-IPTC\_2013-08-19.pdf)

## **Introductory Material**

The manual comprises two volumes, each containing three parts as follows:

Volume I — Manual of Criteria for the Qualification of FSTDs — Aeroplanes

- Part I Training Task Derived Flight Simulation Requirements
- Part II Flight Simulation Training Device Criteria
- Part III Flight Simulation Feature and Fidelity Level Criteria

Volume II — Manual of Criteria for the Qualification of FSTDs — Helicopters

- Part I Training Task Derived Flight Simulation Requirements
- Part II Flight Simulation Training Device Criteria
- Part III Flight Simulation Feature and Fidelity Level Criteria

Sections common to more than one part are only presented in Part II.

The process used to define flight simulation requirements was to conduct an analysis identifying tasks to be accomplished for the training and testing or checking types applicable to the various licences. Figure 1 summarizes this process.

The process outcome defines levels of fidelity of simulation features required to support the training tasks associated with existing pilot licensing, qualification, rating or training types, leading to the identification of seven standard examples of FSTDs. These FSTD examples are summarized in Part I, Appendix B, and are referred to as "Device Types" in Part II.

Individual flight simulation feature and fidelity level criteria are provided in Part III and will provide the industry with criteria for the purposes of:

- international standardization of FSTD qualification:
- tailoring of existing FSTDs to meet existing or future training needs; and
- design of new FSTDs to meet existing or future training needs.

#### In summary:

#### Pilot Licensing, Qualification, Rating or Training Type

The fifteen training types considered are from various CAA definitions. Reference Volume I, Part I, Chapter 4.

#### Training Tasks

The training tasks (approximately 200) were derived from the Procedures for Air Navigation Services — Training (PANS–TRG, Doc 9868) as well as material from FAA 14 CFR Part 60 and other CAA documentation. Reference Volume I, Part I, Chapter 5.

#### Simulation Features

Twelve simulation features were defined using the FSTD standards tables contained in JAR FSTD A and FAA 14 CFR Part 60 to act as building blocks to describe any level of FSTD. Reference Volume I, Part I, Chapter 6.

Other relevant FSTD features related to instructor operating station, self-diagnostic testing, updates to hardware and software, etc. are covered under a separate simulation feature "Miscellaneous" and apply to all FSTDs.

#### Fidelity levels

Four fidelity levels of simulation feature were identified:

- none or not required (N);
- generic (G);
- representative (R); and
- specific (S).

These definitions are explained in more detail in Volume I, Part I, Chapter 3 through Chapter 6.



**Figure 1. Training analysis process** 

## **MANUAL OF CRITERIA FOR THE QUALIFICATION OF FLIGHT SIMULATION TRAINING DEVICES**

**Volume I** 

**Aeroplanes** 

## **Part I**

**Training Task Derived Flight Simulation Requirements** 

## **GLOSSARY OF TERMS, ABBREVIATIONS AND UNITS**

\_

The terms, abbreviations and units used in this document are described in Part II, Chapter 1.

## **VOLUME I CONTENT**

#### **2.1 GUIDANCE PROVIDED IN VOLUME I**

Volume I provides guidance for the following:

- the process and methodology for FSTD qualification; and
- the training tasks that can be partly trained or trained to proficiency in a qualified FSTD.

#### **2.2 PARTS TO VOLUME I**

#### **2.2.1 Part I — Training task derived flight simulation requirements**

Part I contains an analysis of training tasks and related simulation feature and fidelity level requirements, including:

- a description of the tasks considered throughout a broad range of pilot licensing, qualification, rating and training requirements (see Chapter 4);
- a summary of seven standard FSTD examples (see Appendix B); and
- a reference to the training task matrix which compares each task, differentiated on the basis of licence or qualification requirements, against the suite of simulation features. Each simulation feature is defined at a "Specific", "Representative" or "Generic" level of fidelity, or "None" (i.e. the feature is not required).

#### **2.2.2 Part II — Flight simulation training device criteria**

Part II describes the FSTD general requirements, objective tests, and functions and subjective tests to qualify the seven defined examples of FSTD referenced in the summary matrix in Part I, Appendix B.

#### **2.2.3 Part III — Flight simulation feature and fidelity level criteria**

Part III describes the general requirements, objective tests, and functions and subjective tests for the individual flight simulation features, and the fidelity levels to enable qualification of any FSTD.

## **FSTD QUALIFICATION CRITERIA DETERMINATION PROCESS**

#### **3.1 PROCESS**

Figure 3-1 provides a step-by-step process map to determine the fidelity levels and qualification criteria for the simulation features according to training task considerations. This enables the construction of a specific FSTD Qualification Test Guide (QTG). The process is outlined below:

**Step 1 — Licence or Training Type.** The FSTD operator identifies the intended use of the FSTD with reference to the pilot licence and qualification types listed in Chapter 4 and level of training or checking as defined in Chapter 8.

#### **Step 2 — Determine the list of training tasks for licence or training type.**

**Decision.** Confirm that the training tasks listed in Part I, Appendix A for the licence or training type chosen fulfil the FSTD operator's and CAA's requirements.

If **yes**, proceed to step 3 a). If **no**, proceed to step 3 b).

**Step 3 a) — Determine the appropriate FSTD type example** by referring to Part I, Appendix B. Disregard step 3 b).

**Step 3 b) — Determine the changes to the FSTD features/fidelity levels or training tasks** by referring to Part I, Appendix C. Proceed to step 4 b).

**Decision.** Does the FSTD under consideration meet the selected FSTD type example (I through VII) in Part I, Appendix B?

If **yes**, proceed to step 4 a). If **no**, proceed to step 4 b).

**Step 4 a) — Determine the statements of compliance (SOCs) and testing requirements for the FSTD qualification** by referring to Part II, Appendices A, B and C. Proceed to Step 5.

**Step 4 b) — Determine the statements of compliance (SOCs) and testing requirements for the FSTD qualification** by referring to Part III, Appendices A, B and C.

**Step 5 — Construct the Qualification Test Guide (QTG).** 



**Figure 3-1. QTG Specification process map** 

#### **3.2 ADDITIONAL NOTES**

3.2.1 As a future-proofing measure, a CAA may, within an accepted training programme offered at an approved training organization (ATO), authorize the use of an FSTD qualified under an alternative means of compliance from the device requirements established by Part I of this document.

3.2.2 A deviation from the criteria in Part II may be considered if the ATO demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the CAA, that the use of the FSTD achieves a training standard at least equivalent to that provided on a device traditionally used in a similar programme.

3.2.3 When it becomes apparent that a device type example from Part I, Appendix B, is not selected, the CAA should be consulted very early in the device definition process, and the overall process defined above should be followed.

3.2.4 If any of the device features differ from those of the seven type examples in Part I, Appendix B, appropriate objective validation, functions and subjective tests will need to be defined using the information provided in Part III. These differences should be documented in the statement of qualification that also includes the authorized training or checking tasks sought and the contents of the authorized training programme. In this case, the device should be referred to as an FSTD type I-VII∆ (Delta), e.g. type IV∆.

### **LICENCE OR TYPE OF TRAINING**

4.1 The fifteen pilot licensing, qualification, rating or training types identified that might utilize some level of FSTD were identified as follows from a review of existing regulatory material:

4.1.1 From ICAO Annex 1 — Personnel Licensing and the Procedures for Air Navigation Services — Training (PANS-TRG, Doc 9868):

- a) MPL1 Multi-crew Pilot Licence Phase 1, Core flying skills;
- b) MPL2 Multi-crew Pilot Licence Phase 2, Basic;
- c) MPL3 Multi-crew Pilot Licence Phase 3, Intermediate; and
- d) MPL4 Multi-crew Pilot Licence Phase 4, Advanced.

4.1.2 Traditional licence and rating types or training types from FAA and JAA regulations:

- a) IR Initial Instrument Rating;
- b) PPL Private Pilot Licence;
- c) CPL Commercial Pilot Licence;
- d) TR Type Rating Training and Checking;
- e) CR Class Rating;
- f) RL Recurrent Licence (Proficiency) Training and Checking;
- g) RO Recurrent Operator (Proficiency) Training and Checking;
- h) Re Recency (Take-off and Landing);
- i) CQ Continuing Qualification;
- j) IO Initial Operator Training and Checking; and
- k) ATPL Airline Transport Pilot Licence or Certificate.

## **TRAINING TASKS**

5.1 The following definitions extracted from the Procedures for Air Navigation Services - Training (PANS-TRG, Doc 9868) were used in the construction of the training matrix:

5.1.1 Competency. A combination of skills, knowledge and attitudes required to perform a task to the prescribed standard.

5.1.2 Competency-based training and assessment. Training and assessment that are characterized by a performance orientation, emphasis on standards of performance and their measurement, and the development of training to the specified performance standards.

5.1.3 Competency element. An action that constitutes a task that has a triggering event and a terminating event that clearly defines its limits, and an observable outcome.

5.1.4 Competency unit. A discrete function consisting of a number of competency elements. The nine competency units that are required to be demonstrated are as follows:

- a) apply threat and error management principles;
- b) perform aeroplane ground and pre-flight operations;
- c) perform take-off;
- d) perform climb;
- e) perform cruise;
- f) perform descent;
- g) perform approach;
- h) perform landing; and
- i) perform after-landing and post-flight operations.

5.2 The training tasks considered include all those that are required to be trained or to be trained to proficiency for each of the training types or licences listed in Chapter 4. They are shown in detail in Appendix A and were assembled from the following documents:

- a) Annex 1 Personnel Licensing and Annex 6 Operation of Aircraft, Part I International Commercial Air Transport — Aeroplanes for specific upset prevention and recovery training tasks;
- b) PANS-TRG; and
- c) FAA 14 CFR Part 60.

5.3 The following are examples from PANS-TRG of the training tasks down to the competency element level:

"**. . .** 3. Perform Take-off

**. . .** 

- 3.1 Perform pre-take-off and pre-departure preparation
- 3.2 Perform take-off roll
- 3.3 Perform transition to instrument flight rules
- 3.4 Perform initial climb to flap retraction altitude
- 3.5 Perform rejected take-off
- 3.6 Perform navigation
- 3.7 Manage abnormal and emergency situations
- 4. Perform Climb

**. . .** 

- 4.1 Perform standard instrument departure/en-route navigation
- 4.2 Complete climb procedures and checklists
- 4.3 Modify climb speeds, rate of climb and cruise altitude
- 4.4 Perform systems operations and procedures
- 4.5 Manage abnormal and emergency situations
- 4.6 Communicate with cabin crew, passengers and company **. . .**"

## **FSTD SIMULATION FEATURES**

6.1 To assist in the definition of the FSTDs and to provide focus for the training analysis, it was decided to break down the FSTD into some key components that would lead towards the construction of the FSTD Specification. Consequently, twelve FSTD features were defined from a training perspective that, used together and with an additional "Miscellaneous" feature, create an FSTD as follows:

6.1.1 Flight deck layout and structure. Defines the physical structure and layout of the cockpit environment, instrument layout and presentation, controls, and pilot, instructor and observer seating.

6.1.2 Flight model (aerodynamics and engine). Defines the mathematical models and associated data to be used to describe the aerodynamic and propulsion characteristics required to be modelled in the FSTD.

6.1.3 Ground handling. Defines the mathematical models and associated data to be used to describe the ground handling characteristics and runway conditions required to be modelled in the FSTD.

6.1.4 Aeroplane systems. Defines the types of aircraft systems simulation required to be modelled in the FSTD. The ATA chapter definitions describe these in more detail (e.g. hydraulic power, fuel, electrical power). Systems simulation will allow normal, abnormal and emergency procedures to be accomplished.

6.1.5 Flight controls and forces. Defines the mathematical models and associated data to be used to describe the flight controls and flight control force and dynamic characteristics required to be modelled in the FSTD.

6.1.6 Sound cues. Defines the type of sound cue required to be modelled. Such sound cues are those related to sounds generated externally to the cockpit environment such as sounds of aerodynamics, propulsion, runway rumble and weather effects, and those internal to the cockpit.

6.1.7 Visual cues. Defines the type of out-of-cockpit window image display (e.g. collimated or non-collimated) and field of view (horizontal and vertical) that is required to be seen by the pilots using the FSTD from their reference eyepoint. Technical requirements such as contrast ratio and light point details are also described. HUD and EFVS options are also addressed.

6.1.8 Motion cues. Defines the type of motion cueing required to be modelled that may be generated by the aircraft dynamics and from other such effects as airframe buffet, control surface buffet, weather and ground operations.

6.1.9 Environment — ATC. Defines the level of complexity of the simulated Air Traffic Control environment and how it interacts with the flight crew under training. The focus of this feature is on the terminal manoeuvring or control area phase of flight.

6.1.10 Environment — Navigation. Defines the level of complexity of the simulated navigation aids, systems and networks with which the flight crew members are required to operate, such as GPS, VOR, DME, ILS or NDB.

6.1.11 Environment — Atmosphere and weather. Defines the level of complexity of the simulated weather conditions, from ambient temperature and pressure to full thunderstorm modelling, etc.

6.1.12 Environment — aerodromes and terrain. Defines the complexity and level of detail of the simulated aerodrome and terrain modelling required. This includes such items as generic versus customized aerodromes, visual scene requirements, terrain elevation and EGPWS databases.

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  , where  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  , where  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  , where  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  ,  $\overline{\phantom$ 

6.1.13 Miscellaneous. Defines criteria for the following FSTD miscellaneous feature technical requirements:

- instructor operating station;
- self-diagnostic testing;
- computer capacity;
- automatic testing facilities;
- updates to hardware and software;
- daily pre-flight documentation; and
- system integration (transport delay).

## **SIMULATION FEATURE FIDELITY LEVELS**

7.1 Four fidelity levels, i.e. None, Generic, Representative and Specific, were used in the analysis in deciding for each training task the minimum level of fidelity required for each simulation feature, except for the "Miscellaneous" feature. These can be grouped into three categories as follows:

7.1.1 Aircraft simulation comprising the following simulation features:

- a) flight deck layout and structure;
- b) flight model (aerodynamics and engine);
- c) ground handling;
- d) aeroplane systems; and
- e) flight controls and forces.
- 7.1.2 Cueing simulation comprising the following simulation features:
	- a) sound cues;
	- b) visual cues; and
	- c) motion cues.
- 7.1.3 Environment simulation comprising the following simulation features:
	- a) environment ATC;
	- b) environment navigation;
	- c) environment atmosphere and weather; and
	- d) environment aerodromes and terrain.
- 7.2 Fidelity levels for each feature category are described in Table 7-1.



\_



## **TRAINING AND TRAINING-TO-PROFICIENCY**

8.1 The "building block approach" to flight training recognizes the capability of accomplishing the procedural components of piloting tasks, including pilot manual handling tasks, in FSTDs without certain features (such as motion cues) or reduced feature fidelity levels (such as for visual cues). Utilizing this approach, the training master matrix described in Appendix C assigns fidelity feature levels for each listed task where, as a minimum, training (T) is supported. Training is not completed until all tasks listed as training-to-proficiency (TP) are completed utilizing the relevant TP device type.

8.2 Definitions of the terms "train" (T) and "train-to-proficiency" (TP) are in Part II, Chapter 1.

 $\mathcal{L}_\text{max}$  , where  $\mathcal{L}_\text{max}$  is the set of the se
## **Chapter 9**

# **REFERENCES AND RELATED READING MATERIAL**

9.1 Applicants seeking FSTD evaluation, qualification and approval should consult references contained in related documents published by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), the International Air Transport Association (IATA) and the Royal Aeronautical Society (RAeS) referring to and/or dealing with the use of FSTDs and technical and operational requirements relevant to FSTD data and design. Applicable rules and regulations pertaining to the use of FSTDs in the State for which the FSTD qualification and approval is requested should also be consulted.

9.2 The related national and international documents which form the basis of the criteria set out in this document are listed in Part II, Chapter 2.

 $\mathcal{L}_\text{max}$  , where  $\mathcal{L}_\text{max}$  is the set of the se

# **Appendix A**

# **TRAINING TASK vs TRAINING/LICENCE TYPE MATRIX**

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 The matrix contained in this appendix is derived from the master matrix and corresponds to Chapter 3, Figure 3-1, FSTD QTG Specification Process Map, Step 2. It allocates the tasks considered appropriate for each of the licensing, qualification, rating or training types defined in Chapter 4 for which use of an appropriately qualified FSTD is suitable.

- 1.2 Explanatory notes to aid understanding the matrix are as follows:
	- TP is conducted only in an aeroplane for PPL, CPL, CR, IR and MPL1;
	- Recency (Re) is only considered as a T exercise (and not TP);
	- for MPL phases 1 to 4, only the ICAO-designated PANS–TRG training tasks were considered with the addition of upset prevention, recognition and recovery (associated with Training Tasks in the set of ICAO and MISC tasks); and
	- for all other licensing, qualification, rating or training types, the FAA Airline Transport Pilot and Type Rating Practical Test Standards (see Part II, Chapter 2, 2.3.2) designated tasks have been considered in addition to the ICAO MPL tasks.

# Manual of Criteria for the Qualification







Manual of Criteria for the Qualification



Part I. Training Task Derived Flight Simulation Requirements<br>Appendix A. Training task vs training/licence type matrix Appendix A. Training task vs training/licence type matrix Part I. Training Task Derived Flight Simulation Requirements

I-App A-5













I-App A-11



Manual of Criteria for the Qualification





# **Appendix B**

# **FSTD SUMMARY MATRIX**

#### **1. SUMMARY MATRIX**

For FSTD operators that use the seven FSTD standard examples, the summary matrix of Table B-1 applies.

Note.— The content of the summary matrix is considered to have precedence over the contents of the master matrix.



#### **Table B-1. FSTD Summary Matrix**

### **2. GUIDANCE FOR THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE FSTD SUMMARY MATRIX**

2.1 T — See definition of "train" in Part II, Chapter 1, 1.1.

2.2 TP — See definition of "train-to-proficiency" in Part II, Chapter 1, 1.1.

2.3 A device which may be used to demonstrate proficiency may also be used to train for the same task.

2.4 For a definition of the derivative simulator feature fidelity levels R1, G(S) and R(S), see Part II, Chapter 2, 2.2.6 and to the appropriate paragraphs of the FSTD Master Matrix defined in Appendix C to this part.

2.5 For CR, the summary matrix specifies fidelity level S for simulation feature Environment — Navigation despite the fact that there are no specific navigation tasks required. This has been done because FSTDs now have a full navigation database capability.

2.6 For Environment — ATC: All fidelity levels in the summary matrix above are shown greyed out as this feature is currently under development. Guidance on simulated ATC environment and related qualification criteria will remain subject to amendment based on experience (see Part II, Attachment O).

2.7 The MPL concept is a performance-outcome approach to training. The MPL competency framework should accommodate varying degrees of integration of FSTDs and should support the development of a training programme in which appropriate aircraft and FSTDs are used to ensure optimal transfer of learning; trainees move seamlessly through different components of the learning environment to the work environment.

#### 2.8 Devices for MPL Phase 3

MPL Phase 3 learning outcomes are not specific to aeroplane type. The Type VI FSTD example indicated in the summary matrix for MPL Phase 3 offers a means, but not the only means, by which the FSTD specifications support the training outcomes. The task analysis indicates the possibility to meet competency outcomes by a combination of training in the Type V and Type VII FSTD examples. The summary of the Type VI device example is deliberately greyed out to reflect the fact that the training community was, at the time of publication, uncertain about the optimal training device for this phase. The ICAO Annex  $1$  — Personnel Licensing guidance material and the JAR (EASA)-FCL rules also differ in this field; thus, the entire issue is subject to the ICAO "proof of concept" mechanism which collects global MPL experiences as a basis for an update of the MPL Phase 3 device definition when possible.

#### 2.9 Devices for MPL Phase 4

MPL Phase 4 includes, but may not be limited to, an aeroplane type rating. An appropriate combination of device specifications to meet learning outcomes is indicated in the master matrix. The summary matrix however, requires training exclusively in a Type VII device, in compliance with Annex 1, Appendix 3, paragraph 4.

Note.— The Type IV device referred to in Annex 1, Appendix 3, 4.2 d) is equivalent to Type VII in this document.

2.10 Guidance during MPL licence implementation and MPL training programmes introduction

It is suggested that, while the MPL training programmes are being introduced and validated, the highest appropriate level devices are used to facilitate the safe and efficient implementation of the MPL requirements.

 $\mathcal{L}_\text{max}$  , where  $\mathcal{L}_\text{max}$  is the set of the se

# **Appendix C**

# **FSTD MASTER MATRIX**

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 A master matrix was created which defines the device feature fidelity levels for each of the possible training tasks competencies for each of the fifteen pilot licensing, qualification, rating or training types described in Chapter 4.

1.2 The master matrix consists of two tables:

- one table covering the training types for the "Training" requirement (T); and
- a second table covering the training types for the "Training-to-Proficiency" requirement (TP).

1.3 This is the basic reference material used to define the seven FSTD standard examples and the material contained in this document.

1.4 The FSTD standard examples were reached by a process of rolling up the master matrix individual lines into a single-line definition of a device that is able to cover a number of training tasks.

1.5 The following paragraphs (2 to 16) contain the printouts of the master matrix data for each individual training type of the fifteen types listed in Chapter 4. Each licence or type of training printout of the master matrix data is subdivided into its "Training" requirement (T) and its "Training-to-Proficiency" requirement (TP), if these two requirements are both defined in the master matrix. Each paragraph shows the information available on the level of simulation fidelity required for each device feature and licence or type of training against the individual competency element.



#### **2. MPL1 (MULTI-CREW PILOT LICENCE — PHASE 1, CORE FLYING SKILLS) — MASTER MATRIX DATA — TRAINING (T) — THE INTRODUCTION OF A SPECIFIC TRAINING TASK**



#### **3. MPL2 (MULTI-CREW PILOT LICENCE — PHASE 2, BASIC) — MASTER MATRIX DATA**

#### **3.1 MPL2 — Master matrix data — Training (T) — The introduction of a specific training task**









## **3.2 MPL2 — Master matrix data — Training-to-Proficiency (TP)**



attitudes



#### **4. MPL3 (MULTI-CREW PILOT LICENCE — PHASE 3, INTERMEDIATE) — MASTER MATRIX DATA**

#### **MPL3 (T)**  Flight Controls and Forces Environment - Navigation Environment — Navigation Flight Controls and Forces Environment —<br>Atmosphere and Weather Atmosphere and Weather Environment —<br>Aerodromes and Terrain Aerodromes and Terrain Environment - ATC Environment — ATC Aeroplane Systems Aeroplane Systems Flight Deck Layout<br>and Structure Flight Deck Layout Flight Model<br>(Aero and Engine) (Aero and Engine) Ground Handling Ground Handling Environment — Environment — Sound Cues Visual Cues Motion Cues Flight Model Competency Element Source or Training Task ICAO 2.1 Perform dispatch duties R N R R N N N N N N S G N ICAO 2.2 Provide flight crew and cabin crew briefings R N G R N N N N N S G N ICAO 2.3 Perform pre-flight checks and cockpit preparation R N R R R N N N S S G R ICAO 2.4 Perform engine start R R R R R R N N S S R N ICAO 2.5 Perform taxi out R R R R R R R S N S S R R ICAO 2.6 Manage abnormal and emergency situations R R R R R R R S N S S R R ICAO 2.7 Communicate with cabin R R R R R R S N N S R R crew, passengers and company ICAO 3.1 Perform pre-take-off and R R R R R R S N S S R R pre-departure preparation ICAO 3.2 Perform take-off roll R R R R R R S N S S R R ICAO 3.3 Perform transition to R R R R R R S N S S R R instrument flight rules ICAO 3.4 Perform initial climb to flap R R N R R R S N S S R R retraction altitude ICAO 3.5 Perform rejected take-off R R R R R R S N S S R R ICAO 3.6 Perform navigation R R N R R R S N S S R R ICAO 3.7 Manage abnormal and R R N R R R S N S S R R emergency situations ICAO 4.1 Perform standard R R N R R R S N S S R R instrument departure/enroute navigation ICAO 4.2 Complete climb R R N R R R S N S S R R procedures and checklists ICAO 4.3 Modify climb speeds, rate R R N R R R S N S S R R of climb and cruise altitude ICAO 4.4 Perform systems operation R R N R R R S N S S R R and procedure

R R N R R R S N S S R R

R R N R R R S N N S R R

### **4.1 MPL3 — Master matrix data — Training (T) — The introduction of a specific training task**

ICAO 4.5 Manage abnormal and

ICAO 4.6 Communicate with cabin

company

emergency situations

crew, passengers and







## **4.2 MPL3 — Master matrix data — Training-to-Proficiency (TP)**



#### **5. MPL4 (MULTI-CREW PILOT LICENCE — PHASE 4, ADVANCED) — MASTER MATRIX DATA**

### **5.1 MPL4 — Master matrix data — Training (T) — The introduction of a specific training task**









## **5.2 MPL4 — Master matrix data — Training-to-Proficiency (TP)**
and procedures







### **6. IR (INSTRUMENT RATING) — MASTER MATRIX DATA — TRAINING (T) — THE INTRODUCTION OF A SPECIFIC TRAINING TASK**







#### **7. PPL (PRIVATE PILOT LICENCE) — MASTER MATRIX DATA — TRAINING (T) THE INTRODUCTION OF A SPECIFIC TRAINING TASK**







### **8. CPL (COMMERCIAL PILOT LICENCE) — MASTER MATRIX DATA — TRAINING (T) — THE INTRODUCTION OF A SPECIFIC TRAINING TASK**







## **9. TR (TYPE RATING) — MASTER MATRIX DATA**



### **9.1 TR — Master matrix data — Training (T) — The introduction of a specific training task**















## **9.2 TR — Master matrix data — Training-to-Proficiency (TP)**









groups











#### **10. CR (CLASS RATING) — MASTER MATRIX DATA — TRAINING (T) — THE INTRODUCTION OF A SPECIFIC TRAINING TASK**







## **11. RL (RECURRENT LICENCE (PROFICIENCY)) — MASTER MATRIX DATA**



### **11.1 RL — Master matrix data — Training (T) — The introduction of a specific training task**



from, approach to stall: Clean configuration

















# **11.2 RL — Master matrix data — Training-to-Proficiency (TP)**










FAA 14.5 Rapid decompression S S N S S R S R G S R R FAA 14.6 Emergency evacuation S S S S S R N R G N R N

FAA 14.9 Pilot incapacitation SSSSSSRNRGNRM

S S S S S R N R G N R N

S S S S S R N R G N R N

S S S S S R N R G N R N

S S N S S R S R S S N R

FAA 14.7 Engine fire, severe damage, or separation

FAA 14.8 Landing with degraded flight controls

FAA 14.10 All other emergencies as in the FCOM

MISC Manual precision approach without

flight director

### **12. RO (RECURRENT OPERATOR (PROFICIENCY)) — MASTER MATRIX DATA**

### **12.1 RO — Master matrix data — Training (T) — The introduction of a specific training task**



RO(T)														
Source		<b>Competency Element</b> or <b>Training Task</b>	Flight Deck Layout and Structure	(Aero and Engine) Flight Model	Ground Handling	Aeroplane Systems	Flight Controls and Forces	Sound Cues	<b>Visual Cues</b>	<b>Motion Cues</b>	<b>ATC</b> Environment	- Navigation Environment	Atmosphere and Weather Environment	Terrain Environment -- Aerodromes and
<b>ICAO</b>	5.1	Monitor navigation accuracy	S	$\mathbf S$	$\mathsf{N}$	$\mathsf S$	$\mathbf S$	R	$\mathsf{N}$	N	G	${\mathsf S}$	$\mathsf{R}$	N
<b>ICAO</b>	5.2	Monitor flight progress	$\mathbf S$	S	$\mathsf{N}$	S	S	R	N	N	G	S	R	N
<b>ICAO</b>	5.3	Perform descent and approach planning	$\mathbf S$	S	N	S	S	R	N	N	G	S	$\mathsf{R}$	N
<b>ICAO</b>	5.4	Perform systems operations and procedures	S	S	N	$\mathbf S$	$\mathbf S$	R	N	N	G	$\mathbf S$	R	N
<b>ICAO</b>	5.5	Manage abnormal and emergency situations	S	S	$\mathsf{N}$	S	$\mathbf S$	R	N	N	G	S	R	R
<b>ICAO</b>	5.6	Communicate with cabin crew, passengers and company	$\mathbf S$	S	N	S	$\mathbf S$	R	N	N	N	$\mathbf S$	$\sf R$	N
<b>ICAO</b>	6.1	Initiate and manage descent	S	S	N	S	S	R	N	N	G	S	R	N
<b>ICAO</b>	6.2	Monitor and perform en-route and descent navigation	$\mathbf S$	S	N	S	$\mathbf S$	R	N	N	G	S	$\mathsf R$	N
<b>ICAO</b>		6.3 Replanning and update of approach briefing	S	S	N	S	S	R	N	N	G	$\mathbf S$	$\mathsf{R}$	N
<b>ICAO</b>	6.4	Perform holding	$\mathbf S$	S	N	S	$\mathbf S$	R	N	N	G	S	R	N
<b>ICAO</b>	6.5	Perform systems operations and procedures	$\mathbf S$	S	N	S	S	R	N	N	G	S	$\mathsf R$	N
<b>ICAO</b>	6.6	Manage abnormal and emergency situations	S	S	N	S	$\mathbf S$	R	N	N	G	S	R	N
<b>ICAO</b>	6.7	Communicate with cabin crew, passengers and company	S	S	N	$\mathbf S$	$\mathbf S$	R	N	N	N	$\mathbf S$	$\mathsf{R}$	N
<b>ICAO</b>	7.1	Perform approach in general	S	S	N	S	S	R	R	N	G	S	R	R
<b>ICAO</b>	7.2	Perform precision approach	$\mathbf S$	S	N	S	$\mathbf S$	R	R	N	G	S	$\mathsf R$	$\sf R$
<b>ICAO</b>	7.3	Perform non precision approach	S	S	N	S	S	R	R	N	G	S	$\mathsf R$	$\mathsf R$
<b>ICAO</b>		7.4 Perform approach with visual reference to ground	S	S	N	S	S	R	R	N	G	S	R	R
<b>ICAO</b>	7.5	Monitor the flight progress	S	$\mathbf S$	N	$\mathbf S$	$\mathbf S$	R	N	N	G	$\mathbb S$	R	N
<b>ICAO</b>	7.6	Perform systems operations and procedures	$\mathbf S$	$\mathbf S$	${\sf N}$	$\mathbf S$	$\mathbf S$	$\mathsf R$	N	$\mathsf{N}$	G	$\mathsf S$	$\sf R$	N
<b>ICAO</b>	7.7	Manage abnormal and emergency situations	$\mathbf S$	$\mathbb S$	N	S	S	R	N	N	G	$\mathbb S$	R	N
<b>ICAO</b>		7.8 Perform go-around/missed approach	S	$\mathbf S$	${\sf N}$	$\mathbf S$	$\mathbf S$	R	$\mathsf R$	${\sf N}$	G	$\mathbb S$	$\mathsf R$	R
<b>ICAO</b>		7.9 Communicate with cabin crew, passengers and company	$\mathbf S$	$\mathbf S$	${\sf N}$	$\mathbf S$	$\mathbf S$	${\sf R}$	N	$\mathsf{N}$	${\sf N}$	$\mathbf S$	${\sf R}$	N
<b>ICAO</b>	8.1	Land the aircraft	S	$\mathbb S$	$\mathbb S$	$\mathbb S$	$\mathbb S$	R	R	N	G	$\mathbb S$	R	R
<b>ICAO</b>		8.2 Perform systems operations and procedures	$\mathbf S$	$\mathbf S$	$\mathbb S$	$\mathbf S$	$\mathbf S$	${\sf R}$	${\sf R}$	$\mathsf{N}$	G	$\mathsf S$	${\sf R}$	R









the FCOM





## **12.2 RO — Master matrix data — Training-to-Proficiency (TP)**













### **13. RE — (RECENCY (TAKE-OFF AND LANDING)) — MASTER MATRIX DATA — TRAINING (T) — THE INTRODUCTION OF A SPECIFIC TRAINING TASK**





### **14. CQ (CONTINUING QUALIFICATION) — MASTER MATRIX DATA — TRAINING-TO-PROFICIENCY (TP)**







groups







### **15. IO (INITIAL OPERATOR) — MASTER MATRIX DATA**

### **15.1 IO — Master matrix data — Training (T) — The introduction of a specific training task**



ICAO 8.3 Manage abnormal and

emergency situations



S S S S S R R N G S R R









FAA 15.3 Thunderstorm avoidance S S S S S R R N G S R R







# **15.2 IO — Master matrix data — Training-to-Proficiency (TP)**



Source

FAA 8.1.2.1 Recognition/recovery

FAA 8.1.2.2 Recognition/recovery

from, approach to stall: Clean configuration

from, approach to stall: Take-off and manoeuvring

configuration



FAA 7.7 Holding SSSNSSRNRSSRN FAA 7.10 Approach transition S S N S S R N R S S R N

S S N S S R N R S S R N

S S N S S R N R S S R N










### **16. ATPL (AIRLINE TRANSPORT PILOT LICENCE) — MASTER MATRIX DATA**



## **16.1 ATPL — Master matrix data — Training (T) — The introduction of a specific training task**







FAA 9.3 One engine inoperative — S S N S S R R N G S R R

manually flown























 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  , where  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  , where  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  , where  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  ,  $\overline{\phantom$ 

# **MANUAL OF CRITERIA FOR THE QUALIFICATION OF FLIGHT SIMULATION TRAINING DEVICES**

**Volume I** 

**Aeroplanes** 

**Part II** 

**Flight Simulation Training Device Criteria**

# **Chapter 1**

# **GLOSSARY OF TERMS, ABBREVIATIONS AND UNITS**

### **1.1 GLOSSARY OF TERMS**

The terms used in this manual have the following meanings:

- Active force feedback. In the context of a Flight Controls System, active force feedback indicates a dynamic system that produces FSTD control forces accurately reflecting those of the aeroplane in all phases of flight in normal, abnormal and emergency operations.
- **Additional engines/avionics.** An FSTD which has simulation of more than one engine/avionics fit.

**Aeroplane performance data.** Data used to certify the aeroplane performance. The data are generally for a normalized representation of the aeroplane fleet with a margin to ensure that the values represent the least performing case.

 Note.— An example is the data used to generate Aeroplane Flight Manual (AFM) or Flight Planning and Cruise Control Manual (FPCCM) values.

**Air Operator**. A person, organization or enterprise engaged in or offering to engage in an aircraft operation.

Note.— See definition of "operator" in Annex  $6$  — Operation of Aircraft.

**Airport.** A defined area on land or water (including any buildings, installations and equipment) intended to be used either wholly or in part for the arrival, departure and surface movement of aircraft.

Note.— ICAO normally uses the term "aerodrome" but the term "airport" is also used throughout this document.

**Airport clutter.** Ground-based entities added to a visual airport scene to create a sense of activity. Airport clutter may include both static and dynamic models such as gate infrastructure, baggage carts, ground personnel, ground service vehicles and aircraft parked or undertaking ground movements.

**Airspeed**. Calibrated airspeed unless otherwise specified (knots).

**Alpha/beta envelope plot.** A two-dimensional plot of FSTD envelopes with the alpha (α) axis representing the angle of attack and the beta (β) axis representing the angle of sideslip.

 Note.— The type of envelope being plotted varies. For example, a plot may be used to depict various FSTD training envelopes for flaps up and down cases: the envelope validated by flight test data, the envelope defined by wind tunnel or analytical data and the envelope defined by extrapolation of those datasets (see example plots in Attachment P).

**Alternate engines/avionics.** An FSTD which has simulation of a replacement engine/avionics fit.

**Altitude.** Pressure altitude (ft) unless otherwise specified.

**Approved data.** Aeroplane data collected by application of good engineering practice and accepted for use by the CAA. The preferred data sources are the aeroplane manufacturers and/or original equipment manufacturers; however, data supplied by other qualified sources may be considered.

Note.— For additional guidance, see the attachments and related reading material listed in Chapter 2, 2.3.

- **Approved subjective development.** Use of a documented process prior to the initial evaluation, acceptable to the CAA, to resolve issues with approved data by use of specific measurements on the aeroplane and/or documentation for aeroplane operation and/or judgement by qualified personnel.
- **Approved training organization (ATO).** A flight crew training organization formally recognized by a CAA to deliver training.

**Approved use.** The ability to complete the training and testing or checking tasks as prescribed in this manual.

- **ATA Chapters.** A common industry referencing standard for aircraft technical documentation.
- **Atypical flight control response.** A flight control dynamic response is considered atypical when it does not exhibit classic second order system behaviour.
- **Audited engineering simulation.** An aeroplane manufacturer's engineering simulator which has undergone a review by the appropriate CAA and been found to be an acceptable source of supplemental validation data.

**Automatic testing.** FSTD testing wherein all stimuli are under computer control.

**Background radio traffic.** For the purposes of simulation, this refers to radiotelephony messages between air traffic control and other traffic that broadcast on the active frequency and heard by the flight crew.

 Note 1.— The word "background" refers to the fact that these messages are not intended for the ownship. In real-world environments, other radio communications on the active frequency, such as aircraft-to-aircraft transmissions, may also be heard by the flight crew.

Note 2.— Background radio traffic is also known as "party line" or "background chatter".

**Bank.** Bank/roll angle (degrees).

- **Basic operating mass (BOM).** The empty mass of the aeroplane plus the mass of the following: normal oil quantity; lavatory servicing fluid; potable water; required crew members and their baggage; and standard equipment.
- **Breakout force.** The force required at the pilot's primary controls to achieve initial movement of the control position.
- **Checking (pilot proficiency).** The comparison of the knowledge about a task, or the skill or ability to perform a task, against an established set of criteria to determine that the knowledge, skill or ability observed meets or exceeds, or does not meet, those criteria.

 Note.— The use of the words "testing" or "checking" depends on the CAA's preference, as they are very similar in meaning, and their use may be dependent on the outcome of the event, e.g. a step towards a licence issuance or a recurrent evaluation of competency.

**Class of aeroplane.** In relation to the classification of aeroplanes, means aeroplanes having similar operating characteristics.

- *Closed loop testing.* A test method for which the flight control stimuli are generated by controllers which drive the FSTD to follow a pre-defined target response.
- *Computer controlled aeroplane (CCA).* An aeroplane in which pilot inputs to the control surfaces are transferred and augmented via computers.
- *Control sweep.* Movement of the appropriate pilot controller from neutral to an extreme limit in one direction (forward, aft, right or left), a continuous movement back through neutral to the opposite extreme position and then a return to the initial position.
- *Convertible FSTD.* An FSTD in which significant hardware or software, or a combination of both, are changed so that the device replicates a different model, type or variant, usually of the same aeroplane. The same FSTD platform, motion system, visual system, computers and necessary peripheral equipment can thus be used in more than one simulation.

*Note.— The significance of the difference, as adjudged by the CAA, will dictate whether a complete separate QTG would be necessary. Otherwise, a supplemental section added to the original QTG may suffice.* 

- *Correct trend and magnitude (CT&M).* A tolerance representing the appropriate general direction of movement of the aeroplane, or part thereof, with appropriate corresponding scale of forces, rates, accelerations, etc.
- *Critical engine parameter.* The engine parameter that is the most appropriate measure of propulsive force for that engine.

#### *Damping.*

- a) *Critical damping.* That minimum damping of a second order system such that no overshoot occurs in reaching a steady state value after being displaced from a position of equilibrium and released. This corresponds to a relative damping ratio of 1.0.
- b) *Overdamped.* That damping of a second order system such that it has more damping than is required for critical damping as described above. This corresponds to a relative damping ratio of more than 1.0.
- c) *Underdamped.* That damping of a second order system such that a displacement from the equilibrium position and free release results in one or more overshoots or oscillations before reaching a steady state value. This corresponds to a relative damping ratio of less than 1.0.
- *Daylight visual.* A visual system capable of meeting, as a minimum, the system brightness and contrast ratio requirements as identified in Appendix B.
- *Deadband.* The amount of movement of the input for a system for which there is no reaction in the output or state of the system observed.
- *Device qualified as T only.* Training on this FSTD type may be credited towards the issuance of the associated licence, rating or qualification.
- *Device qualified as TP***.** Training on this FSTD type may be credited towards the issuance of the associated licence, rating or qualification and should include all tasks to the level of proficiency required. Testing and checking can additionally be conducted provided that training-to-proficiency has also been completed on a device qualified to the same level.
- **Driven.** A test method where the input stimulus or variable is driven or deposited by automatic means, generally a computer input.
- **Engineering simulator validation data.** Validation data generated by an engineering simulation or engineering simulator that is acceptable to the CAA.
- **Evaluation (FSTD).** The careful appraisal of an FSTD by the CAA to ascertain whether or not the criteria required for a specified qualification level are met.
- **Fidelity level.** The level of realism assigned to each of the defined FSTD features.
- **Fidelity level G.** Where the fidelity level is G, the initial validation should be based on subjective evaluation against approved data, where available, complemented if necessary by approved subjective development, to determine a reference data standard. Recurrent validations should be measured objectively against the reference data standard.
- **Fidelity level N.** Where the fidelity level is N, the FSTD feature is not required.
- **Fidelity level R.** Where the fidelity level is R, the initial validation should be based on objective evaluation against approved data, complemented if necessary by approved subjective development, to determine a reference data standard. Recurrent validations should be objectively measured against the reference data standard.

Note.— Fidelity level R1 is defined in Chapter 2, 2.2.6.3.

- **Fidelity level S.** Where the fidelity level is S, the initial and recurrent validation should be based on objective evaluation against approved data.
- **Flight simulation training device (FSTD).** A synthetic training device that is in compliance with the minimum requirements for FSTD qualification as described in this manual.
- **Flight test data.** Actual aeroplane data obtained by the aeroplane manufacturer (or other approved supplier of data) during an aeroplane flight test programme.
- **Footprint test.** A test conducted and recorded on the same FSTD, during its initial evaluation, to be used as the reference data standard for recurrent evaluations. In the event of an approved change to the FSTD to the flight model, or flight control system that may alter its characteristic, the CAA may require that the footprint test result be re-generated under the new conditions to form a new reference data standard.

Note.— See also definition of "master qualification test guide (MQTG)".

**Free response.** The hands-off response of the aeroplane after completion of a control input or disturbance.

**Frozen/locked.** A test condition where a variable is held constant over time.

- **FSTD approval.** Declaration of the extent to which an FSTD of a specified qualification type may be used by an FSTD operator or training organization as agreed by the CAA. It takes account of differences between aeroplanes and FSTDs and of the operating and training ability of the organization.
- **FSTD data.** The various types of data used by the FSTD manufacturer and the applicant to design, manufacture and test the FSTD.
- **FSTD feature.** Describes the characteristics of an FSTD for each of the thirteen categories that have been used in this manual to define the general and technical requirements for FSTDs.

**FSTD operator.** The person, organization or enterprise directly responsible to the CAA for requesting and maintaining the qualification of a particular FSTD.

Note.— The term "FSTD operator" is similar to the term "sponsor" used in some national regulations.

- **FSTD qualification level.** The level of technical capability of an FSTD.
- **FSTD user.** The person, organization or enterprise requesting training, checking or testing credits through the use of an FSTD.

**Full sweep.** See definition for "control sweep".

- **Functional performance.** An operation or performance that can be verified by objective data or other suitable reference material that may not necessarily be flight test data.
- **Functions test.** A quantitative and/or qualitative assessment of the operation and performance of an FSTD by a suitably qualified evaluator. The test should include verification of correct operation of controls, instruments and systems of the simulated aeroplane under normal and non-normal conditions.
- Generic (G). The lowest level of required fidelity for a given FSTD feature.
- **Ground effect.** A change in aerodynamic characteristics due to modification of the airflow pattern past the aeroplane, caused by proximity to the ground.
- **Ground reaction.** Forces acting on the aeroplane due to contact with the ground. These forces include the effects of strut deflections, tire friction, side forces, structural contact and other appropriate aspects. These forces change appropriately, for example, with weight and speed.

**Hands-off.** A test manoeuvre conducted or completed without pilot control inputs.

Hands-on. A test manoeuvre conducted or completed with pilot control inputs.

**Heavy.** Operating mass at or near the maximum for the specified flight condition.

**Height.** Height above ground = AGL (m or ft).

- **Highlight brightness.** The maximum displayed brightness.
- **Icing accountability.** Refers to changes from normal (as applicable to the individual aeroplane design) in take-off, climb (en-route, approach or landing) or landing operating procedures or performance data, in accordance with the Aeroplane Flight Manual, for flight in icing conditions or with ice accumulation on unprotected surfaces.
- **Integrated testing.** Testing of the FSTD such that all aeroplane system models are active and contribute appropriately to the results.

 Note 1.— None of the aeroplane system models should be substituted with models or other algorithms intended for testing purposes only.

 Note 2.— This testing should be accomplished by using controller displacements as the input. These controllers should represent the displacement of the pilot's controls and should have been calibrated.

**Intended use**. Completion of the training and testing or checking tasks as prescribed in Part I of this document.

- **International Committee for FSTD Qualification (ICFQ).** A former committee of the Royal Aeronautical Society that reviewed proposals for updating this manual. The reviews are now carried out by the International Pilot Training Consortium (IPTC) Training Device Work Stream (TDWS).
- **Irreversible control system.** A control system in which movement of the control surface will not back drive the pilot's control on the flight deck.
- Latency. Additional time, beyond that of the basic perceivable response time of the aeroplane, due to the response of the FSTD.
- **Light**. Operating mass at or near the minimum for the specified flight condition.
- **Light gross mass.** A mass chosen by the FSTD operator or data provider that is not more than 120 per cent of the BOM of the aeroplane being simulated or as limited by the minimum practical operating mass of the test aeroplane.
- **Manual testing.** FSTD testing wherein the pilot conducts the test without computer inputs except for initial set-up. All modules of the simulation should be active.
- **Master qualification test guide (MQTG).** The CAA-approved test guide that incorporates the results of tests acceptable to the authorities at the initial qualification. The MQTG, as amended, serves as the reference for future evaluations. It may have to be re-established if any approved changes occur to the device, but should still be compliant with the approved data.
- **Medium.** Normal operating mass for the flight condition.
- **Medium gross mass.** A mass chosen by the FSTD operator or data provider that is within ±10 per cent of the average of the numerical values of the BOM and the maximum certificated mass of the aeroplane being simulated.
- **Near maximum gross mass.** A mass chosen by the FSTD operator or data provider that is not less than the BOM of the aeroplane being simulated plus 80 per cent of the difference between the maximum certificated mass (either take-off mass or landing mass, as appropriate for the test) and the BOM.
- **Night visual.** A visual system capable of producing, as a minimum, all features applicable to the twilight scene (see "twilight (dusk/dawn) visual") with the exception of the need to portray reduced ambient intensity, therefore lacking ground cues that are not self-illuminating or illuminated by ownship lights (e.g. landing lights).
- **Nominal.** Normal operating mass, configuration, speed, etc., for the flight segment specified.
- **None (N).** Feature is not required.
- **Non-normal control.** A state where one or more of the intended control, augmentation or protection functions are not fully available. Used in reference to computer-controlled aeroplanes.

 Note.— Specific terms, such as alternate, direct, secondary or back-up, may be used to define an actual level of degradation used in reference to computer-controlled aeroplanes.

**Normal control.** A state where the intended control, augmentation and protection functions are fully available. Used in reference to computer-controlled aeroplanes.

**Not applicable (N/A)**. A task not considered to be applicable to that part of the licence type or rating.

**Objective test.** A quantitative assessment based on comparison to data.

- **Other traffic**. Entities other than the ownship in the simulated environment. This traffic will include other aircraft, both airborne and on the ground, and may also include ground vehicles as part of an airport scene.
- Passive force feedback. In the context of a Flight Controls System, passive force feedback indicates a passive system that may be provided by a spring or spring and damper arrangement and produces FSTD control forces that may or may not represent those of the aeroplane in any phase of flight in normal and, in particular, abnormal and emergency operations.
- **Protection functions.** Systems functions designed to protect an aeroplane from exceeding its flight and manoeuvre limitations.
- **Pulse input.** A step input to a control followed by an immediate return to the initial position.
- **Qualification test guide (QTG).** The primary reference document used for the evaluation of an FSTD. It contains test results, statements of compliance and the other prescribed information to enable the evaluator to assess whether the FSTD meets the test criteria described in this manual.

**Representative (R).** The intermediate level of required fidelity for a given FSTD feature.

- **Reversible control system.** A control system in which movement of the control surface will back drive the pilot's control on the flight deck.
- **Second segment.** That portion of the take-off profile from after gear retraction to end of climb at  $V_2$  and the beginning of the acceleration segment (initial flap/slat retraction).

**Sideslip.** Sideslip angle (degrees).

**Simulated ATC environment.** The simulation of other traffic entities within an airspace or ground environment, along with the associated ATC radio and data communications to other traffic and the ownship within this wider context.

**Snapshot.** Presentation of one or more variables at a given instant in time.

Specific (S). The highest level of required fidelity for a given FSTD feature.

**Stall.** An aerodynamic loss of lift caused by exceeding the critical angle of attack.

 Note.— A stalled condition may exist at any attitude and airspeed, and may be recognized by continuous stall warning activation accompanied by at least one of the following:

- 1) buffeting, which may be heavy at times;
- 2) lack of pitch authority and/or roll control;
- 3) inability to arrest the rate of descent;
- **Stall warning.** A natural or synthetic indication provided when approaching a stall that may include one or more of the following indications:
	- a) aerodynamic buffeting (some aeroplanes will buffet more than others);
	- b) reduced roll stability and aileron effectiveness;
	- c) visual or aural cues and warnings;
	- d) reduced elevator (pitch) authority;
	- e) inability to maintain altitude or arrest rate of descent; and
	- f) stick shaker activation (if installed).

Note.— A stall warning indicates an immediate need to reduce the angle of attack.

**Statement of compliance (SOC).** A declaration that specific requirements have been met.

**Step input.** An abrupt input held at a constant value.

**Subjective test.** A qualitative assessment based on established standards as interpreted by a suitably qualified person.

**Testing (pilot proficiency).** The comparison of the knowledge about a task, or the skill or ability to perform a task, against an established set of criteria to determine that the knowledge, skill or ability observed meets or exceeds, or does not meet, those criteria.

Note.— The use of the words "testing" or "checking" depends on the CAA's preference, as they are very similar in meaning, and their use may be dependent on the outcome of the event, e.g. a step towards a licence issuance or a recurrent evaluation of competency.

- **Throttle lever angle (TLA).** The angle of the pilot's primary engine control lever(s) on the flight deck, which also may be referred to as TLA or power lever angle or throttle angle.
- **Time history.** The presentation of the change of a variable with respect to time.
- **Train.** The introduction of a specific training task. The training accomplished may be credited towards the issuance of a licence, rating or qualification, but the training would not be completed to proficiency. The fidelity level of one or more of the simulation features may not support training-to-proficiency.

Note.— In the context of this definition, the word "train" can be replaced by "training".

**Train-to-proficiency.** The introduction, continuation or completion of a specific training task. The training accomplished may be credited towards proficiency and/or the issuance of a licence, rating or qualification, and the training is completed to proficiency. The fidelity level of all simulation features supports training-to-proficiency.

Note.— In the context of this definition, the words "train-to-proficiency" can be replaced by "training-toproficiency".

- **Transport delay.** The FSTD system processing time required for an input signal from a pilot primary flight control until motion system, visual system and instrument response. It is a measure of the time from the flight control input through the hardware/software interface, through each of the host computer modules and back through the software/hardware interface to the motion system, flight instrument and visual system. Each of these three processing times excludes the aeroplane dynamic response and represents the transport delay for that particular system. It is the overall time delay incurred from signal input until output response and is independent of the characteristic delay of the aeroplane being simulated.
- **Twilight (dusk/dawn) visual.** A visual system capable of producing, as a minimum, full-colour presentations of reduced ambient intensity and sufficient surfaces with appropriate textural cues that include self-illuminated objects such as road networks, ramp lighting and airport signage.
- **Update.** The improvement or enhancement of an FSTD where it retains its existing qualification type.
- **Upgrade.** The improvement or enhancement of an FSTD for the purpose of achieving a higher qualification type.
- **Validation data.** Data used to prove that the FSTD performance corresponds to that of the aeroplane.
- **Validation data roadmap (VDR).** A document from the aeroplane validation data supplier that should clearly identify (in matrix format) the best possible sources of data for all required qualification tests in the QTG. It should also provide validity with respect to engine type and thrust rating and the revision levels of all avionics that affect aeroplane handling qualities and performance.
	- Note.— The VDR is described in Attachment D.
- **Validation flight test data.** Performance, stability and control, and other necessary test parameters, electrically or electronically recorded in an aeroplane using a calibrated data acquisition system of sufficient resolution and verified as accurate to establish a reference set of relevant parameters to which like FSTD parameters can be compared.
- **Validation test.** A test by which FSTD parameters can be compared to the relevant validation data.
- **Visual ground segment.** The visible distance on the ground, between the lower cut-off of the aeroplane cockpit and the furthest visible point, as limited by the prevailing visibility.

## **1.2 ABBREVIATIONS AND UNITS**

The abbreviations and units used in Part II of this manual have the following meaning:













 $\mathcal{L}=\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  , where  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  , we have the set of the set of

# **Chapter 2**

# **INTRODUCTION**

Note.— In this part, all references to an appendix or an attachment point to content in Part II of this document unless otherwise indicated.

### **2.1 PURPOSE**

2.1.1 Part II establishes the performance and documentation requirements for evaluation by CAAs of seven standard aeroplane FSTDs used for training and testing or checking of flight crew members. These requirements and methods of compliance were derived from the extensive experience of CAAs and industry.

2.1.2 Part II is intended to provide the means for a CAA to qualify an FSTD, subsequent to a request by an applicant, through initial and recurrent evaluations of the FSTD. Further, Part II is intended to provide the means for a CAA of other States to accept the qualifications granted by the State which conducted the initial and recurrent evaluations of an FSTD, without the need for additional evaluations, when considering approval of the use of that FSTD by applicants from their own State.

### **2.2 BACKGROUND**

2.2.1 The availability of advanced technology has permitted greater use of FSTDs for training and testing or checking of flight crew members. The complexity, costs and operating environment of modern aeroplanes also have encouraged broader use of advanced simulation. FSTDs can provide more in-depth training than can be accomplished in aeroplanes and provide a safe and suitable learning environment. Fidelity of modern FSTDs is sufficient to permit pilot assessment with assurance that the observed behaviour will transfer to the aeroplane. Fuel conservation and reduction in adverse environmental effects are important by-products of FSTD use.

2.2.2 The FSTD requirements provided in this chapter are derived from training requirements which have been developed through a training task analysis, the details of which are fully presented in Part I. A summary of the FSTDs identified to support the training requirements is presented in the FSTD summary matrix (Table 2-1).

2.2.3 The MPL content is preliminary and offers a means by which the FSTD requirements may be satisfied but should not be treated as the only means by which the FSTD requirements of an MPL programme may be met. The relevant text in this manual will be updated when the pertinent information from the completion of the MPL programmes implementation phase becomes available.

2.2.4 The summary matrix defines the FSTD types by correlating training types against fidelity levels for key simulation features. Each of the FSTD types is designed to be used in the training and, if applicable, testing or checking towards the associated licences or ratings. The terminology used in the table below for training type, device feature and level of fidelity of device feature is defined as follows:

#### 2.2.4.1 Training types:



2.2.4.2 FSTD features:

Flight Deck Layout and Structure Flight Model (Aerodynamics and Engine) Ground Handling Aeroplane Systems (ATA Chapters) Flight Controls and Forces

Sound Cues Visual Cues Motion Cues

Environment — ATC Environment — Navigation Environment — Atmosphere and Weather Environment — Aerodromes and Terrain

Miscellaneous (Instructor Operating Station, etc.)

2.2.4.3 Device feature fidelity level:

- S (Specific) Highest level of fidelity
- R (Representative) Intermediate level of fidelity
- G (Generic) Lowest level of fidelity
- N (None) Feature not required

For detailed definitions of fidelity levels S, R, G and N, see Chapter 1, Section 1.1.

2.2.5 Training codes:

2.2.5.1 Device qualified as T only. The introduction of a specific training task. The training accomplished may be credited towards the issuance of a licence, rating or qualification, but the training would not be completed to proficiency. The fidelity level of one or more of the simulation features may not support training-to-proficiency.
2.2.5.2 Device qualified as TP. The introduction, continuation or completion of a specific training task. The training accomplished may be credited towards proficiency and/or the issuance of a licence, rating or qualification, and the training is completed to proficiency. The fidelity level of all simulation features supports training-to-proficiency.





2.2.6 Notes for special cases in Table 2-1:

2.2.6.1 For Environment — ATC: All fidelity levels in the summary matrix above are shown greyed out as this feature is currently under development. Guidance on simulated ATC environment and related qualification criteria will remain subject to amendment based on experience (see Attachment O).

2.2.6.2 Type VI — MPL3 — Intermediate: MPL Phase 3 learning outcomes are not specific to aeroplane type. The Type VI FSTD example indicated in the summary matrix for MPL Phase 3 offers a means, but not the only means, by which the FSTD specifications support the training outcomes. The task analysis indicates the possibility to meet competency outcomes by a combination of training in the Type V and Type VII FSTD examples. The summary of the Type VI device example represents a class-like device specification, to meet the learning outcomes in Phase 3, with a representative highperformance multi-engine turbine aeroplane. Furthermore, the definition of this device type has not been confirmed by the ICAO MPL process. The relevant text in this manual may be updated when pertinent information from the completion of MPL programmes implementation becomes available, allowing this device type to be finally defined.

2.2.6.3 Type VI — MPL3 — Intermediate — Motion Cues — R1: The pilot receives an effective and representative motion cue and stimulus, which provides the appropriate sensations of acceleration of the aeroplane 6 degrees of freedom. Motion cues should always provide the correct sensation. These sensations may be generated by a variety of methods which are specifically not prescribed. The sensation of motion can be less for simplified non-type-specific training, the magnitude of the cues being reduced.

2.2.6.4 Type I - CPL - Environment - Aerodromes and Terrain - G(S): Level S if required for specific VFR cross-country navigation training.

2.2.6.5 Type I — PPL — Environment — Aerodromes and Terrain — R(S): Level S if required for specific VFR cross-country navigation training.

2.2.6.6 Type I - MPL1 - Core flying skills - Flight Controls and Forces - R1: Aeroplane-like, derived from class, appropriate to aeroplane mass. Active force feedback not required.

2.2.6.7 The "Miscellaneous" category does not appear in the table.

2.2.7 The FSTD general and technical requirements defined in Appendix A are grouped by device feature. The FSTD validation tests and functions and subjective tests are found in Appendices B and C and are grouped by device type.

2.2.8 The preceding process resulted in the seven defined device types. The option still remains for an FSTD operator to define a unique device for specific training tasks. The process, utilizing Parts I and III, is similar to that used to attain the seven pre-defined device types. In very simple terms, one determines the training tasks, then selects the FSTD features and fidelity levels to support the tasks as described in Part I, Chapter 3 of this Volume. The associated qualification and validation testing requirements for those feature fidelity levels are obtained through Part III of this Volume. If considering using this process, the appropriate CAA should be consulted very early.

## **2.3 RELATED READING MATERIAL**

2.3.1 Applicants seeking FSTD evaluation, qualification and approval for use of aeroplane FSTDs should consult references contained in related documents published by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), the International Air Transport Association (IATA) and the Royal Aeronautical Society (RAeS) referring to and/or dealing with the use of FSTDs and technical and operational requirements relevant to FSTD data and design. Applicable rules and regulations pertaining to the use of FSTDs in the State for which the FSTD qualification and approval is requested should also be consulted.

2.3.2 The related national and international documents which form the basis of the criteria set out in this document are:





2.3.4 It is important to regularly monitor regulatory guidance material on the CAA web sites to understand the latest regulatory opinion on new technology or practices.

#### **2.4 FSTD QUALIFICATION**

2.4.1 In dealing with FSTDs, CAAs differentiate between the technical criteria of the FSTD and its use for training/testing and checking. The FSTD should be evaluated by the CAA taking into consideration the aeroplane manufacturer's recommended training practices. Qualification is achieved by comparing the FSTD performance against the criteria specified in the Qualification Test Guide (QTG) for the qualification level sought.

2.4.2 The validation, functions and subjective tests required for the QTG enable the CAA to "spot check" the performance of the FSTD in order to confirm that it represents the aeroplane in some significant training and testing or checking areas. Without such spot checking using the QTG, FSTD performance cannot be verified in the time normally available for the regulatory evaluation. It should be clearly understood that the QTG does not provide for a rigorous examination of the quality of the simulation in all areas of flight and systems operation. The full testing of the FSTD is intended to have been completed by the FSTD manufacturer and its operator prior to the FSTD being submitted for the regulatory evaluation and prior to the delivery of the results in the QTG. This "in depth" testing is a fundamental part of the whole cycle of testing and is normally carried out using documented acceptance test procedures in which the test results are recorded. These procedures will test the functionality and performance of many areas of the simulation that are not addressed in the QTG as well as such items as the instructor operating station.

2.4.3 Once the FSTD has been qualified, the authority responsible for oversight of the activities of the user of the FSTD can approve what training tasks can be carried out. This determination should be based on the FSTD qualification, the availability of FSTDs, the experience of the FSTD user, the training programme in which the FSTD is to be used and the experience and qualifications of the pilots to be trained. This latter process results in the approved use of an FSTD within an approved training programme.

## **2.5 TESTING FOR FSTD QUALIFICATION**

2.5.1 The FSTD should be assessed in those areas which are essential to completing the flight crew member training and testing or checking process. This includes the FSTD's longitudinal and lateral-directional responses; performance in take-off, climb, cruise, descent, approach and landing; all-weather operations; control checks; and pilot, flight engineer and instructor station functions checks. The motion, visual and sound systems should be evaluated to ensure their proper operation.

2.5.2 The intent is to evaluate the FSTD as objectively as possible. Pilot acceptance, however, is also an important consideration. Therefore, the FSTD should be subjected to the validation tests listed in Appendix B and the functions and subjective tests in Appendix C. Validation tests are used to objectively compare FSTD and aeroplane data to ensure that they agree within specified tolerances. Functions tests are objective tests of systems using aeroplane documentation. Subjective tests provide a basis for evaluating the FSTD capability to perform over a typical training period and to verify correct operation and handling characteristics of the FSTD.

2.5.3 Tolerances listed for parameters in Appendix B should not be confused with FSTD design tolerances and are the maximum acceptable for FSTD qualification.

2.5.4 The validation testing for initial and recurrent evaluations listed in Appendix B should be conducted in accordance with the FSTD type against approved data. An optional process for recurrent evaluation using MQTG results as reference data is described in Attachment H.

2.5.4.1 Where the fidelity level is S, the initial and recurrent evaluations should be based on objective evaluation against approved data. For evaluation of FSTDs representing a specific aeroplane type, the aeroplane manufacturer's validation flight test data are preferred. Data from other sources may be used, subject to the review and concurrence of the CAA responsible for the qualification. The tolerances listed in Appendix B are applicable for the initial evaluation. Alternatively, the recurrent evaluation can be based on objective evaluation against MQTG results as described in Attachment H.

2.5.4.2 Where the fidelity level is R, the initial and recurrent validation will be based on objective evaluation against approved data for a class of aeroplane with the exception of aeroplane type specific FSTDs (Type V sound system and Type VII sound and motion systems) where these evaluations are against aeroplane type-specific data. For initial evaluation of FSTDs representing a class of aeroplane, the aeroplane manufacturer's validation flight test data are preferred. Data from other sources may be used, subject to the review and concurrence of the CAA responsible for the qualification.

2.5.4.2.1 For motion and sound systems, where approved subjective development is submitted for the initial evaluation, the QTG should contain both:

a) the original objective test results showing compliance to the validation flight test data; and

 b) the "improved" results, based upon approved subjective development against the validation flight test data. If approved subjective development is used, the MQTG result for those particular cases will become the reference data standard. Recurrent validations should be objectively measured against the reference data standard.

2.5.4.2.2 The tolerances listed in Appendix B are applicable for both initial and recurrent evaluations except where approved subjective development is used for motion and sound systems.

2.5.4.2.3 Alternatively, the recurrent evaluation can be based on objective evaluation against MQTG results as described in Attachment H.

2.5.4.3 Where the fidelity level is G, the initial validation will be based on evaluation against approved data, where available, complemented if necessary by approved subjective development, to determine a reference data standard. Correct trend and magnitude (CT&M) tolerances can be used for the initial evaluation only. Recurrent validations should be objectively measured against the reference data standard. The tolerances listed in Appendix B are applicable for recurrent evaluations and should be applied to ensure the device remains at the standard initially qualified.

2.5.5 Requirements for generic or representative FSTD data are defined below.

2.5.5.1 Generic or representative data may be derived from a specific aeroplane within the class of aeroplanes the FSTD is representing or it may be based on information from several aeroplanes within the class. With the concurrence of the CAA, it may be in the form of a manufacturer's previously approved set of validation data for the applicable FSTD. Once the set of data for a specific FSTD has been accepted and approved by the CAA, it will become the validation data that will be used as reference for subsequent recurrent evaluations with the application of the stated tolerances.

2.5.5.2 The substantiation of the set of data used to build validation data should be in the form of a "Reference Data" engineering report and should show that the proposed validation data are representative of the aeroplane or the class of aeroplanes modelled. This report may include flight test data, manufacturer's design data, information from the aeroplane flight manual (AFM) and maintenance manuals, results of approved or commonly accepted simulations or predictive models, recognized theoretical results, information from the public domain, or other sources as deemed necessary by the FSTD manufacturer to substantiate the proposed model.

2.5.6 In the case of new aeroplane programmes, the aeroplane manufacturer's data, partially validated by flight test data, may be used in the interim qualification of the FSTD. However, the FSTD should be re-qualified following the release of the manufacturer's data obtained during the type certification of the aeroplane. The re-qualification schedule should be as agreed by the CAA, the FSTD operator, the FSTD manufacturer and the aeroplane manufacturer. For additional information, see Attachment A.

2.5.7 FSTD operators seeking initial or upgrade evaluation of an FSTD should be aware that performance and handling data for older aeroplanes may not be of sufficient quality to meet some of the test standards contained in this manual. In this instance it may be necessary for an FSTD operator to acquire additional flight test data.

2.5.8 During FSTD evaluation, if a problem is encountered with a particular validation test, the test may be repeated to ascertain if test equipment or personnel error caused the problem. Following this, if the test problem persists, an FSTD operator should be prepared to offer alternative test results which relate to the test in question.

2.5.9 Validation tests which do not meet the test criteria should be satisfactorily rectified or a rationale should be provided with appropriate engineering judgement.

## **2.6 QUALIFICATION TEST GUIDE (QTG)**

2.6.1 The QTG is the primary reference document used for the evaluation of an FSTD. It contains FSTD test results, statements of compliance and other information to enable the evaluator to assess if the FSTD meets the test criteria described in this manual.

- 2.6.2 The applicant should submit a QTG which includes:
	- a) a title page including (as a minimum) the:
		- 1) FSTD operator's name;
		- 2) aeroplane model and series or class, as applicable, being simulated;
		- 3) FSTD qualification level;
		- 4) CAA FSTD identification number;
		- 5) FSTD location;
		- 6) FSTD manufacturer's unique identification or serial number; and
		- 7) provision for dated signature blocks:
			- i) one for the FSTD operator to attest that the FSTD has been tested using a documented acceptance testing procedure covering flight deck layout, all simulated aeroplane systems and the Instructor Operating Station, as well as the engineering facilities, the motion, visual and other systems, as applicable;
			- ii) one for the FSTD operator to attest that all manual validation tests have been conducted in a satisfactory manner using only procedures as contained in the QTG manual test procedure;
			- iii) one for the FSTD operator to attest that the functions and subjective testing in accordance with Appendix C have been conducted in a satisfactory manner; and
			- iv) one for the FSTD operator and the CAA indicating overall acceptance of the QTG;
	- b) an FSTD information page providing (as a minimum):
		- 1) applicable regulatory qualification standards;
		- 2) the aeroplane model and series or class, as applicable, being simulated;
		- 3) the aerodynamic data revision;
		- 4) the engine model(s) and its(their) data revision(s);
		- 5) the flight control data revision;
		- 6) the avionic equipment system identification and revision level when the revision level affects the training and testing or checking capability of the FSTD;
- 7) the FSTD manufacturer;
- 8) the date of FSTD manufacture;
- 9) the FSTD computer identification;
- 10) the visual system type and manufacturer;
- 11) the motion system type and manufacturer;
- 12) three or more designated qualification visual scenes; and
- 13) supplemental information for additional areas of simulation which are not sufficiently important for the CAA to require a separate QTG;
- c) a table of contents to include a list of all QTG tests including all sub-cases, unless provided elsewhere in the QTG;
- d) a log of revisions and/or list of effective pages;
- e) a listing of reference and source data for FSTD design and test;
- f) a glossary of terms and symbols used;
- g) a statement of compliance (SOC) with certain requirements; SOCs should refer to sources of information and show compliance rationale to explain how the referenced material is used, applicable mathematical equations and parameter values and conclusions reached (see the "Comments" column of Appendices A and B for SOC requirements);
- h) recording procedures and required equipment for the validation tests;
- i) the following items for each validation test designated in Appendix B:
	- 1) Test number. The test number which follows the numbering system set out in Appendix B;
	- 2) Test title. Short and definitive based on the test title referred to in Appendix B;
	- 3) Test objective. A brief summary of what the test is intended to demonstrate;
	- 4) Demonstration procedure. A brief description of how the objective is to be met. It should describe clearly and distinctly how the FSTD will be set up and operated for each test when flown manually by the pilot and, when required, automatically tested;
	- 5) References. References to the aeroplane data source documents including both the document number and the page/condition number and, if applicable, any data query references;
	- 6) Initial conditions. A full and comprehensive list of the FSTD initial conditions;
	- 7) Test parameters. A list of all parameters driven or constrained during the automatic test;
- 8) Manual test procedures. Procedures should be self-contained and sufficient to enable the test to be flown by a qualified pilot, by reference to flight deck instrumentation. Reference to reference data or test results is encouraged for complex tests, as applicable. Manual tests should be capable of being conducted from either pilot seat, although the cockpit controller positions and forces may not necessarily be available from the other seat;
- 9) Automatic test procedures. A test identification number for automatic tests should be provided;
- 10) Evaluation criteria. The main parameter(s) under scrutiny during the test;
- 11) Expected result(s). The aeroplane result, including tolerances and, if necessary, a further definition of the point at which the information was extracted from the source data;
- 12) Test result. FSTD validation test results obtained by the FSTD operator from the FSTD. Tests run on a computer, which is independent of the FSTD, are not acceptable. The results should:
	- a) be computer generated;
	- b) be produced on appropriate media acceptable to the CAA conducting the test;
	- c) be time histories unless otherwise indicated and:
		- i) should plot for each test the list of recommended parameters contained in the Aeroplane Flight Simulator Evaluation Handbook, Volume I (see 2.3.3);
		- ii) be clearly marked with appropriate time reference points to ensure an accurate comparison between FSTD and aeroplane;
		- iii) the FSTD result and validation data plotted should be clearly identified; and
		- iv) in those cases where a "snapshot" result in lieu of a time history result is authorized, the FSTD operator should ensure that a steady state condition exists at the instant of time captured by the "snapshot";
	- d) be clearly labelled as a product of the device being tested;
	- e) have each page reflect the date and time completed;
	- f) have each page reflect the test page number and the total number of pages in the test;
	- g) have parameters with specified tolerances identified, with tolerance criteria and units given. Automatic flagging of "out-of-tolerance" situations is encouraged; and
	- h) have incremental scales on graphical presentations that provide the resolution necessary for evaluation of the tolerance parameters shown in Appendix B;
- 13) Validation data.
	- a) Computer-generated displays of flight test data overplotted with FSTD data should be provided. To ensure authenticity of the validation data, a copy of the original validation data, clearly marked with the document name, page number, the issuing organization and the test number and title as specified in 1) and 2) above, should also be provided;
- c) validation data variables should be defined in a nomenclature list along with sign convention. This list should be included at some appropriate location in the QTG;
- 14) Comparison of results. The accepted means of comparing FSTD test results to the validation data is overplotting;
- j) a copy of the applicable regulatory qualification standards, or appropriate sections as applicable, used in the initial evaluation; and
- k) a copy of the validation data roadmap (VDR) to clearly identify (in matrix format only) sources of data for all required tests including sound and vibration data documents.

2.6.3 The QTG will provide the documented proof of compliance with the FSTD validation tests in Appendix B. FSTD test results should be labelled using terminology common to aeroplane parameters as opposed to computer software identifications. These results should be easily compared with the supporting data by employing overplotting or other acceptable means. For tests involving time histories, the overplotting of the FSTD data to aeroplane data is essential to verify FSTD performance in each test. The evaluation serves to validate the FSTD test results given in the QTG.

## **2.7 MASTER QUALIFICATION TEST GUIDE (MQTG)**

2.7.1 During the initial evaluation of an FSTD, the MQTG is created. This is the master document, as amended in agreement with the CAA, to which FSTD recurrent evaluation test results are compared.

2.7.2 After the initial evaluation, the MQTG is available as the document to use for recurrent or special evaluations and is also the document that any CAA can use as proof of an evaluation and current qualifications of an FSTD when approval for the use of the particular FSTD is requested for a specific training task.

#### **2.8 ELECTRONIC QUALIFICATION TEST GUIDE (eQTG)**

Use of an eQTG may reduce costs, save time and improve timely communication, and is becoming a common practice. ARINC Report 436 provides guidelines for an eQTG (see 2.3.3 above).

#### **2.9 QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AND CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT**

2.9.1 A quality management system which is acceptable to the CAA should be established and maintained by the FSTD operator to ensure the correct maintenance and performance of the FSTD. The quality management system may be based upon established industry standards, such as ARINC Report 433 (see 2.3.3 above).

2.9.2 A configuration management system should be established and maintained to ensure the continued integrity of the hardware and software as from the original qualification standard, or as amended or modified through the same system.

## **2.10 TYPES OF EVALUATIONS**

2.10.1 An initial evaluation is the first evaluation of an FSTD to qualify it for use. It consists of a technical review of the QTG and a subsequent on-site validation of the FSTD to ensure it meets all the requirements of this manual.

2.10.2 Recurrent evaluations are those that may be accomplished periodically to ensure that the FSTD continues to meet its qualification level.

2.10.3 Special evaluations are those that may be accomplished resulting from any of the following circumstances:

- a) a major hardware and/or software change which may affect the handling qualities, performance or systems representations of the FSTD;
- b) a request for an upgrade for a higher qualification level;
- c) the discovery of a situation that indicates the FSTD is not performing at its initial qualification standard;
- d) re-location;
- e) change of ownership; and
- f) re-entry into service following a prolonged shut-down*.*

*Note.— Some of the above circumstances may require establishing revised tests leading to an amendment of the MQTG.* 

## **2.11 CONDUCT OF EVALUATIONS**

*Note.— The* Manual on the Approval of Training Organizations *(Doc 9841) contains guidance on the recognition by other States of an FSTD qualification issued by a State, including for the initial qualification of an FSTD that already holds a qualification issued by another State*.

#### **2.11.1 Initial FSTD evaluations**

2.11.1.1 An FSTD operator seeking qualification of an FSTD should make the request for an evaluation to the CAA of the State in which the FSTD will be located.

2.11.1.2 A copy of the FSTD's QTG, with annotated test results, should accompany the request. Any QTG deficiencies raised by the CAA should be corrected prior to the start of the evaluation.

2.11.1.3 The request for evaluation should also include a statement that the FSTD has been thoroughly tested using a documented acceptance testing procedure covering flight deck layout, all simulated aeroplane systems and the instructor operating station as well as the engineering facilities, motion, visual and other systems, as applicable. In addition, a statement should be provided that the FSTD meets the criteria described in this manual. The applicant should further certify that all the QTG tests for the requested qualification level have been satisfactorily conducted.

## **2.11.2 Modification of an FSTD**

2.11.2.1 An **update** is a result of a change to the existing device where it retains its existing qualification level. The change may be approved through a recurrent evaluation or a special evaluation if deemed necessary by the CAA, according to the applicable regulations in effect at the time of initial qualification.

2.11.2.2 If such a change to an existing device would imply that the performance of the device could no longer meet the requirements at the time of initial qualification, but that the result of the change would, in the opinion of the CAA, clearly mean an improvement to the performance and training capabilities of the device altogether, then the CAA may accept the proposed change as an update while allowing the device to retain its original qualification level.

2.11.2.3 An **upgrade** is defined as the raising of the qualification level of a device, which can only be achieved by undergoing a special qualification according to the latest applicable regulations.

2.11.2.4 In summary, as long as the qualification level of the device does not change, all changes made to the device should be considered to be updates pending approval by the CAA. An upgrade and consequent initial qualification according to latest regulations is only applicable when the FSTD operator requests a higher qualification level for the FSTD.

## **2.11.3 Temporary deactivation of a currently qualified FSTD**

2.11.3.1 In the event an FSTD operator plans to remove an FSTD from active status for a prolonged period, the appropriate CAA should be notified and suitable controls established for the period the FSTD is inactive.

2.11.3.2 An understanding should be arranged with the CAA to ensure that the FSTD can be restored to active status at its originally qualified level.

#### **2.11.4 Moving an FSTD to a new location**

2.11.4.1 In instances where an FSTD is to be moved to a new location, the appropriate CAA should be advised of the planned activity and provided with a schedule of events related thereto.

2.11.4.2 Prior to returning the FSTD to service at the new location, the FSTD operator should agree with the appropriate CAA which of the validation and functional tests from the QTG should be performed to ensure that the FSTD performance meets its original qualification standard. A copy of the test documentation should be retained with the FSTD records for review by the appropriate CAA.

#### **2.11.5 Composition of an evaluation team**

2.11.5.1 For the purposes of qualification of an FSTD, an evaluation team is usually led by a pilot inspector from the CAA along with engineers and a type-qualified pilot.

2.11.5.2 The applicant should provide technical assistance in the operation of the FSTD and the required test equipment. The applicant should make available a suitably knowledgeable person to assist the evaluation team as required.

2.11.5.3 On an initial evaluation, the FSTD manufacturer and/or aeroplane manufacturer should have technical staff available to assist as required.

#### **2.11.6 FSTD recurrent evaluations**

2.11.6.1 Following satisfactory completion of the initial evaluation and qualification tests, a system of periodic evaluations should be established to ensure that FSTDs continue to maintain their initially qualified performance, functions and other characteristics.

2.11.6.2 The CAA having jurisdiction over the FSTD should establish the time interval between recurrent evaluations.

#### **2.12 ADOPTION OF THIS MANUAL INTO THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK**

The articulation of Volume I of this manual and its amendments into the regulatory framework is the responsibility of the various CAAs through national regulatory documents such as FAA 14 CFR Part 60, EASA CS-FSTD (A) or other equivalent document (see 2.3.2).

#### **2.13 FUTURE UPDATES OF THIS MANUAL**

Appendix D describes the process to be used for proposed future updates to this manual.

#### **2.14 EVALUATION HANDBOOKS**

The Aeroplane Flight Simulator Evaluation Handbook, as amended, is a useful source of guidance for conducting the tests required to establish that the FSTD under evaluation complies with the criteria set out in this manual. This twovolume document can be obtained through the Royal Aeronautical Society (see 2.3.3).

#### **2.15 GUIDANCE ON "GRANDFATHERED" RIGHTS**

2.15.1 The regulatory standards for the qualification of FSTDs will continue to develop to cater for: changing training needs; data revisions; relocations; the introduction of new equipment, procedures and technologies; and mandated measures to address safety issues. The introduction of changes to the regulatory standards should not necessarily result in making existing qualified FSTDs obsolete. To enable accredited training to continue on them, "grandfathering" of the qualification should be applied. This allows continued training on the device provided it continues to meet the qualification standard achieved at its initial qualification.

2.15.2 When CAA's implement these technical requirements into their regulations they should make provisions for the grandfathering of FSTDs that are in existence, on order, or under development. In addition, the regulations should include provisions to retroactively mandate certain updates that are considered important for aviation safety.

 $\mathcal{L}_\text{max}$  , where  $\mathcal{L}_\text{max}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_\text{max}$ 

# **Appendix A**

## **FSTD REQUIREMENTS**

## **INTRODUCTION**

This appendix describes the minimum FSTD requirements for qualifying a device to an internationally agreed type, as defined in Chapter 2, Table 2-1. The validation tests and functions and subjective tests listed in Appendices B and C should also be consulted when determining the requirements for qualification. Certain requirements included in this appendix should be supported with a statement of compliance (SOC) and, in some designated cases, an objective test. The SOC should describe how the requirement was met, such as gear modelling approach, coefficient of friction sources, etc. In the following tabular listing of FSTD criteria, requirements for SOCs are indicated in the comments column.



## **1. REQUIREMENT — FLIGHT DECK LAYOUT AND STRUCTURE**















## **2. REQUIREMENT — FLIGHT MODEL (AERO AND ENGINE)**









## **3. REQUIREMENT — GROUND REACTION AND HANDLING CHARACTERISTICS**













## **5. REQUIREMENT — FLIGHT CONTROLS AND FORCES**







## **6. REQUIREMENT — SOUND CUES**







## **7. REQUIREMENT — VISUAL CUES**












#### **8. REQUIREMENT — MOTION CUES**











## **9. REQUIREMENT — ENVIRONMENT — ATC**







































### **10. REQUIREMENT — ENVIRONMENT — NAVIGATION**





### **11. REQUIREMENT — ENVIRONMENT — ATMOSPHERE AND WEATHER**









# **12. REQUIREMENT — ENVIRONMENT — AERODROMES AND TERRAIN**














## **13. REQUIREMENT — MISCELLANEOUS**









 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  , where  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  , where  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  , where  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  , where  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

# **Appendix B**

# **FSTD VALIDATION TESTS**

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 FSTD performance and system operation should be objectively evaluated by comparing the results of tests conducted in the FSTD to validation data, unless specifically noted otherwise. The validation, functions and subjective tests required for the QTG enable the evaluator to "spot check" the performance of the FSTD in order to confirm that it represents the aeroplane in some significant training or testing and checking areas. Without such spot checking using the QTG, FSTD performance cannot be verified in the time normally available for the regulatory evaluation. It should be clearly understood that the QTG does not provide for a rigorous examination of the quality of the simulation in all areas of flight and systems operation. The full testing of the FSTD simulation is intended to have been completed by the FSTD manufacturer's and the FSTD operator's personnel prior to the FSTD being submitted for the regulatory evaluation and prior to the delivery of the results in the QTG. This "in depth" testing is a fundamental part of the whole cycle of testing and is normally carried out using documented acceptance test procedures in which the test results are recorded. These procedures will test the functionality and performance of many areas of the simulation that are not addressed in the QTG as well as such items as the instructor operating station. To facilitate the validation of the FSTD using the QTG, an appropriate recording device acceptable to the CAA should be used to record each validation test result. These recordings should then be compared to the validation data. The QTG validation tests should be documented, considering the following:

- a) the FSTD QTG should describe clearly and distinctly how the FSTD will be set up and operated for each test. Use of a driver programme designed to automatically accomplish the tests is required. It is not the intent, nor is it acceptable, to test each FSTD sub-system independently. Overall integrated testing of the FSTD, with test inputs at the pilot controls, should be accomplished to assure that the total FSTD system meets the prescribed standards;
- b) to ensure compliance with this intent, QTGs should contain explanatory material which clearly indicates how each test (or group of tests) is executed, e.g. which parameters are driven/free/constrained and the use of closed/open loop drivers; and
- c) all QTG validation tests based on flight test data should also be able to be run manually in order to validate the automatic test results. Short-term tests with simple inputs should be easily reproduced manually. Longer term tests with complex inputs are unlikely to be easily duplicated.

1.2 Certain visual and motion tests in this appendix are not necessarily based upon validation data with specific tolerances. However, these tests are included here for completeness, and the required criteria should be fulfilled instead of meeting a specific tolerance.

1.3 A manual test procedure with explicit and detailed steps for completion of each test should also be provided. The function of the manual test procedure is to confirm that the results obtained when using an automated driver are the same as those that would be experienced by a pilot flying the same test and using the same control inputs as were used by the pilot in the aeroplane from which the validation flight test data was recorded. The manual test results should be able to be achieved using the same tolerances as those utilized for the automatic test. Manual test results may not meet the tolerances; however the CAA evaluator should be confident they could meet the tolerances if enough effort was spent trying to reproduce the pilot inputs exactly.

1.4 Submission for approval of data other than flight test should include an explanation of validity with respect to available flight test information. Tests and tolerances in this appendix should be included in the FSTD QTG. For aeroplanes certificated after 1 January 2002, the QTG should be supported by a validation data roadmap (VDR) as described in Attachment D. Data providers are encouraged to supply a VDR for older aeroplanes.

1.5 The table of FSTD validation tests in this appendix indicates the required tests. Unless noted otherwise, FSTD tests should represent aeroplane performance and handling qualities at operating mass and centre of gravity (cg) positions typical of normal operation. If a test is supported by aeroplane data at one extreme mass or cg position, another test supported by aeroplane data at mid-conditions or as close as possible to the other extreme should be included. Certain tests which are relevant only at one extreme mass or cg position need not be repeated at the other extreme. Tests of handling qualities should include validation of augmentation devices.

1.6 For the testing of computer-controlled aeroplane (CCA) FSTDs, flight test data are required for both the normal (N) and non-normal (NN) control states, as indicated in the validation requirements of this appendix. Tests in the non-normal state will always include the least augmented state. Tests for other levels of control state degradation may be required as detailed by the CAA at the time of definition of a set of specific aeroplane tests for FSTD data. Where applicable, flight test data should record:

- a) pilot controller deflections or electronically generated inputs including location of input; and
- b) flight control surface positions unless test results are not affected by, or are independent of, surface positions.

1.7 The recording requirements of 1.6 a) and b) apply to both normal and non-normal states. All tests in the table of FSTD validation tests require test results in the normal control state unless specifically noted otherwise in the comments section following the CCA designation. However, if the test results are independent of control state, nonnormal control data may be substituted.

1.8 Where non-normal control states are required, test data should be provided for one or more non-normal control states including the least augmented state.

1.9 Tests affected by normal, non-normal or other degraded control states not possible in the approved operating envelope of the aeroplane being simulated, and for which results cannot be provided, should be addressed in the QTG by an appropriate rationale included from the aeroplane manufacturer's VDR.

# **2. TEST REQUIREMENTS**

2.1 The ground and flight tests required for qualification are listed in the table of FSTD validation tests. Computer-generated FSTD test results should be provided for each test. The results should be produced on an appropriate recording device acceptable to the CAA. Time histories are required unless otherwise indicated in the table of FSTD validation tests.

2.2 In cases where the objective test results authorize a "snapshot test" or a "series of snapshot tests" in lieu of a time history, the data provider should ensure that a steady state condition exists at the instant of time captured by the "snapshot". This is often verified by showing that a steady state condition existed from some period prior to, through some period following, the snapshot. The time period most frequently used is from 5 seconds prior to, through 2 seconds following, the instant of time captured by the snapshot. This paragraph is primarily addressing the validation data and the method by which the data provider ensures that the steady state condition for the snapshot is representative.

2.3 Flight test data which exhibit rapid variations of the measured parameters may require engineering judgement when making assessments of FSTD validity. Such judgement should not be limited to a single parameter. All relevant parameters related to a given manoeuvre or flight condition should be provided to allow overall interpretation. When it is difficult or impossible to match FSTD to aeroplane data throughout a time history, differences should be justified by providing a comparison of other related variables for the condition being assessed.

2.4 Parameters, tolerances and flight conditions. The table of FSTD validation tests describes the parameters, tolerances and flight conditions for FSTD validation. When two tolerance values are given for a parameter, the less restrictive may be used unless indicated otherwise. Regardless, the test should exhibit correct trends. FSTD results should be labelled using the tolerances and units given, considering the following:

- a) the tolerances for some of the objective tests have been reduced to "Correct Trend and Magnitude" (CT&M). The use of CT&M is not to be taken as an indication that certain areas of simulation can be ignored. For such tests, the performance of the device should be appropriate and representative of the simulated designated aeroplane and should under no circumstances exhibit characteristics that could lead to negative training;
- b) the tolerances listed for tests noted as CT&M are applicable for recurrent evaluations and should be applied to ensure the device remains at the standard initially qualified. Where CT&M is noted, it is required that an automatic recording system be used to "footprint" the baseline results thereby avoiding the effects of possible divergent subjective opinions during recurrent evaluations;
- c) for parameters that have units of per cent, or parameters normally displayed in the cockpit in units of per cent (e.g.  $N_1$ ,  $N_2$ , engine torque or power), then a percentage tolerance will be interpreted as an absolute tolerance unless otherwise specified (i.e. for an observation of 50 per cent  $N_1$  and a tolerance of 5 per cent, the acceptable range would be from 45 per cent to 55 per cent); and
- d) for parameters not displayed in units of per cent, a tolerance expressed only as a percentage will be interpreted as the percentage of the current reference value of that parameter during the test, except for parameters varying around a zero value for which a minimum absolute value should be agreed with the CAA.

2.5 Flight condition verification. When comparing the parameters listed to those of the aeroplane, sufficient data should also be provided to verify the correct flight condition. For example, to show the control force is within ±2.2 daN (5 lbf) in a static stability test, data to show correct airspeed, power, thrust or torque, aeroplane configuration, altitude, and other appropriate datum identification parameters should also be given. If comparing short-period dynamics, normal acceleration may be used to establish a match to the aeroplane, but airspeed, altitude, control input, aeroplane configuration, and other appropriate data should also be given. All airspeed values should be clearly annotated as to indicated, calibrated, etc., and like values used for comparison.

2.6 Flight condition definitions. The flight conditions specified in the table of FSTD validation tests, sections 1 (Performance) and 2 (Handling Qualities) are defined as follows:

- a) ground on ground, independent of aeroplane configuration;
- b) take-off gear down with flaps in any certified take-off position;
- c) second segment climb gear up with flaps in any certified take-off position;
- d) clean flaps and gear up;
- e) cruise clean configuration at cruise altitude and airspeed;
- f) approach gear up or down with flaps at any normal approach position as recommended by the aeroplane manufacturer; and
- g) landing gear down with flaps in any certified landing position.

#### **3. INFORMATION FOR VALIDATION TESTS**

#### **3.1 Engines**

3.1.1 Tests are required to show the response of the critical engine parameter to a rapid throttle movement for an engine acceleration and an engine deceleration. The procedure for evaluating the response is illustrated in Figures B-1 and B-2.



**Figure B-1. Engine acceleration** 



**Figure B-2. Engine deceleration** 

# **3.2 Control dynamics**

3.2.1 General. The characteristics of an aeroplane flight control system have a major effect on handling qualities. A significant consideration in pilot acceptability of an aeroplane is the "feel" provided through the flight controls. Considerable effort is expended on aeroplane feel system design so that pilots will be comfortable and will consider the aeroplane desirable to fly. In order for an FSTD to be representative, it too should present the pilot with the proper feel: that of the aeroplane being simulated. Compliance with this requirement should be determined by comparing a recording of the control feel dynamics of the FSTD to actual aeroplane measurements in the take-off, cruise and landing configurations.

3.2.1.1 Recordings such as free response to a pulse or step function are traditionally used to estimate the dynamic properties of electromechanical systems. In any case, the dynamic properties can only be estimated since the true inputs and responses are also only estimated. Therefore, it is imperative that the best possible data be collected since

close matching of the FSTD control loading system to the aeroplane systems is essential. The required control dynamics tests are indicated in 2.b.1 through 2.b.3 of the table of FSTD validation tests.

3.2.1.2 Control dynamics characteristics are usually assessed by measuring the free response of the controls using a step input or pulse input to excite the system. The procedure should be accomplished in the take-off, cruise and landing flight conditions and configurations.

3.2.1.3 For aeroplanes with irreversible control systems, measurements may be obtained on the ground if proper pitot-static inputs are provided to represent airspeeds typical of those encountered in flight. Likewise, it may be shown that for some aeroplanes, take-off, cruise and landing configurations have like effects. Thus, one configuration may suffice. If either or both considerations apply, engineering validation or aeroplane manufacturer rationale should be submitted as justification for ground tests or for eliminating a configuration. For FSTDs requiring static and dynamic tests at the controls, special test fixtures will not be required during initial and upgrade evaluations if the QTG shows both test fixture results and the results of an alternate approach, such as computer plots which were produced concurrently and show satisfactory agreement. Repeat of the alternate method during the initial evaluation would then satisfy this test requirement.

3.2.2 Control dynamics evaluation. The dynamic properties of control systems are often stated in terms of frequency, damping and a number of other traditional measurements which can be found in various documents available on control systems. In order to establish a consistent means of validating test results for FSTD control loading, criteria are needed that will clearly define the interpretation of the measurements and the tolerances to be applied. Criteria are needed for underdamped, critically damped and overdamped systems. In the case of an underdamped system with very light damping, the system may be quantified in terms of frequency and damping. In critically damped or overdamped systems, the frequency and damping are not readily measured from a response time history. Therefore, some other measurement should be used.

3.2.2.1 Tests to verify that control feel dynamics represent the aeroplane should show that the dynamic damping cycles (free response of the controls) match those of the aeroplane within specified tolerances. The method of evaluating the response and the tolerance to be applied is described for the underdamped and critically damped cases. The response is as follows:

> a) Underdamped response. Two measurements are required for the period: the time to first zero crossing (in case a rate limit is present) and the subsequent frequency of oscillation. It is necessary to measure cycles on an individual basis in case there are non-uniform periods in the response. Each period will be independently compared to the respective period of the aeroplane control system and, consequently, will enjoy the full tolerance specified for that period.

The damping tolerance should be applied to overshoots on an individual basis. Care should be taken when applying the tolerance to small overshoots since the significance of such overshoots becomes questionable. Only those overshoots larger than 5 per cent of the total initial displacement should be considered. The residual band, labelled  $T(A<sub>d</sub>)$  on Figure B-3, is  $\pm 5$  per cent of the initial displacement amplitude  $A_d$  from the steady state value of the oscillation, or  $\pm 0.5$  per cent of the total control travel (stop to stop). Only oscillations outside the residual band are considered significant. When comparing FSTD data to aeroplane data, the process should begin by overlaying or aligning the FSTD and aeroplane displacement values and then comparing amplitudes of oscillation peaks, the time to the first zero crossing and individual periods of oscillation. The FSTD should show the same number of significant overshoots to within one when compared against the aeroplane data. This procedure for evaluating the response is illustrated in Figure B-3.

b) Critically damped and overdamped response. Due to the nature of critically damped and overdamped responses (no overshoots), the time to travel from 90 per cent of the initial displacement to 10 per cent of the steady state (neutral point) value should be the same as the aeroplane within ±10 per cent or ±0.05 s. Figure B-4 illustrates the procedure.

 c) Special considerations. Control systems which exhibit characteristics other than traditional overdamped or underdamped responses should meet specified tolerances. In addition, special consideration should be given to ensure that significant trends are maintained.

3.2.2.2 Tolerances. The following table summarizes the tolerances, T for underdamped systems. See Figure B-3 for an illustration of the referenced measurements.

- $T(P_0)$   $\pm 10$  per cent of P<sub>0</sub> or  $\pm 0.05$  s.
- $T(P_1)$   $\pm 20$  per cent of  $P_1$  or  $\pm 0.05$  s.
- $T(P_2)$   $\pm 30$  per cent of P<sub>2</sub> or  $\pm 0.05$  s.
- $T(P_n)$   $\pm 10(n+1)$  per cent of P<sub>n</sub> or  $\pm 0.05$  s.
- $T(A_n)$   $\pm 1$  per cent of  $A_{max}$ , where  $A_{max}$  is the largest amplitude or  $\pm 0.5$  per cent of the total control travel (stop to stop).
- $T(A_d)$   $\pm 5$  per cent of  $A_d$  = residual band or  $\pm 0.5$  per cent of the maximum control travel = residual band.

 ±1 significant overshoots (minimum of 1 significant overshoot). Steady state position within residual band.

Note 1.— Tolerances should not be applied on period or amplitude after the last significant overshoot.

Note 2.— Oscillations within the residual band are not considered significant and are not subject to tolerances.







**Figure B-4 Critically damped step response** 

The following tolerance applies only to the overdamped and critically damped systems (see Figure B-4 for an illustration of the reference measurement):

 $T(P_0)$   $\pm 10$  per cent of  $P_0$  or  $\pm 0.05$  s.

3.2.3 Alternate method for control dynamics evaluation of irreversible flight controls. One aeroplane manufacturer has proposed, and its CAA has accepted, an alternate means for dealing with control dynamics. The method applies to aeroplanes with hydraulically powered flight controls and artificial feel systems. Instead of free response measurements, the system would be validated by measurements of control force and rate of movement.

3.2.3.1 These tests should be conducted under typical taxi, take-off, cruise and landing conditions. For each axis of pitch, roll and yaw, the control should be forced to its maximum extreme position for the following distinct rates:

- a) Static test. Slowly move the control such that approximately 100 seconds are required to achieve a full sweep. A full sweep is defined as movement of the controller from neutral to the stop, usually aft or right stop, then to the opposite stop, then to the neutral position.
- b) Slow dynamic test. Achieve a full sweep in approximately 10 seconds.
- c) Fast dynamic test. Achieve a full sweep in approximately 4 seconds.

Note.— Dynamic sweeps may be limited to forces not exceeding 44.5 daN (100 lbf).

#### 3.2.3.2 Tolerances.

- a) Static test. Items 2.a.1, 2.a.2 and 2.a.3 of the table of FSTD validation tests.
- b) Dynamic test.  $\pm 0.9$  daN (2 lbf) or  $\pm 10$  per cent of dynamic increment above static test.

3.2.3.3 CAAs are open to alternative means such as the one described in 3.2.3. Such alternatives should, however, be justified and appropriate to the application. For example, the method described here may not apply to all manufacturers' systems and certainly not to aeroplanes with reversible control systems. Hence, each case should be considered on its own merit on an ad hoc basis. Should the CAA find that alternative methods do not result in satisfactory performance, more conventionally accepted methods should then be used.

3.2.4 Alternate method for control dynamics evaluation of flight controls with atypical response. Dynamic responses exhibiting atypical behaviour, as frequently seen on reversible controls, may be evaluated using an alternate reference line better suited for such cases. This alternate line is based on the dynamic response itself and attempts to better approximate the true rest position of the control throughout the step response. A full discussion on how to compute the alternate reference line is provided in Attachment N. Figure B-5 shows the final result and how to apply the tolerances using the new reference.

3.2.5 A flight control dynamic response is considered atypical when it does not exhibit classic second order system behaviour. For underdamped systems, the key features of such a behaviour are a constant period, decaying overshoots (an overshoot is always smaller than the previous one) and a fixed steady state position. Overdamped systems show a control position that will demonstrate a smooth exponential decay from its initial displacement towards a fixed steady state position.



**Figure B-5 Tolerances applied using the alternate reference line** 

# **3.3 Ground effect**

3.3.1 An FSTD to be used for take-off and landing should faithfully reproduce the aerodynamic changes which occur in ground effect. The parameters chosen for FSTD validation should be indicative of these changes. A dedicated test which will validate the aerodynamic ground effect characteristics should be undertaken. The choice of the test method and procedures to validate ground effect rests with the organization performing the flight tests; however, the duration of the flight test performed near the ground should be sufficient to validate the ground-effect model.

- 3.3.2 Acceptable tests for validation of ground effect should include one of the following:
	- a) Level fly-bys. The level fly-bys should be conducted at a minimum of three heights within the ground effect, including one at no more than 10 per cent of the wingspan above the ground, one each at approximately 30 per cent and 50 per cent of the wingspan, where height refers to main gear tire height above the ground. In addition, one level-flight trim condition should be conducted out of ground effect, e.g. at 150 per cent of the wingspan.
	- b) Shallow approach landing. The shallow approach landing should be performed at a glide slope of approximately one degree with negligible pilot activity until flare.

If other methods are proposed, rationale should be provided to conclude that the tests performed do validate the ground-effect model.

3.3.3 The lateral-directional characteristics are also altered by ground effect. For example, because of changes in lift, roll damping is affected. The change in roll damping will affect other dynamic modes usually evaluated for FSTD validation. In fact, Dutch roll dynamics, spiral stability and roll rate for a given lateral control input are altered by ground effect. Steady heading sideslips will also be affected. These effects should be accounted for in the simulator modelling. Several tests such as "crosswind landing", "one engine inoperative landing" and "engine failure on take-off" serve to validate lateral-directional ground effect since portions of them are accomplished while transiting heights at which ground effect is an important factor.

# **3.4 Engineering simulator validation data**

3.4.1 When a fully flight test validated simulation is modified as a result of changes to the simulated aeroplane configuration, a qualified aeroplane manufacturer may, with the prior agreement of the relevant CAA:

- a) supply validation data from an audited engineering simulator/simulation to selectively supplement flight test data. This arrangement is confined to changes that are incremental in nature and which are both easily understood and well defined; or
- b) support the most recent data package using engineering simulator validation data, and track only the latest version of test requirements.

When the FSTD operator receives appropriate validation data from the approved data provider and receives approval from the CAA, the FSTD operator may adopt tests and associated tolerances described in the current qualification standards as the tests and tolerances applicable for the continuing qualification of a previously qualified FSTD. The updated test(s) and tolerance(s) should be made a permanent part of the MQTG.

3.4.2 To be qualified to supply engineering simulator validation data, an aeroplane manufacturer, or other approved data supplier, should:

a) have a proven track record of developing successful data packages;

- b) have demonstrated high-quality prediction methods through comparisons of predicted and flight test validated data;
- c) have an engineering simulator that:
	- 1) has models which run in an integrated manner;
	- 2) uses the same models as those released to the training community (which are also used to produce stand-alone proof-of-match and check-out documents);
	- 3) is used to support aeroplane development and certification;
- d) use the engineering simulation to produce a representative set of integrated proof-of-match cases; and
- e) have an acceptable configuration control system in place covering the engineering simulator and all other relevant engineering simulations.

3.4.3 Aeroplane manufacturers seeking to take advantage of this alternative arrangement should contact the CAA at the earliest opportunity.

3.4.4 For the initial application, each applicant should demonstrate its ability to qualify to the satisfaction of the CAA, in accordance with the means provided in this appendix and Attachment B.

## **3.5 Motion system**

#### 3.5.1 General

3.5.1.1 Pilots use continuous information signals to manage the state of the aeroplane. In concert with the instruments and outside-world visual information, whole-body motion feedback is essential in assisting the pilot to control the aeroplane's dynamics, particularly in the presence of external disturbances. The motion system should therefore meet objective performance criteria as well as be subjectively tuned at the pilot's seat position to represent the linear and angular accelerations of the aeroplane during a prescribed minimum set of manoeuvres and conditions. Moreover, the response of the motion cueing system should be repeatable.

3.5.1.2 The objective validation tests presented in this appendix are intended to qualify the FSTD motion cueing system from both a mechanical performance standpoint and a motion cueing fidelity perspective.

3.5.2 Motion system checks. The intent of tests 3.a (frequency response) and 3.b (turn-around check), as described in the table of FSTD validation tests, is to demonstrate the performance of the motion system hardware and to check the integrity of the motion set-up with regard to calibration and wear. These tests are independent of the motion cueing software and should be considered as robotic tests.

#### 3.5.3 Motion cueing fidelity tests

3.5.3.1 Frequency-domain based objective motion cueing test

3.5.3.1.1 Background. This test quantifies the response of the motion cueing system from the output of the flight model to the motion platform response. Other motion tests, such as the motion system frequency response, concentrate on the mechanical performance of the motion system hardware alone. The intent of this test is to provide quantitative frequency response records of the entire motion system for specified degree-of-freedom transfer relationships over a range of frequencies. This range should be representative of the manual control range for that particular aeroplane type and the FSTD as set up during qualification. The measurements of this test should include the combined influence of the motion cueing algorithm, the motion platform dynamics, and the transport delay associated with the motion cueing and control system implementation. Specified frequency responses describing the ability of the FSTD to reproduce aeroplane translations and rotations, as well as the cross-coupling relations, are required as part of these measurements. When simulating forward aeroplane acceleration, the FSTD is accelerated momentarily in the forward direction to provide the onset cueing. This is considered the direct transfer relation. The FSTD is simultaneously tilted nose-up due to the low-pass filter in order to generate a sustained specific force. The tilt associated with the generation of the sustained specific force, and the angular rates and angular accelerations associated with the initiation of the sustained specific force, are considered cross-coupling relations. The specific force is required for the perception of the aeroplane sustained specific force, while the angular rates and accelerations do not occur in the aeroplane and should be minimized.

3.5.3.1.2 Frequency response test. This test requires the frequency response to be measured for the motion cueing system. Reference sinusoidal signals are inserted at the pilot reference position prior to the motion cueing computations (see Figure B-6). The response of the motion platform in the corresponding degree-of-freedom (the direct transfer relations), as well as the motions resulting from cross-coupling (the cross-coupling relations), are recorded. These are given in Table B-1. These are the tests that are important to pilot motion cueing and are general tests applicable to all types of aeroplanes. These tests can be run at any time deemed acceptable to the CAA prior to and/or during the initial qualification. The test requirement can be satisfied by a statement of compliance (SOC) supported with the relevant objective tests and which should be provided by the FSTD manufacturer following factory testing. It should not be necessary to run these tests for evaluations at the FSTD operator site unless changes are made to the motion cueing algorithms and associated parameters.



**Figure B-6.** Schematic of measured input <sup>o</sup> and output  $\bullet$  relation **for frequency-domain motion cueing test.** 





3.5.3.1.3 The frequency responses describe the relations between aeroplane motions and simulator motions as defined in Table B-1. The relations are explained below per individual test. Tests 1, 3, 5, 6, 8 and 10 show the direct transfer relations, while tests 2, 4, 7 and 9 show the cross-coupling relations.

- 1) FSTD pitch response to aeroplane pitch input;
- 2) FSTD surge acceleration response due to aeroplane pitch acceleration input;
- 3) FSTD roll response to aeroplane roll input;
- 4) FSTD sway specific force response due to aeroplane roll acceleration input;
- 5) FSTD yaw response to aeroplane yaw input;
- 6) FSTD surge response to aeroplane surge input;
- 7) FSTD pitch response to aeroplane surge specific force input;
- 8) FSTD sway response to aeroplane sway input;
- 9) FSTD roll response to aeroplane sway specific force input; and
- 10) FSTD heave response to aeroplane heave input.

3.5.3.1.4 Frequencies. The tests should be conducted by introducing sinusoidal inputs at discrete input frequencies entered at the output of the flight model, transformed to the pilot reference position just before the motion cueing computations, and measured at the response of the FSTD platform. The twelve discrete frequencies for these tests range from 0.100 rad/s to 15.849 rad/s and are given in Attachment F, Table F-1. The relationship between the frequency and corresponding measured modulus and phase defines the system transfer function. This test requires that, for each degree-of-freedom, measurements at the twelve specified frequencies should be taken.

3.5.3.1.5 Input signal amplitudes. The tests applied here to the motion cueing system are intended to qualify its response to normal control inputs during manoeuvring (i.e. not aggressive or excessively hard control inputs). It is necessary to excite the system in such a manner that the response is measured with a high signal-to-noise ratio, and that the possible non-linear elements in the motion cueing system are not overly excited. The sinusoidal input signal amplitudes are defined in Attachment F, Tables F-2 and F-4.

3.5.3.1.6 Data recording. The measured parameters for each test should include the modulus and phase as prescribed in Attachment F, 2.2, for the tests delineated in Table B-1. The modulus indicates the amplitude ratio of the output signal divided by the input signal, expressed in non-dimensional terms in case of the direct transfer relations (1, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 10) and in dimensional terms in the case of the cross-coupling relations (2, 4, 7, and 9). The phase describes the delay at that frequency between the output signal and the input signal, and is expressed in degrees.

3.5.3.1.7 Frames of reference. Measurements of the FSTD response should be transformed to estimated measurements at the pilot reference frame. This is defined as being attached to the FSTD in the plane of symmetry of the cab, at a height approximately 35 cm below pilot eye height. The x-axis points forward and the z-axis points downward. The frames of reference are defined in Attachment F, 8.4.

3.5.3.1.8 Aeroplane characteristics. The tests should be conducted in the FSTD configuration representing the motion drive algorithm during the flight mode. If the motion drive algorithm parameters are different in the ground mode (for example during taxi or take-off roll), the tests should be repeated for this configuration. If to be performed, the recommended conditions on ground are low speed taxi at 10 kt and approach to take-off speed at 80 kt.

3.5.3.1.9 Presentation of results. The measured modulus and phase should be tabulated for the twelve discrete frequencies and for each of the transfer relations given in Table B-1. The results should also be plotted for each component in bode plots. The modulus and phase should be presented as a function of frequency in rad/s. The modulus should be presented in a log-log plot, the phase in a semi-log plot. An example is shown in Figure B-7.

3.5.3.1.10 Tolerances. The boundaries of the criteria for the ten tests are presented in Attachment F, section 7.



**Figure B-7. Example bode plots of the frequency response derived from OMCT measurements** 

## 3.5.3.2 Time-domain based objective motion cueing test

A time-domain based objective motion cueing test, which would complement the frequency-domain test in 3.5.3.1, is currently being tested and evaluated by the TDWS (see Appendix D). This test will help quantify the response of the motion cueing system. The testing methodology, criteria and tolerances for this test will be implemented into this section after more testing and when sufficient experience is gained.

3.5.4 Motion system repeatability. The intent of this test is to ensure that the motion system software and motion system hardware have not degraded or changed over time. This will allow an improved ability to determine changes that have adversely affected the training value of the motion as was accepted during the initial qualification. The following information delineates the methodology that should be used for this test:

- a) Conditions:
	- 1) one test case on ground: to be determined by the FSTD operator; and
	- 2) one test case in flight: to be determined by the FSTD operator.
- b) Input. The inputs should be such that both rotational accelerations/rates and linear accelerations are inserted before the transfer from the aeroplane cg to the pilot reference point with a minimum amplitude of 5  $\sqrt[6]{s}^2$ , 10  $\sqrt[6]{s}$  and 0.3 g, respectively, to provide adequate analysis of the output.
- c) Recommended output:
	- 1) actual platform linear accelerations; the output will comprise accelerations due to both the linear and rotational motion acceleration; and
	- 2) motion actuators position.

#### 3.5.5 Motion vibrations

3.5.5.1 Presentation of results. The characteristic motion vibrations are a means to verify that the FSTD can reproduce the frequency content of the aeroplane when flown in specific conditions. The test results should be presented as a power spectral density (PSD) plot with frequencies on the horizontal axis and amplitude on the vertical axis. The aeroplane data and FSTD data should be presented in the same format with the same scaling, for frequencies up to at least 20 Hz. The algorithms used for generating the FSTD data should be the same as those used for the aeroplane data. If they are not the same, the algorithms used for the FSTD data should be proven to be sufficiently comparable. As a minimum, the results along the vertical and lateral axes should be presented. Longitudinal axis should be presented if either the aeroplane's or FSTD's vibrations are significant and, if the longitudinal axis is not presented, a rationale should be provided.

3.5.5.2 Interpretation of results. The overall trend of the PSD plot should be considered while focusing on the dominant frequencies. Less emphasis should be placed on the differences at the high frequency and low amplitude portions of the PSD plot. During the analysis, it should be considered that certain structural components of the FSTD have resonant frequencies that are filtered and thus may not appear in the PSD plot. If such filtering is required, the notch filter bandwidth should be limited to 1 Hz to ensure that the buffet feel is not adversely affected. In addition, a rationale should be provided to explain that the characteristic motion vibration is not being adversely affected by the filtering. The amplitude should match aeroplane data as per the following description; however, if for subjective reasons the PSD plot was altered, a rationale should be provided to justify the change. If the plot is on a logarithmic scale, it may be difficult to interpret the amplitude of the buffet in terms of acceleration. A 1  $\times$  10<sup>-3</sup> (g<sub>rms</sub>)<sup>2</sup>/Hz would describe a heavy buffet and may be seen in the deep stall regime. On the other hand, a 1  $\times$  10<sup>-6</sup> (g<sub>rms)</sub><sup>2</sup>/Hz buffet is almost not perceivable but may represent a flap buffet at low speed. The previous two examples differ in magnitude by 1 000. On a PSD plot this represents three decades (one decade is a change in order of magnitude of 10; two decades is a change in order of magnitude of 100; etc.).

### **3.6 Visual system**

3.6.1 General. Visual systems should be tested in accordance with the table of FSTD validation tests (see section 4).

- 3.6.2 Visual ground segment. See test 4.d.
	- a) Height and RVR for the assessment have been selected in order to produce a visual scene that can be readily assessed for accuracy (RVR calibration) and where spatial accuracy (centre line and G/S) of the aeroplane being simulated can be readily determined using approach/runway lighting and flight deck instruments.
	- b) The QTG should indicate the source of data, i.e. published decision height, aerodrome and runway used, ILS G/S antenna location (aerodrome and aeroplane), pilot's eye reference point, flight deck cut-off angle, etc., used to accurately make visual ground segment (VGS) scene content calculations (see Figure B-8).
	- c) Automatic positioning of the simulated aeroplane on the ILS is encouraged. If such positioning is accomplished, diligent care should be taken to ensure that the correct spatial position and aeroplane attitude are achieved. Flying the approach manually or with an installed autopilot should also produce acceptable results.

#### 3.6.3 Image geometry.

The geometry of the final image as displayed to each pilot should meet the criteria defined. This assumes that the individual optical components have been tested to demonstrate a performance that is adequate to achieve this end result.



**Figure B-8. VGS scene content calculations** 

3.6.3.1 Image position. See test 4.a.2.a.1.

3.6.3.1.1 When measured from the pilot's and co-pilot's eyepoint the centre of the image should be positioned horizontally between 0 degrees and 2 degrees inboard and within ±0.25 degree vertically relative to the FSTD centreline taking into account any designed vertical offset.

3.6.3.1.2 The differential between the measurements of horizontal position between each eyepoint should not exceed 1 degree.

Note.— The tolerances are based on eye spacings of up to  $\pm 53.3$  cm  $(\pm 21$  inches). Greater eye spacings should be accompanied by an explanation of any additional tolerance required.

3.6.3.2 Image absolute geometry. See test 4.a.2.a.2.

The absolute geometry of any point on the image should not exceed 3 degrees from the theoretical position. This tolerance applies to the central 200 degrees by 40 degrees. For larger fields of view, there should be no distracting discontinuities outside this area.

3.6.3.3 Image relative geometry. See test 4.a.2.a.3.

3.6.3.3.1 The relative geometry check is intended to test the displayed image to demonstrate that there are no significant changes in image size over a small angle of view. With high detail visual systems, the eye can be a very powerful comparator to discern changes in geometric size. If there are large changes in image magnification over a small area of the picture the image can appear to "swim" as it moves across the mirror.

3.6.3.3.2 The typical Mylar-based mirror system will naturally tend to form a "bathtub" shape. This can cause magnification or "rush" effects at the bottom and top of the image. These can be particularly distracting in the lower half of the mirror when in the final approach phase and hence should be minimized. The tolerances are designed to try to keep these effects to an acceptable level while accepting that the technology is limited in its ability to produce a perfect spherical shape.

3.6.3.3.3 The 200˚× 40˚ FOV is divided up into three zones to set tolerances for relative geometry as shown in Figure B-9.

3.6.3.3.4 Testing of the relative geometry should proceed as follows:

a) from the pilot's eye position, measure every visible 5-degree point on the vertical lines and horizontal lines. Also, at —90, —60, —30, 0 and +15 degrees in azimuth, measure all visible 1-degree points from the —10˚point to the lowest visible point;

 Note.— Not all points depicted on the pattern are measured, but they may be measured if observation suggests a problem.

b) from the co-pilot's eye position, measure every visible 5 degree point on the vertical lines and horizontal lines. Also, at +90, +60, +30, 0 and -15 degrees in azimuth, measure all visible 1-degree points from the —10˚point to the lowest visible point;

 Note.— Not all points depicted on the pattern are measured, but they may be measured if observation suggests a problem.

,



**Figure B-9. Relative geometry test pattern showing zones.** 

c) the relative spacing of points should not exceed the following tolerances when comparing the gap between one pair of dots with the gap between an adjacent pair:

Zone 1 < 0.075 degree/degree,

Zone 2 < 0.15 degree/degree,

Zone 3 < 0.2 degree/degree;

- d) where 5 degree gaps are being measured the tolerances should be multiplied by 5, e.g. one 5 degree gap should not be more than  $(5*0.075) = 0.375$  degree more or less than the adjacent gap when in zone 1; and
- e) for larger fields of view, there should be no distracting discontinuities outside this area.

3.6.3.3.5 For recurrent testing, the use of an optical checking device is encouraged. This device should typically consist of a hand-held go/no go gauge to check that the relative positioning is maintained.

3.6.4 Laser speckle contrast ratio (laser projection system).

The objective measure of speckle contrast that is described in the following paragraphs considers the grainy structure of speckle and concentrates on the variations of brightness inherently introduced by speckle. Speckle contrast is quite commonly measured in many applications. However, speckle contrast does not take into account the size of the grains, i.e. the spatial wavelength of the speckle pattern.

3.6.4.1 Definition of speckle contrast ratio

3.6.4.1.1 Due to its noisy character, one adequate measure to quantify speckle is the root mean square (RMS) deviation derived from statistical theory: in a random distribution, the RMS deviation quantifies the amount of variation from the mean value.

3.6.4.1.2 When applied to the intensity profile of an illuminated surface, the speckle contrast C is the RMS deviation normalized to the mean value.

3.6.4.1.3 Given the intensity profile I(x, y) in the considered field of view, the speckle contrast C can be defined as:

$$
C=\frac{\sqrt{\langle I^2\rangle-\langle I\rangle^2}}{\langle I\rangle},
$$

where the average operator  $\lt$  > operating on a profile  $I(x, y)$  is defined as:

$$
\langle I \rangle := \frac{1}{A} \cdot \int_{FOV} I(x, y) dA
$$

Hence:

$$
C = \frac{\sqrt{A \cdot \int_{FOV} (I(x, y))^2 dA - \left(\int_{FOV} I(x, y) dA\right)^2}}{\int_{FOV} I(x, y) dA}
$$

# 3.6.4.2 Speckle measurement

3.6.4.2.1 The intensity profile I(x, y) can be measured with a charge-coupled device (CCD) camera. The setup of the measurement (selection of lenses and CCD array) ensures that the granularity of the speckle can easily be resolved; hence, the granularity on the CCD chip should therefore be larger than the pixel size.

3.6.4.2.2 With the discrete nature of the CCD chip,  $I(x, y)$  translates into an array  $I_{m,n}$ , while

$$
\frac{1}{A} \cdot \int_{Fov} I(x, y) dA
$$

translates into:

$$
\frac{1}{m \cdot n} \cdot \sum_{FOV} I_{m,n}
$$

Therefore,

$$
C = \frac{\sqrt{m \cdot n \cdot \sum_{FOV} I_{m,n}^2 - \left(\sum_{FOV} I_{m,n}\right)^2}}{\sum_{FOV} I_{m,n}}
$$

where:



3.6.4.2.3 Since the definition of C is also sensitive to the profile's low-frequency variations across the FOV, either the illumination together with the reflectivity of the screen should be homogeneous, or the measured intensity profile should be corrected for these variations. This can be accomplished by applying a suitable high-pass filter, for example by evaluating on sufficiently small FOVs in which low-frequency variations are negligible.

3.6.4.2.4 To take into account the subjective nature of speckle, the f-number (or f# which is sometimes called the focal ratio expressing the diameter of the entrance pupil D divided by the focal length f, i.e. D/f) of the lens should be used as close as possible to that of the human eye. The recommended f# is 1/16.

# 3.6.4.3 Speckle tolerance (see test 4.a.11)

If the speckle contrast is more than 10 per cent the image begins to appear disturbed. The distractive modulation as an overlay of the image reduces the perceptibility of the projected image and then degrades the perceived resolution. With a speckle contrast below 10 per cent, the resolution and focus are not affected.

### 3.6.5 Solid-state illuminators

3.6.5.1 Projectors using solid-state illuminators, such as LEDs or lasers, exhibit improved lifetimes over those illuminated by lamps. However, current LED and laser illuminators lose this lifetime improvement when required to achieve 30 cd/m<sup>2</sup> (8.8 ft-lamberts) light-point intensity. This limitation is considered acceptable when measured against the benefits of solid-state illuminators. Such devices should therefore only be required to achieve 20 cd/m<sup>2</sup> (5.8 ft-lamberts) light-point brightness.

3.6.5.2 As soon as technology allows solid-state illuminators to achieve the full 8.8 ft-lamberts that capability should be employed. This is further emphasised by current advances in solid-state illuminators which show that this waiver for the limitation will soon be unnecessary.

# **3.7 Sound system**

3.7.1 General. The total sound environment in the aeroplane is very complex and changes with atmospheric conditions, aeroplane configuration, airspeed, altitude, power settings, etc. Thus, flight deck sounds are an important component of the flight deck operational environment and as such provide valuable information to the flight crew. These aural cues can either assist the crew, as an indication of an abnormal situation, or hinder the crew, as a distraction or nuisance. For effective training, the FSTD should provide flight deck sounds that are perceptible to the pilot during normal, abnormal and emergency operations and that are comparable to those of the aeroplane. Accordingly, the FSTD operator should carefully evaluate background noises in the location being considered. To demonstrate compliance with the sound requirements, the objective or validation tests in this appendix have been selected to provide a representative sample of normal static conditions typical of those experienced by a pilot. Due to the nature of sound, objective criteria may have been regularly disregarded during previous evaluations. Adhering to the objective criteria is an important component of the total sound.

3.7.2 Alternate propulsion. For FSTDs with multiple propulsion configurations, any condition listed in section 5 (Sound systems) of this appendix that is identified by the aeroplane manufacturer as significantly different, due to a change in propulsion system (engine or propeller), should be presented for evaluation as part of the QTG.

# 3.7.3 Data and data collection system.

3.7.3.1 Information provided to the FSTD manufacturer should comply with the current edition of the IATA document Flight Simulator Design and Performance Data Requirements. This information should contain calibration and frequency response data.

3.7.3.2 The system used to perform the tests listed in section 5 of this appendix, should meet or exceed the following standards:

- a) ANSI S1.11-2004, as amended Specification for Octave, Half-Octave and Third Octave Band Filter Sets; and
- b) IEC 61094-4-1995, as amended Measurement microphones Frequency response of the microphone used to record the FSTD sounds should be at least as good as the one used to record the approved dataset sounds.

3.7.4 Headsets. If headsets are used during normal operation of the aeroplane they should also be used during the FSTD evaluation.

3.7.5 Playback equipment. It is recommended that playback equipment such as a laptop and headphones and recordings from the approved dataset be available during initial evaluations in order to enable subjective comparison between FSTD results and the approved data.

3.7.6 Volume Level. The FSTD is qualified at the full volume level, which corresponds to the actual volume level in the approved dataset. When full volume is not selected, an indication of abnormal setting should be provided to the instructor to prevent inadvertent operation at this setting.

# 3.7.7 Background noise.

3.7.7.1 Background noise includes the noise in the FSTD due to the FSTD's cooling and hydraulic systems that are not associated with the aeroplane and the extraneous noise from other locations in the building. Background noise can seriously impact the correct simulation of aeroplane sounds, so the goal should be to keep the background noise below the aeroplane sounds. In some cases, the sound level of the simulation can be increased to compensate for the background noise. However, this approach is limited by the specified tolerances and by the subjective acceptability of the sound environment to the evaluation pilot.

3.7.7.2 The acceptability of the background noise levels is dependent upon the normal sound levels in the aeroplane or class of aeroplane being represented. Background noise levels that fall below the lines defined by the following points may be acceptable (see Figure B-10):

- a) 70 dB @ 50 Hz;
- b) 55 dB @ 1 000 Hz; and
- c) 30 dB @ 16 kHz.

These limits are for unweighted 1/3 octave band sound levels. Meeting these limits for background noise does not ensure an acceptable FSTD. Aeroplane sounds which fall below this limit require careful review and may require lower limits on the background noise.

3.7.7.3 The background noise measurement may be rerun at the recurrent evaluation as per 3.7.9. The tolerances to be applied are that recurrent 1/3 octave band amplitudes cannot differ by more than ±3 dB when compared to the initial results.



**Figure B-10. 1/3 octave band frequency (Hz).** 

3.7.8 Frequency response. Frequency response plots for each channel should be provided at initial evaluation. These plots may be rerun at the recurrent evaluation as per 3.7.9. The tolerances to be applied are:

- a) recurrent 1/3 octave band amplitudes cannot differ by more than  $\pm 5$  dB for three consecutive bands when compared to the initial results; and
- b) the average of the sum of the absolute differences between initial and recurrent results over all bands cannot exceed 2 dB (see Table B-2).

3.7.9 Initial and recurrent evaluations. If recurrent frequency response and FSTD background noise results are within tolerance, respective to initial evaluation results, and the FSTD operator can prove that no software or hardware changes have occurred that will affect the aeroplane cases, it is not required to rerun those cases during recurrent evaluations. If aeroplane cases are rerun during recurrent evaluations, the results may be compared against initial evaluation results rather than aeroplane master data.

3.7.10 Validation testing. Deficiencies in aeroplane recordings should be considered when applying the specified tolerances to ensure that the simulation is representative of the aeroplane. Examples of typical deficiencies are:

- a) variation of data between tail numbers;
- b) frequency response of microphones;
- c) repeatability of the measurements; and
- d) extraneous sounds during recordings.

Note.— Atmospheric pressure differences between data collection and reproduction may play a role in subjective perceptions.



16 000 71.1 71.1 0.0

Average 1.1

# **Table B-2. Example of recurrent frequency response test tolerance**









II-App B-27








 $11 - A$ pp  $B - 31$ 













II-App B-37







Manual of Criteria for the Qualification



 $1 + 9$   $p + 41$ 







Manual of Criteria for the Qualification













Manual of Criteria for the Qualification



 $11-Ap$  B-51

















**11-App B-59** 





 $11-ApD B-61$ 





## Part II. Flight Simulation Training Device Criteria<br>Appendix B. FSTD validation tests Appendix B. Part II. Flight Simulation Training Device Criteria FSTD validation tests II-App B-63

II-App B-63


























































Manual of Criteria for the Qualification



Part II. Flight Simulation Training Device Criteria<br>Appendix B. FSTD validation tests Appendix B. Part II. Flight Simulation Training Device Criteria FSTD validation tests II-App B-93

II-App B-93



# **Appendix C**

# **FUNCTIONS AND SUBJECTIVE TESTS**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 Accurate replication of aeroplane systems functions should be checked at each flight crew member position. This includes procedures using the AFM and checklists. Handling qualities, performance and FSTD systems operation as they pertain to the actual aeroplane, as well as FSTD cueing (e.g. visual cueing and motion cueing) and other supporting systems (e.g. IOS), should be subjectively assessed. Prior coordination with the CAA responsible for the evaluation is essential to ensure that the functions tests are conducted in an efficient and timely manner and that any skills, experience or expertise required by the evaluation team are available.

1.2 The necessity of functions and subjective tests arises from the need to confirm that the simulation has produced a totally integrated and acceptable replication of the aeroplane. Unlike the objective tests listed in Appendix B, subjective testing should cover areas of the flight envelope that may reasonably be reached by a trainee. Like the validation tests, the functions and subjective tests conducted during the initial evaluation are only a "spot check" and not a rigorous examination of the quality of the simulation in all areas of flight and systems operation. The FSTD operator should have completed the acceptance testing of the FSTD with support from the FSTD manufacturer prior to the device being submitted for the initial evaluation to be conducted by the CAA evaluator(s).

1.3 At the request of an FSTD operator, the FSTD may be assessed for a special aspect of a relevant training programme during the functions and subjective portion of an evaluation. Such an assessment may include a portion of a line-oriented flight training (LOFT) scenario or special emphasis items in the training programme. Unless directly related to a requirement for the current qualification level, the results of such an evaluation would not affect the FSTD's current qualification status.

1.4 Functions tests should be run in a logical flight sequence at the same time as performance and handling assessments. This also permits the FSTD to run for two to three hours in real time, without repositioning of flight or position freeze, thereby permitting proof of reliability. A useful source of guidance for conducting the functions and subjective tests is published in the RAeS Aeroplane Flight Simulator Evaluation Handbook, Volume II (see Chapter 2, 2.3).

1.5 The FSTD should be assessed to ensure that repositions, resets and freezes support efficient and effective training.

1.6 At the time of writing, simulated ATC environment was still in the early stages of its development and adoption. As a result, training approval and device qualification for this subject has not yet been proven by experience. Until such a time, it is envisaged that the evaluation of FSTD simulated ATC environment capability will be conducted via training approval and not as part of FSTD qualification.

1.7 The FSTD should be assessed to ensure that simulated ATC environment supports the specific training task (for example, as needed for MPL/ab initio training) in an efficient and effective manner. Emphasis should be on the approval of those functions that support key training objectives, rather than those that attempt to provide a high fidelity synthetic representation of real-world operations.

1.8 Since the requirements for simulated ATC environment are intentionally non-prescriptive, assessment will be largely subjective. The qualification of the FSTD should not be withheld, restricted or simulated ATC environment annotated as a "non-qualified task" as a result of non-compliance. However, if the system does not meet the criteria of a largely subjective evaluation, the training task should not be approved.

1.9 Further guidance on approval and qualification will be published in subsequent updates or amendments to this document when sufficient experience has been gathered by industry.

### **2. TEST REQUIREMENTS**

2.1 The ground and flight tests and other checks required for qualification are listed in the following Table of Functions and Subjective Tests. The table includes manoeuvres and procedures (both conventional and performancebased navigation) to ensure that the FSTD functions and performs appropriately for use in pilot training and testing or checking in the manoeuvres and procedures normally required of an approved training programme.

2.2 Some manoeuvres and procedures include pilot techniques and features of advanced technology aeroplanes and innovative training programmes. For example, "continuous descent final approach technique" and "high angle of attack manoeuvring" are included to provide an alternative to "dive and drive final approaches" and "approach to stall", respectively. For the latter, such an alternative is necessary for aeroplanes employing flight envelope limiting technology.

2.3 A representative selection of systems functions should be assessed for normal and, where appropriate, alternate operations. Normal, abnormal and emergency procedures associated with a flight phase should be assessed during the evaluation of manoeuvres or events within that flight phase. The effects of the selected malfunctions should be sufficient to correctly exercise the aeroplane-related procedures, normally contained in a quick reference handbook (QRH). Systems are listed separately under "any flight phase" to ensure appropriate attention to system checks.

## **3. TABLE OF FUNCTIONS AND SUBJECTIVE TESTS**

 Note.— "Other" means any other test as applicable to the aeroplane being simulated and as applicable to the FSTD type.




















### Manual of Criteria for the Qualification II-App C-12 **II-App C-12** of Flight Simulation Training Devices — Volume I



















\_

# **Appendix D**

## **DOC 9625 UPDATE PROCESS**

#### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Simulation technology and training research will continue to advance. It is likely that at some stage, before further revisions of Doc 9625 are published, other technical requirements or solutions to meet the criteria specified herein may be proposed. This appendix details the process to be undertaken when an update to this manual is considered.

#### **2. PROCESS**

2.1 Prior to considering the inclusion of alternate requirements or solutions, the related proposal should include, as a minimum, the items listed below to the satisfaction of the CAA(s) concerned:

- a) a detailed description of the technical proposal including differences and advantages compared with existing means of compliance for the criteria or requirement in question;
- b) demonstration by the applicant to the satisfaction of the CAA that the proposed alternate requirement or solution achieves a level of training capability at least equivalent to that provided by existing means. This should include evidence that existing training and training-to-proficiency outcomes have been achieved;
- c) revised or additional validation testing criteria to be used in FSTD evaluation and qualification;
- d) revised or additional functional and subjective testing criteria to be used in FSTD evaluation and qualification; and
- e) publication of supporting regulatory guidance documentation based on the technical proposal, the demonstration by the applicant, and the revised or additional criteria described above.

2.2 The items listed above are to be submitted to the International Pilot Training Consortium (IPTC) Training Devices Work Stream (TDWS). After establishing that the international training community supports the alternate requirements or solutions, the TDWS would prepare an update to Doc 9625.

### **3. FLOW CHART**

Figure D-1 illustrates the process to be followed for an update to Doc 9625.



**Figure D-1. Doc 9625 update process** 

\_

# **Attachment A**

# **FSTD QUALIFICATION FOR NEW AEROPLANE TYPES**

1.1 Aeroplane manufacturers' final approved data for performance, handling qualities, systems or avionics are usually not available until after a new or derivative aeroplane has entered service. In order to minimize the associated training risk, every effort should be made to provide the final data as soon as possible. However, it may be necessary to use preliminary data provided by the aeroplane manufacturer for interim qualification of FSTDs, so that flight crew training and licensing can begin several months prior to the entry of the first aeroplane into service. Flight crew training credit should be evaluated by the CAA, which may choose to impose a time limit or other limitations until final FSTD qualification has been granted.

1.2 In recognition of the sequence of events that should occur and the time required for final data to become available, the CAA may accept certain partially validated preliminary aeroplane and systems data, and early release ("red label") avionics data, in order to permit the necessary programme schedule for training, certification and service introduction.

1.3 FSTD qualification should be based upon approved data. FSTD operators seeking qualification based on preliminary data should, however, consult the CAA as soon as it is known that special arrangements will be necessary or as soon as it is clear that the preliminary data will need to be used for FSTD qualification. Aeroplane and FSTD manufacturers should also be made aware of the needs and be agreed parties to the data plan and FSTD qualification plan. The plans should include periodic meetings to keep the interested parties informed of project status.

1.4 The precise procedure followed to gain CAA acceptance of preliminary data will vary from case to case and among aeroplane manufacturers. Each aeroplane manufacturer's new aeroplane development and test programme is designed to suit the needs of the particular project and may not contain the same events or sequence of events as another manufacturer's programme or even the same manufacturer's programme for a different aeroplane. Hence, there cannot be a prescribed invariable procedure for acceptance of preliminary data, but instead a statement of needs with the final sequence of events, data sources and validation procedures agreed by the FSTD operator, the aeroplane manufacturer, the FSTD manufacturer and the CAA.

 Note.— A description of aeroplane manufacturer-provided data needed for flight simulator modelling and validation is to be found in the IATA document Flight Simulation Training Device Design and Performance Data Requirements (see Chapter 2, 2.3).

1.5 There should be assurance that the preliminary data are the manufacturer's best representation of the aeroplane and reasonable certainty that final data will not deviate to a large degree from these preliminary projections, but will only be refined; they are not just estimates. Data derived from these predictive or preliminary techniques should be validated by available sources including, at least, the following:

- a) Manufacturer's engineering report. Such a report should explain the predictive method used and illustrate past successes of the method on similar projects. For example, the manufacturer could show the application of the method to an earlier aeroplane model or predict the characteristics of an earlier model and compare the results to final data for that model.
- b) Early flight test results. Such data will often be derived from aeroplane certification tests and should be used to maximum advantage for early FSTD qualification. Certain critical tests, which would normally be done early in the aeroplane certification programme, should be included to validate essential pilot

training and certification manoeuvres. These include cases in which a pilot is expected to cope with an aeroplane failure mode including engine failures. The early data available, however, will depend on the aeroplane manufacturer's flight test programme design and may not be the same in each case. However, it is expected that the aeroplane manufacturer's flight test programme would include provisions for generation of very early flight test results for FSTD qualification.

1.6 The preliminary data supporting an interim qualification are not intended to be used for an indefinite period. The aeroplane manufacturer's final data should be made available within six months after the aeroplane's entry into service or as agreed by the CAA, the FSTD operator and the aeroplane manufacturer, but usually not later than one year after entry into service. In applying for an interim qualification using preliminary data, the FSTD operator and the CAA should agree upon the update programme. This will normally specify that the final data update will be installed in the FSTD within a period of six months following the final data release but not later than two years, unless special conditions exist and a different schedule is agreed.

1.7 FSTD avionics should essentially stay in step with aeroplane avionics (hardware and software) updates. The permitted time lapse between aeroplane and FSTD updates is not a fixed time but should be minimal. It may depend on the magnitude of the update and whether the QTG and pilot training and checking are affected. Permitted differences in aeroplane and FSTD avionics versions and the resulting effects on FSTD qualification should be agreed between the FSTD operator and the CAA. Consultation with the FSTD manufacturer is desirable throughout the agreement of the qualification process.

1.8 The following provides an example of the design data and sources which might be used in the development of an interim qualification plan.

1.8.1 The plan should consist of the development of a QTG based upon a mix of flight test and engineering simulation data. For data collected from specific aeroplane flight tests or other flights, the required design model/data changes necessary to support an acceptable proof of match (POM) should be generated by the aeroplane manufacturer.

1.8.2 In order to ensure that the two sets of data are properly validated, the aeroplane manufacturer should compare its simulation model responses against the flight test data when driven by the same control inputs and subjected to the same atmospheric conditions as recorded in the flight test. The model responses should result from a simulation where the following systems are run in an integrated fashion and are consistent with the design data released to the FSTD manufacturer:

- a) propulsion;
- b) aerodynamics;
- c) mass properties;
- d) flight controls;
- e) stability augmentation; and
- f) brakes/landing gear.

Note.— The POM should meet the relevant tolerances.

1.9 For the qualification of FSTDs of new aeroplane types, it may be beneficial that the services of a suitably qualified CAA or aeroplane manufacturer test pilot be used for the purpose of assessing handling qualities and evaluating performance.

 $\mathcal{L}=\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  , where  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  , we have the set of  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ 

## **Attachment B**

# **ENGINEERING SIMULATION VALIDATION DATA**

### **1. BACKGROUND**

1.1 In the case of simulation models of a new or major derivative aeroplane that are fully flight test validated, it is likely that these models will become progressively unrepresentative as the aeroplane configuration is revised.

1.2 Traditionally, as the aeroplane configuration has been revised the simulation models have consequently been revised to reflect changes. In the case of aerodynamic, engine, flight control and ground handling models, this revision process normally results in the collection of additional flight test data and the subsequent release of updated models and validation data.

1.3 The quality of the prediction of simulation models has advanced to the point where differences between predicted and flight test validated models are often quite small.

1.4 The major aeroplane manufacturers utilize the same simulation models in their engineering simulations as those released to the training community. These simulations vary from physical engineering simulators with and without aeroplane hardware to non-real-time workstation-based simulations.

#### **2. APPROVAL GUIDELINES FOR USING ENGINEERING SIMULATION VALIDATION DATA**

2.1 The current practice of requiring flight test data as a reference for validating training simulators should continue.

2.2 When a simulation model that is fully flight test validated is modified as a result of changes to the simulated aeroplane configuration, an aeroplane manufacturer may choose, with prior agreement of the CAA(s), to supply validation data from an engineering simulator/simulation to selectively supplement flight test data.

2.3 In cases where data from an engineering simulator are used, the appropriate CAA(s) is(are) responsible for auditing the engineering simulation process.

2.4 In all cases, a data package verified to current standards against flight tests should be available for the aeroplane "entry-into-service" configuration of the baseline aeroplane.

2.5 Where engineering simulation data are used as part of a QTG, a close match is expected as described in Attachment C.

2.6 In cases where the use of engineering simulation data is envisaged, a complete proposal should be presented to the appropriate CAA(s). Such a proposal would contain evidence of the engineering simulation data supplier's past achievements in high-fidelity modelling. The CAA(s) should conduct technical reviews of the proposed plan and of the subsequent validation data to establish acceptability of the proposal.

2.7 The flight-test validated data may be modified once to produce derived data, but the derived data may not be processed further. In the event that subsequent changes are necessary, the original flight-test validated data should be used to produce a new set of derived data.

2.8 A configuration management process should be maintained, including an audit trail which clearly defines the simulation model changes step-by-step, away from a fully flight-test validated simulation model, so that it would be possible to undo the changes and return to the baseline (flight-test validated) version.

2.9 The procedure will be considered complete when an approval statement is issued. This statement will identify acceptable validation data sources.

2.10 To be admissible as an alternative source of validation data, an engineering simulator should:

- a) exist as a physical entity, complete with a flight deck, with controls sufficient for manual flight;
- b) have a visual system and preferably also a motion system;
- c) where appropriate, have actual avionics boxes interchangeable with the equivalent software simulations, to support validation of released software;
- d) have a rigorous configuration control system covering hardware and software; and
- e) have been found to be a high-fidelity representation of the aeroplane by the pilots of the manufacturers, air operators and the CAA(s).

2.11 Engineering simulators used to produce system data may not need all the above features.

2.12 The precise procedure followed to gain acceptance of engineering simulation data will vary from case to case depending on aeroplane manufacturers and type of change. Irrespective of the procedure followed, engineering simulations/simulators should conform to the following criteria:

- a) the original (baseline) simulation models should have been fully flight test validated;
- b) the models as released by the aeroplane manufacturer to the industry for the FSTD used in training should be essentially identical to those used by the aeroplane manufacturer in its engineering simulations/simulators; and
- c) these engineering simulations/simulators will have been used as part of the aeroplane design, development or certification process.

2.13 FSTDs used for training and utilizing the baseline simulation models should be currently qualified to internationally recognized criteria such as those contained in this manual.

2.14 The types of modifications covered using engineering simulation validation data will be restricted to those with "well-understood effects", such as:

- a) software (e.g. flight control computer, autopilot);
- b) simple (in aerodynamic terms) geometric revisions (e.g. fuselage length);
- c) engines (limited to non-propeller-driven aeroplanes);
- d) control system gearing/rigging/deflection limits; and
- e) brake, tire and steering revisions.

2.15 The FSTD operator, with the assistance of the aeroplane manufacturer, wishing to take advantage of using engineering simulation validation data is expected to demonstrate a sound engineering basis for its proposed approach. Such analysis would show that the predicted effects of the change(s) were incremental in nature and both easily understood and well defined, confirming that additional flight test data were not required. In the event that the predicted effects were not deemed to be sufficiently accurate, it may be necessary to collect a limited set of flight test data to validate the predicted increments.

2.16 The CAA(s) should review any applications for this procedure and provide feedback.

 $\mathcal{L}=\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  , where  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  , we have the set of  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ 

## **Attachment C**

## **VALIDATION TEST TOLERANCES**

#### **1. FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES**

1.1 The tolerances listed in Appendix B are designed to be a measure of quality of match using flight test data as a reference.

1.2 There are many reasons, however, why a particular test may not fully comply with the prescribed tolerances. For example:

- a) flight test data are subject to many sources of potential error, e.g. instrumentation errors and atmospheric disturbance during data collection;
- b) data that exhibit rapid variation or noise may also be difficult to match; and
- c) engineering simulator data and other calculated data may exhibit errors due to the variety of potential differences listed in 1.6 below.

1.3 When applying tolerances to any test, good engineering judgment with reference to 1.6 below should be applied. Where a test clearly falls outside the prescribed tolerance(s) for no acceptable reason, it should be judged to have failed.

1.4 The use of non-flight test data as reference data was in the past quite infrequent. Thus, these tolerances were used for all tests. Over the last few years, the inclusion of this type of data as a validation source has rapidly expanded and will probably continue to expand.

1.5 When engineering simulation validation data are used, it is understood that the flight test based tolerances should be reduced since applied tolerances should not include measurement errors inherent to flight test data.

1.6 There are reasons why the results from an FSTD would differ from engineering validation test data. These reasons include, but are not limited to:

- a) hardware (avionics and flight controls);
- b) modelling solutions used in the FSTD different from those used by the aeroplane's original equipment manufacturer (ground handling models, braking models, engine models, etc.);
- c) model cascading effects:
	- 1) iteration rates;
	- 2) execution order;
	- 3) integration methods; and
	- 4) processor architecture;
- d) digital drift:
	- 1) interpolation methods;
	- 2) data handling differences; and
	- 3) auto-test trim tolerances;
- e) open loop versus closed loop responses, and test duration;
- f) extent of dependency on contributory aeroplane systems adding to the complexity of the test; and
- g) accuracy of the match of the initial conditions.

1.7 Any differences between FSTD results and engineering simulation validation data should, however, be small and the reasons for any differences, other than those listed in 1.6, should be clearly explained.

1.8 Historically, engineering simulation validation data were used only to demonstrate compliance with certain extra modelling features because:

- a) flight test data could not reasonably be made available;
- b) data from engineering simulations made up only a small portion of the overall validation dataset; and
- c) key areas were validated against flight test data.

1.9 The current increase in the use and projected use of engineering simulation validation data is an important issue because:

- a) flight test data are often not available due to valid technical reasons;
- b) alternative technical solutions are being advanced; and
- c) cost is an ever-present consideration.

1.10 Guidelines are therefore needed for the application of tolerances to engineering simulator generated validation data.

#### **2. NON-FLIGHT TEST TOLERANCES**

2.1 Where engineering simulation validation data or other non-flight test data are used as an allowable form of reference validation data for the objective tests listed in Appendix B, the match obtained between the reference data and the FSTD results should be very close. It is not possible to define a precise set of tolerances, as the reasons for reaching other than an exact match will vary depending upon a number of factors (see section 1 above).

2.2 When non-flight test validation data are used for reference data, the tolerance applied should be 40 per cent of the corresponding flight test tolerances and out-of-tolerance flagging should be in accordance with this guideline. The validation data provider (aeroplane manufacturer) should supply a well-documented test procedure that enables replication of its engineering simulation results.

2.3 If the difference between the reference data and the FSTD results exceeds 40 per cent of the flight test tolerances, the FSTD manufacturer should provide a clear rationale for each affected QTG test case.

2.4 The validation data providers may identify cases where the suggested 40 per cent tolerance cannot be met. In such cases, the data providers should provide a clear rationale as part of their VDR (see Attachment D).

2.5 Where the engineering simulation used to generate reference data includes aeroplane hardware, the tolerances applied may have to be increased above the suggested 40 per cent. A rationale should be provided.

2.6 FSTD results should be obtained without having to change the simulation models of the FSTD to meet the criteria for exact replication of the engineering simulation results.

 $\mathcal{L}=\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  , where  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ 

# **Attachment D**

## **VALIDATION DATA ROADMAP**

1.1 Aeroplane manufacturers or other sources of data should supply a validation data roadmap (VDR) document as part of the data package. A VDR document contains guidance material from the aeroplane validation data supplier recommending the best possible sources of data to be used as validation data in the QTG. A VDR is of special value in the cases of requests for interim qualification and requests for qualification of simulations of aeroplanes certificated prior to 1992, and for qualification of alternate engine or avionics fits (see Attachment E). A VDR should be submitted to the CAA as early as possible in the planning stages for any FSTD planned for qualification to the criteria contained herein. The respective CAA is the final authority to approve the data to be used as validation material for the QTG.

1.2 The VDR should clearly identify (in matrix format) sources of data for all required tests. It should also provide guidance regarding the validity of these data for a specific engine type and thrust rating configuration and the revision levels of all avionics affecting aeroplane handling qualities and performance. The document should include rationale or explanation in cases where data or parameters are missing, engineering simulation data are to be used, flight test methods require explanation, etc., together with a brief narrative describing the cause/effect of any deviation from data requirements. Additionally, the document should make reference to other appropriate sources of validation data (e.g. sound and vibration data documents).

1.3 Table D-1 depicts a generic VDR matrix identifying sources of validation data. Only the first page of the full matrix is shown and some test conditions were deleted for brevity. The first column refers to validation tests in Appendix B or to tests in the IATA document Flight Simulation Training Device Design and Performance Data Requirements. Relevant regulatory material should be consulted and all applicable tests addressed in the actual VDR document submitted. Validation sources, validation data documents, and comments provided herein are for reference only. The actual data sources and documents will be dependent upon the particular airframe/engine combination under consideration. The following set of guidelines should be used when applying this example to a specific VDR document.

1.3.1 Include CCA mode column if applicable.

1.3.2 Include column for each validation source (e.g. each flight test airframe/engine combination and the simulation configuration).

1.3.3 Include column for each document being referenced as a source of validation data. The term "integrated" in the document title indicates that test conditions contained in these documents conform to the definition of "integrated testing" as described in the glossary.

1.3.4 Data type numbering should align with the hierarchy of preferences outlined in Attachment J, 1.5.

1.4 Tables D-2 and D-3 provide examples of another presentation of VDR matrices identifying sources of validation data for an abbreviated list of tests along with detailed information for a typical test case. A complete matrix should address all test conditions. A complete set of detailed information pages for tests quoted in the matrix would be provided with this particular presentation.

1.5 Additionally, two examples of "rationale pages" are presented in Appendix F of the IATA document Flight Simulation Training Device Design and Performance Data Requirements. These illustrate the type of aeroplane and avionics configuration information and descriptive engineering rationale used to describe data anomalies, provide alternative data or provide to the CAA an acceptable basis for obtaining deviations from QTG validation requirements.













### **Table D-2. Recommended Qualification Test Guide — 1**





#### **A — Requirements**

Document: ICAO Doc 9625 - Manual of Criteria for the Qualification of Flight Simulation Training Devices, Volume I — Aeroplanes, Fourth Edition.

Tolerance:  $\pm 2$  % or  $\pm 10$ % of turn rate.

Flight Ground.

Condition:

Comments: Plot a minimum of two speeds, greater than minimum turning radius speed, with a spread of at least 5 kt groundspeed.

Type: **I II III IV V VI VII** 

### **B — Data Package**



#### **Rationales:**



\_

## **Attachment E**

# **GUIDELINES FOR ADDITIONAL/ALTERNATE ENGINES OR AVIONICS VALIDATION DATA**

### **1. BACKGROUND**

1.1 For a new aeroplane type, the majority of flight test validation data is collected on the first aeroplane configuration with a "baseline" engine fit and a "baseline" avionics configuration. Generally the flight test campaign is conducted on the first aeroplane with one engine fit, which forms the basis of the models and the data pack. This dataset is then used to validate all FSTDs representing that aeroplane type.

1.2 Primary engine fit is the FSTD terminology for the primary engine fit for the aeroplane configuration that the FSTD operator has contractually demanded. The operator may contractually add alternate engine fits. The primary engine fit for a given FSTD will be validated by running the entire QTG for that engine fit. Additional engine fits for that device will only require a subset of the QTG as defined in paragraph 2 of this attachment. Note that the FSTD operator's primary engine fit may not be the airframe manufacturer's baseline.

1.3 In the case of FSTDs representing an aeroplane with a different engine fit than the baseline, or with a revised avionics configuration or more than one avionics configuration, additional test validation data may be needed.

1.4 When an FSTD with multiple engine fits is to be qualified, the QTG should contain test validation data for selected cases where engine differences are expected to be significant.

1.5 When an FSTD with alternate avionics configurations is to be qualified, the QTG should contain test validation data for selected cases where the avionics configuration differences are expected to be significant as defined in paragraph 3 of this attachment.

1.6 The nature of the required complementary validation data (e.g. flight test data, engineering data) should be in accordance with the guidelines prescribed by paragraph 4 of this attachment, except where other data are specifically allowed (see Attachment B).

### **2. QTG GUIDELINES FOR THE QUALIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL ENGINE FITS**

2.1 The following guidelines apply to FSTDs equipped with multiple engine types or thrust ratings. The primary engine fit for a given FSTD will be validated by running the entire QTG for that engine fit. To validate additional engine types or thrust ratings in that FSTD, a subset of the QTG should be provided. The test conditions (one per test number) in Table E-1 should be included in that subset, as a minimum.

2.2 When the additional engine fit is a different type from the primary configuration, all the tests under the additional engine type column in Table E-1 should be provided in the QTG.

2.3 In the case where the additional engine type is the same, but the thrust rating exceeds that of the primary configuration (i.e. 'baseline') by five per cent or more, or is significantly less than the primary configuration engine rating

(a decrease of fifteen per cent or more), all the tests in the additional engine rating column should be provided in the QTG. Otherwise, it might be acceptable to only provide the throttle calibration data (i.e. commanded power setting parameter versus throttle lever angle), and the engine acceleration and deceleration cases.



### **Table E-1. Minimum recommended list of QTG tests for an additional engine configuration**

### **3. QTG GUIDELINES FOR THE QUALIFICATION OF AN ALTERNATE AVIONICS CONFIGURATION**

3.1 The following guidelines apply to FSTDs representing aeroplanes with a revised avionics configuration or more than one avionics configuration.

3.2 The aeroplane avionics can be segmented into those systems or components that can significantly affect the QTG results and those that cannot. The following avionics systems or components are examples of those for which hardware design changes or software revision updates may lead to significant differences relative to the baseline avionics configuration: flight control computers; controllers for engines; autopilot; braking system; nosewheel steering system; high-lift system; and landing gear system. Related avionics such as stall warning and stability augmentation systems should also be considered. The aeroplane manufacturer should identify, for each avionics system change, the affected QTG tests. The aeroplane manufacturer should identify for each validation test affected by an avionics change what the effect is.

3.3 For changes to an avionics system or component that could affect a QTG validation test, but where that test is not affected by this particular change (e.g. the avionics change is a BITE update or a modification affecting a different flight phase), the QTG test can be based on validation data from the previously validated avionics configuration. The FSTD operator should provide a statement from the aeroplane manufacturer clearly stating that this avionics change does not affect the test.

3.4 For an avionics change that affects some tests in the QTG, but where no new functionality is added and the impact of the avionics change on aeroplane response is a small, well-understood effect, the QTG may be based on validation data from the previously validated avionics configuration. This should be supplemented with avionics-specific validation data from the aeroplane manufacturer's engineering simulation generated with the revised avionics configuration. In such cases, the FSTD operator should provide a rationale from the aeroplane manufacturer explaining the nature of the change and its effect on the aeroplane response.

3.5 For an avionics change that significantly affects some tests in the QTG, especially where new functionality is added, the QTG should be based on validation data from the previously validated avionics configuration and supplemental avionics-specific test data necessary to validate the alternate avionics revision. However, additional flight validation data may not be needed if the avionics changes were certified without need for testing with a comprehensive flight instrumentation package. In this situation, the FSTD operator should coordinate FSTD data requirements in advance with the aeroplane manufacturer and then the CAA.

3.6 For changes to an avionics system or component that are non-contributory to QTG validation test response, the QTG test can be based on validation data from the previously validated avionics configuration. For such changes, it is not necessary to include a rationale that this avionics change does not affect the test.

### **4. VALIDATION DATA REQUIREMENT GUIDELINES FOR ALTERNATE ENGINE FITS AND ALTERNATE AVIONICS CONFIGURATIONS**

4.1 For tests that are affected by difference in engine type or thrust rating as prescribed by paragraph 2, flight test data would be preferred to validate that particular aeroplane-engine configuration or the alternate thrust rating. Table E-2 presents a minimum list of validation tests that should be supported by flight test data.

4.2 If certification of the flight characteristics of the aeroplane with a new thrust rating (regardless of thrust rating percentage change) does require certification flight testing with a comprehensive stability and control flight instrumentation package, then the list of tests detailed in Table E-2, as a minimum, should be supported by flight test data and presented in the QTG (along with additional tests listed in Table E-1 for which other sources of validation data

are acceptable). Flight test data, other than throttle calibration and engine acceleration and deceleration data, are not required if the new thrust rating is certified on the aeroplane without need for a comprehensive stability and control flight instrumentation package.

4.3 Tests that are significantly affected by a change to the avionics configuration, as described in paragraph 3.5, should be supported by flight test data.

4.4 A matrix or VDR should be provided with the QTG indicating the appropriate validation data source for each test (see Attachment D). The FSTD operator should coordinate FSTD data requirements pertaining to alternate engines or avionics configurations in advance with the CAA.



#### **Table E-2. Minimum recommended list of validation flight tests for an alternate engine configuration.**

Note 1.— Should be provided for all changes in engine type or thrust rating (see 2.3).

\_

Note 2.— See 2.3 for a definition of applicable thrust ratings.

## **Attachment F**

# **FREQUENCY-DOMAIN MOTION CUEING SYSTEM PERFORMANCE TEST**

#### **1. BACKGROUND**

1.1 The objective of this attachment is to offer guidance on an objective test which should be used to ensure motion cueing of FSTDs is consistently delivered in an acceptable manner. This guidance should help engineers involved in preparing for this test as well as CAA personnel involved in the evaluation of FSTDs using this test.

1.2 The purpose of this test is to objectively measure the frequency response of the complete motion cueing system for specified degree-of-freedom relationships. Other motion tests, such as the motion system frequency response, concentrate on the mechanical performance of the motion system hardware alone. The motions experienced by the pilot are highly dependent on the motion cueing algorithm and its implementation in the FSTD. This test quantifies the response of the motion cueing system from the output of the flight model to the motion platform response.

1.3 The characteristics of the motion cueing system have a direct impact on the perception and control exercised by the pilot in the FSTD, especially during manual flying. The pilot's appreciation of the FSTD fidelity depends considerably on the perceived "feel" of the aeroplane being simulated, and this feel is influenced by the motion cueing system, among others. The first element in the motion cueing system is the motion drive algorithm (MDA), a set of control blocks that transform the outputs from the flight model to motion platform commands. A block diagram of the basic scheme of a MDA is shown in Figure F-1.

1.4 In Figure F-1, the HP filter and LP filter indicate high-pass and low-pass filters, respectively. The scaling factors, f-scale and ω-scale, are chosen to attenuate the input signals in such a way that the motion platform remains within its mechanical limits.

1.5 In order for the FSTD to provide a feel that is representative of the aeroplane, the MDA parameters are tuned during acceptance by the evaluation pilot under different simulated flight conditions. Usually, the evaluation pilot's subjective feel is used to tune the motion cueing system. This, however, does not lead to a consistently reliable and reproducible tuning of the motion cueing system not only because of variability in preferences across pilots but also variability of feel for the same pilot over different days.

1.6 Invariably, compromises need to be made in order to provide motion cues that feel reasonable, while keeping the motion platform within its fixed boundaries. The gains are therefore attenuated throughout the frequency range. In this sense, the motion system includes the following:

- a) the motion cueing algorithm;
- b) the motion platform actuator extension transformation and control laws;
- c) the motion platform hardware that reacts to these transformed aeroplane motion commands; and
- d) the digital time delay embedded in the above processes.



**Figure F-1. Basic scheme of a motion cueing algorithm (from Reid-Nahon)** 

1.7 Analogue processes have a modulus and a phase which includes the analogue delays. When these analogue processes are simulated digitally, an additional digital time delay is introduced.

1.8 All of the above influence the pilot's perception of the simulated motion. In order to compare and evaluate motion systems in a more rigorous manner, an objective motion cueing test (OMCT) is described herein.

1.9 For this test, it is important that the "reference" signals are defined at the location of the pilot  $F_{PA}$  in the aeroplane, and not at the aeroplane cg. It is important because this is what the pilot feels when in his seat. The FSTD response is measured at the pilot position  $F_{PS}$  in the FSTD. The response at  $F_{PS}$  should be compared with the signal at  $F_{PA}$ . This provides information on the transformation of the aeroplane motions to FSTD motions as perceived by the pilot, and is shown in the signal diagram of Figure F-2. The measured frequency response of the motion cueing system describes the relation between the motion platform responses measured at  $\bullet$  compared to the input at  $\bullet$ , with the "switch" in Figure F-2 in the down position. The signals generated by the OMCT signal generator are described below.

#### Note.— The relevant frames of reference are described in paragraph 8.4.

1.10 The MDA is defined here as the set of processes needed to transform the  $F_{PA}$  motions to FSTD motion platform response  $F_{PS}$ . It includes the motion cueing algorithm as applied in the operational use of the training device, including all special effects and buffet computations, actuator inverse transformations and the control laws needed to command the closed-loop motions of the platform. This OMCT considers all these aspects as a whole in order to capture the transport delays introduced by these processes and any delays in the related computer equipment used in the motion system. In some cases, the MDA may be integrated in the host computer, and in others it may be part of the motion control computer.




1.11 The FSTD motion platform is defined as the mechanical hardware used to generate the motions.

1.12 The criterion on which the OMCT is based states that, over the finite frequency range important for manual control, the modulus of the total system should be high (close to 1) and the phase should be small (close to zero) for the direct transformation and some of the cross-coupling relations, in order to simulate the aeroplane motions as realistically as possible. Hence, the OMCT is set up to evaluate the modulus and phase of the FSTD over the defined frequency range against this criterion.

1.13 The ideal FSTD would provide rotations and translations as they would occur in the aeroplane. However, due to the limitations of the motion platform, this is physically not possible. As a result, FSTD translations and rotations are used in a mixed manner to create the effect of both aeroplane rotations and translations. From the motion stimulation and pilot perception point of view, the following frequency responses have been defined as being of direct importance for the OMCT:

- a) FSTD rotational response due to aeroplane pure rotational manoeuvres;
- b) FSTD specific force response due to aeroplane pure translational manoeuvres;
- c) FSTD rotational accelerations due to aeroplane pure translational manoeuvres; and
- d) FSTD translational response due to aeroplane pure rotational manoeuvres.

1.14 The first two relations are of direct importance for the correct simulation of motions. In the frequency range of importance to manual flying, these require a high gain with respect to the aeroplane motions, and a small phase distortion. The other two relations (c and d) provide information about the cross-coupling of the FSTD motion response and may be used to create the illusion of the aeroplane environment.

#### **2. OBJECTIVE MOTION CUEING TEST (OMCT) PROCEDURE**

2.1 The OMCT is to be conducted in up to two configurations separately, representing the motion cueing algorithm settings on the ground, and again in flight. If these settings are not changed between ground and flight on the FSTD in question, a single set of tests is acceptable.

2.2 Measurement frequencies. The purpose of these tests is to determine the frequency response of the complete motion cueing system for the four relations described above. For these measurements, the frequencies of the input signals are given in Table F-1.

Note.— In Table F-1, the frequency given in Hertz is that corresponding to the frequency in rad/s and is only shown for reference.



### **Table F-1. Input test signal frequencies and required modulus and phase measurements**

2.2.1 The relationship between the frequency and corresponding modulus M and the corresponding phase φ defines the system frequency response. The OMCT requires that for each degree of freedom, measurements at 12 discrete frequencies are taken. It should be noted that as more experience is gained with this test for a specific application, the exact number of discrete frequencies required may change.

2.2.2 During the OMCT, for the measurements required, the individual degrees of freedom are excited independently for pitch, roll and yaw and modified inputs are given for the surge, sway and heave (described below). For each discrete input frequency defined in Table F-1, the measured relation in modulus and phase should be shown. This can be done manually (by measuring amplitude and phase on the resulting plots as shown in Figure F-3) or by using appropriate digital methods.



**Figure F-3. General definition of amplitudes of an output signal u and input signal i and time shift** ∆**t between u and i.**

2.2.3 Whereas Table F-1 describes the frequencies at which these measurements are to be performed, combinations of sinusoidal inputs may be used instead in order to reduce the testing time. If such a method is used, care should be taken to obtain the correct results.

2.2.4 Depending on the sampling frequency of the input sum of sinusoids and the output, a total run length of the input signal of 200 to 300 seconds will be needed.

2.2.5 The modulus M and phase  $\phi$  are defined as:

 $M(\omega)$  = amplitude of output  $u(\omega)$ /amplitude of input  $i(\omega)$ 

 $\phi$  (ω) =  $\Delta t$  ω 360 /  $2\pi$  [°]

Note.— A description of symbols and notations is provided in paragraph 8.

#### **3. INPUT AMPLITUDES**

3.1 A key goal of the MDA is to generate motion responses while maintaining the platform within its mechanical limits. In order to test the motion cueing system in the region important to manual control, the input amplitudes are defined.

3.2 The tests applied to the motion cueing system are intended to quantify its response to normal control inputs during manoeuvring (i.e. not aggressive or excessively hard control inputs) with linear response in order to maintain consistency. It is, however, necessary to excite the system in such a manner that the response is measured with a high signal-to-noise ratio and that the possible non-linear elements in the motion cueing system are not overly excited.

3.3 In order to carry out these tests, a specific test signal is entered into the motion cueing system using the OMCT signal generator as shown in Figure F-2. These test signals stimulate the motion cueing system in a way similar to the aeroplane model output in the FSTD. The test signal represents the aeroplane state variables

$$
\left(\phi_{a/c}, \theta_{a/c}, \text{ and } \psi_{a/c}, f^x_{a/c}, f^y_{a/c}, \text{ and } f^z_{a/c}\right).
$$

These variables should correspond to those normally applied in the particular motion cueing system. In other words, if the FSTD manufacturer uses the angular rates instead of attitudes, the corresponding input signals have to be generated.

3.3.1 Specific force input amplitudes. In the specific force channels, the input signal is defined by the following equation, using the amplitudes A given in Table F-2:

$$
f_{a/c}^{x,y,z}(t) = A \sin{(\omega t)}.
$$

3.3.2 Rotational input amplitudes. For the rotational inputs, the relations between attitude, angular rate and angular acceleration are given in Table F-3, and the corresponding amplitudes in Table F-4. These equations are only valid for ω in rad/s. The tests may be carried out with attitude, angular rate or angular acceleration inputs, as long as the inputs are consistent with the MDA implemented in the FSTD.

Frequency signal number	Frequency [rad/s]	<b>Frequency [Hz]</b>	Amplitude A $[m/s^2]$
	0.100	$0.0159$ Hz	1.00
$\overline{2}$	0.158	$0.0251$ Hz	1.00
3	0.251	$0.0399$ Hz	1.00
$\overline{4}$	0.398	0.0633 Hz	1.00
5	0.631	$0.1004$ Hz	1.00
6	1.000	$0.1591$ Hz	1.00
7	1.585	$0.251$ Hz	1.00
8	2.512	$0.399$ Hz	1.00
9	3.981	0.633 Hz	1.00
10	6.310	1.004 Hz	1.00
11	10.000	1.591 Hz	1.00
12 15.849		2.515 Hz	1.00

**Table F-2. Specific force input amplitudes** 



#### **Table F-3. Rotational input amplitudes**

**Table F-4. Rotational input amplitudes given by attitude, angular rate or acceleration** 

Frequency signal number	Frequency [rad/s]	<b>Frequency [Hz]</b>	<b>Attitude</b> Amplitude $A[^{\circ}]$	Angular rate amplitude A ω [ $\%$ ]	Angular acceleration amplitude A $\omega^2$ [% <sup>2</sup> ]
1	0.100	$0.0159$ Hz	6.000	0.600	0.060
$\overline{2}$	0.158	$0.0251$ Hz	6.000	0.948	0.150
3	0.251	0.0399 Hz	3.984	1.000	0.251
4	0.398	$0.0633$ Hz	2.513	1.000	0.398
5	0.631	$0.1004$ Hz	1.585	1.000	0.631
6	1.000	$0.1591$ Hz	1.000	1.000	1.000
7	1.585	$0.251$ Hz	0.631	1.000	1.585
8	2.512	$0.399$ Hz	0.398	1.000	2.512
9	3.981	$0.633$ Hz	0.251	1.000	3.981
10	6.310	1.004 Hz	0.158	1.000	6.310
11	10.000	1.591 Hz	0.100	1.000	10.000
12	15.849	$2.515$ Hz	0.040	0.631	10.000

#### **4. OMCT TEST MATRIX**

The OMCT requires the frequency response to be measured for the motion cueing system from the pilot reference position in the aeroplane  $F_{PA}$  to the pilot reference position in the FSTD  $F_{PS}$  for the transformations defined in Table F-5. Six independent tests (one for each aeroplane input signal) should be performed. Tests 1 and 2, tests 3 and 4, tests 6 and 7, and tests 8 and 9 are to be conducted with one input signal while measuring two output responses, simultaneously. The reason for this is to measure both the direct responses and cross-coupling responses in one test.

#### **5. OMCT TEST DESCRIPTION**

5.1 The frequency responses describe the relations between aeroplane motions and FSTD motions as defined in Table F-5. The relations are explained below per individual test.



5.2 Tests 1, 3, 5, 6, 8 and 10 show the direct transfer relations, while tests 2, 4, 7 and 9 show the crosscoupling relations.



#### **Table F-5. Test matrix with test numbers**

#### **6. PRESENTATION OF RESULTS**

6.1 The results should be presented for each of the OMCT tests defined in Table F-5, and at each frequency defined in Table F-1, in terms of the modulus and the phase. Ten tables should be presented as described in section 5 above. The results should also be plotted for each component in the test matrix, in bode plots with the modulus and the phase along the vertical axis and the frequency in rad/s along the horizontal axis (see Figure F-4). The modulus and phase tolerance boundaries for all ten tests are presented in Tables F-6 to F-15. These tolerance boundaries were derived from the motion cueing systems of eight FSTDs from several of the leading FSTD manufacturers and the consideration in 6.2 below.





6.2 As these tests show the additional modulus and phase introduced by the FSTD motion cueing system, the criterion on which the OMCT is based stipulates that it is important to achieve a relatively high modulus and a relatively low phase for tests 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10. Tests 2 and 4 define undesired motions and should have relatively low moduli. Note that when the modulus is low, phase errors are correspondingly less significant.

6.3 Regions of acceptable fidelity are given in Tables F-6 to F-15 for the in-flight conditions as maximum and minimum allowable modulus and phase of the frequency response. The motion cueing systems should lie within the maximum and minimum fidelity tolerance boundaries.

6.4 Tolerance tables for on-ground conditions have not yet been determined and will be provided in future revisions of this document.

6.5 From the above description of the OMCT, it is clear that the results describe the motion cueing system dynamic characteristics between  $F_{PA}$  and  $F_{PS}$  in the frequency domain. For correct simulation of the aeroplane motions at the pilot position in the aeroplane (which is the input to the motion cueing system), it is important that the calculation of the specific forces at pilot reference position  $F_{PA}$  is performed correctly.

## **7. MOTION CUEING CRITERIA**

7.1 The motion cueing criteria are defined in the frequency domain by indicating areas for fidelity and low fidelity. The boundaries are based on the notion that preferably the motion cueing has a high gain and small phase to present motion cues to the pilot as close as possible to those in the real aeroplane. This is, however, not always practical. Therefore, a practical approach has been used based on the statistical results of reliable OMCT measurements of eight Level D or Type VII FSTDs. The boundaries are based on the average behaviour ±2 times the standard deviations for each test defining the boundaries for high fidelity and low fidelity areas (see Figure F-5 where the high fidelity area is labelled "fidelity"). The boundaries for the phase angles of Tests 2 and 4 may be considered as an indication for possible errors in the frequency responses but have no significant meaning for the motion cueing where the modulus for these tests is already small.



**Figure F-5. Example of bode plots with the boundaries for the OMCT modulus and phase for fidelity.**

7.2 In Tables F-6 to F-15, the boundaries for the modulus and phase for each test are presented with high fidelity between the values in the columns "maximum" and "minimum" and low fidelity outside the values in these columns.



### **Table F-6. The boundaries for fidelity for the modulus and phase of the frequency response for Test 1**

## **Table F-7. The boundaries for fidelity for the modulus and phase of the frequency response for Test 2**





## **Table F-8. The boundaries for fidelity for the modulus and phase of the frequency response for Test 3**

**Table F-9. The boundaries for fidelity for the modulus and phase of the frequency response for Test 4** 

	Modulus $[m]^{\circ}$ ]		Phase [°]	
Frequency [rad/s]	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Minimum</b>
0.1000	0.1800	0.0001	290.00	70.00
0.1585	0.1800	0.0001	263.00	44.00
0.2512	0.1800	0.0001	236.00	18.00
0.3981	0.1800	0.0001	209.00	$-8.00$
0.6310	0.1800	0.0001	182.00	$-34.00$
1.0000	0.0895	0.0001	155.00	$-60.00$
1.5850	0.0447	0.0001	128.00	$-86.00$
2.5120	0.0221	0.0001	101.00	$-112.00$
3.9810	0.0110	0.0001	74.00	$-138.00$
6.3100	0.0110	0.0001	47.00	$-164.00$
10.0000	0.0110	0.0001	20.00	$-190.00$
15.8490	0.0110	0.0001	$-7.00$	$-216.00$



## **Table F-10. The boundaries for fidelity for the modulus and phase of the frequency response for Test 5**

**Table F-11. The boundaries for fidelity for the modulus and phase of the frequency response for Test 6** 

	<b>Modulus</b>		Phase [°]	
Frequency [rad/s]	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Minimum</b>
0.1000	1.0000	0.4983	0.000	$-6.728$
0.1585	1.0000	0.5571	0.000	$-9.993$
0.2512	1.0000	0.5464	0.000	$-16.133$
0.3981	1.0000	0.4905	0.000	-33.732
0.6310	1.0000	0.3581	2.116	$-62.645$
1.0000	1.0000	0.1000	6.427	$-97.015$
1.5850	1.0000	0.1000	88.567	$-189.130$
2.5120	1.0000	0.1294	172.898	$-155.592$
3.9810	1.0000	0.1626	135.606	-87.596
6.3100	1.0000	0.1609	86.135	$-86.752$
10.0000	1.0000	0.1206	63.372	$-110.460$
15.8490	1.1115	0.0564	53.757	$-151.068$





## **Table F-12. The boundaries for fidelity for the modulus and phase of the frequency response for Test 7**

**Table F-13. The boundaries for fidelity for the modulus and phase of the frequency response for Test 8** 

	<b>Modulus</b>		Phase [°]	
Frequency [rad/s]	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Minimum</b>
0.1000	1.0000	0.3103	0.000	$-8.465$
0.1585	1.0961	0.3355	0.000	$-12.366$
0.2512	1.0979	0.3144	0.000	$-19.548$
0.3981	1.0988	0.2631	0.000	$-30.681$
0.6310	1.0882	0.1724	0.000	$-48.655$
1.0000	1.0532	0.0400	27.399	$-83.909$
1.5850	1.0000	0.0627	102.943	$-148.567$
2.5120	1.0000	0.1200	135.772	$-150.148$
3.9810	1.0000	0.3247	117.522	$-99.978$
6.3100	1.0000	0.4448	62.714	$-51.655$
10.0000	1.0000	0.3429	42.305	$-79.292$
15.8490	1.0368	0.1885	30.545	$-122.581$



### **Table F-14. The boundaries for fidelity for the modulus and phase of the frequency response for Test 9**

**Table F-15. The boundaries for fidelity for the modulus and phase of the frequency response for Test 10** 

	<b>Modulus</b>		Phase $\lceil \degree \rceil$	
Frequency [rad/s]	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Minimum</b>
0.1000	1.0000			0.000
0.1585	1.0000	0.0001	280.382	0.000
0.2512	1.0000	0.0003	260.530	0.000
0.3981	1.0000	0.0013	238.435	0.000
0.6310	1.0000	0.0041	213.109	0.000
1.0000	1.0000	0.0111	185.979	0.000
1.5850	1.0000	0.0246	154.825	0.000
2.5120	1.0000	0.0447	123.413	0.000
3.9810	1.0000	0.0755	94.706	0.000
6.3100	1.0000	0.1301	68.148	0.000
10.0000	1.0000	0.2043	40.922	$-21.483$
15.8490	1.0000	0.2867	10.539	$-50.328$

#### **8. NOTATIONS AND FRAMES OF REFERENCE**





## 8.3 **Superscript indices**

x, y, z along the X, Y, and Z axis, respectively.

#### 8.4 **Frames of reference**

In order to ensure that the results are consistent between FSTDs, the following frames of reference are defined.

#### **Frame**  $F<sub>D</sub>$

Reference frame  $F_D$  is located with its origin at the centre of the motion measurement system that may be used in these tests. The x-axis points forward, and the z-axis points downward. The x-y plane is parallel to the upper FSTD frame which will be assumed to be parallel to the floor of the cockpit. Note that  $F_D$  is not explicitly shown in Figure F-6.

#### **Frame F<sup>I</sup>**

The inertial reference frame  $F<sub>l</sub>$  is fixed to the ground with the z-direction aligned with the gravity vector g. This frame is often used in the MDA.

### **Frame**  $F_s$

The FSTD reference frame  $F_S$  has its origin at a reference point selected to suit the manufacturer's MDA. It is attached to the FSTD cab and is parallel to frame  $F_D$ . Its origin may be coincident with  $F_D$ .

#### **Frame F<sup>A</sup>**

The aeroplane reference frame  $F_A$  has its origin at the aeroplane centre of gravity. Frame  $F_A$  has the same orientation with respect to the flight deck as the FSTD frame  $F_S$ .

#### **Frame**  $F_{PS}$

This is a reference frame attached to the FSTD in the plane of symmetry of the cab, at a height approximately 35 cm below eye height. The x-axis points forward, and the z-axis points downward.  $F_{PS}$  is parallel to  $F_{D}$ .

#### **Frame FPA**

This is the same as  $F_{PS}$ , but for the aeroplane pilots.



**Figure F-6. Aeroplane and FSTD frames of reference relevant to MDAs.** 

 $\mathcal{L}=\{1,2,3,4,5\}$ 

## **Attachment G**

## **TRANSPORT DELAY AND LATENCY TESTING**

#### **1. BACKGROUND**

1.1 The purpose of this attachment is to provide guidance on the methods for conducting transport delay and latency tests.

1.2 The transport delay test has become the primary method for determining the delay introduced into the FSTD due to the time taken for the computations through the FSTD controls, host, motion and visual computer modules. The transport delay test is not dependent upon flight test data but may require avionics computer and instrument data from the data supplier for some cases described below.

1.3 The latency test is a second method that remains acceptable as an alternate means of compliance. Figure G-1 presents the principal of transport delay and latency testing.



**Figure G-1. Transport delay and latency testing** 

## **2. TRANSPORT DELAY**

2.1 Purpose. This attachment describes how the transport delay introduced through the FSTD system should be measured and demonstrated to not exceed a specified duration. It is not the intention of the transport delay test to arrive at a comparison with the aeroplane but rather to demonstrate acceptable performance of the simulation at initial qualification, and then to be used as a non-regression test for the software architecture at each recurrent qualification. The transport delay needs to be measured from the control inputs through the interface, through each of the host computer modules and back through the interface to motion, flight instrument and visual systems, and shown to be no more than the tolerances required in the validation test tables.

2.2 In all cases, the simulation will have been demonstrated to be dynamically equivalent to the aeroplane in terms of response by the many dynamic tests in the QTG as well as the subjective handling tests, both for short-term and long-term modes. It is, therefore, only necessary to measure the maximum increased time added by the various interfaces and computing elements in the FSTD that are not present in the aeroplane. To do this, a signal is processed through the entire system from the input to the first interface from the control column or stick, through each subsequent computing element or interface and back out to the physical feedback to the pilot, via the motion system, visual system or cockpit instruments. To make this signal more traceable, a handshaking method may be used from element to element such that a clear leading edge is visible at any point through the system. However, it should be noted that the signal needs to be passed through each element of the software and hardware architectures and that the simulation should be running in its normal mode with all software elements active. This is to ensure that the test may be re-run at subsequent re-qualifications to check that software modifications have not modified the overall path length. A full description of the method chosen and the path of the signal, as well as the input and recording points, should be provided.

2.3 The test result analysis requires only that the input and output signals be measured to be separated by no more than 100/200 ms for the motion and instruments and 120/200 ms for the visual system, according to the type of FSTD. The point of movement will be very simple to determine since both input and output signals will have clear leading edges.

2.4 Non-computer-controlled aeroplanes. In the case of classic, non-computer-controlled aeroplanes, no further analysis will be necessary.

2.5 Computer-controlled aeroplanes. For FSTDs of aeroplanes with electronic elements in the path between input from the pilot and resulting output, the measured transport delay will obviously include elements of the aeroplane itself. These may include flight control systems avionics or display systems. Since the intention of the transport delay test is to measure only the time specific to the FSTD and not that of the aeroplane, the test result time should be offset by the throughput time of the avionics elements. This throughput time should be based on data from the manufacturer of the aeroplane or avionics. Alternatively, the aeroplane equipment may be bypassed, provided that the signal path is maintained in terms of FSTD interfaces. A schematic diagram should be provided to present that part of the aeroplane equipment being considered in this manner, and the way in which the signal path has been treated to be representative of all the simulation elements (see Figure G-2).

2.5.1 For FSTDs on which the avionics elements in question are replaced by re-hosted, re-targeted or other similar solutions, it is still necessary to offset the test result by the equivalent time of the aeroplane elements. However, the schematic diagram should in this case demonstrate the equivalence of the simulated avionics to the real avionics in terms of architecture. It is the responsibility of the developer of the re-hosted, re-targeted, or other similar solution to establish the equivalence of the simulated element to the aeroplane element being replaced.

2.5.2 For cases of computer-controlled aeroplanes where it can be established that the data path to the instrumentation in the aeroplane is subject to computer and data bus asynchronism, uncertainty or "jitter" of a similar order of magnitude to the transport delay allowance, a statement of compliance (SOC) will suffice in place of an actual test. This optional SOC should establish the equivalence of the simulated solution to that of the aeroplane and provide a rationale regarding the statistical uncertainty. In this case, the need for the objective test 6.a.1 for pitch, roll and yaw may be waived.

2.6 Interpretation of results. It is normal that FSTD results vary over time from test to test. This can easily be explained by a simple factor called "sampling uncertainty". FSTDs may run at a specific rate with all modules executed sequentially in one or more host processors. The flight controls input can occur at any time in the iteration, but these data will not be processed before the start of the new iteration. For an FSTD running at 60 Hz, a worst-case difference of 16.67 ms could be expected. Where multiple parallel processors or priority based execution systems are used, the scatter may be greater. Moreover, in some conditions, the host FSTD and the visual system do not run at the same iteration rate, therefore the output of the host computer to the visual will not always be synchronized.

2.7 **When offsetting the measured results by the throughput time of the avionics elements, it is also necessary to recognize that digital equipment will normally give a range of response times dependent upon the synchronization of the control input with the internal equipment frame time. The aeroplane or avionics manufacturer should quantify the range of results that should be expected by providing minimum and maximum response times, as well as an indication of the statistical spread in this range. It may be necessary to run the test several times on the FSTD to demonstrate the correctness of the avionics simulation in these conditions.** 

2.8 Recorded signals. The signals recorded to conduct the transport delay calculations should be explained on the schematic block diagram. An explanation of why each signal was selected, and how it relates to the descriptions above, should also be provided.

2.9 Visual system modes. The transport delay test should account for both daylight and night modes of operation of the visual system. In both cases, the tolerance is as required in the validation test tables, and motion response needs to occur before the end of the first video scan containing new information. Where it can be demonstrated that the visual system operates at the same execution rate for both day and night modes, a single test in each axis is sufficient, backed up by a supporting statement.

## **3. LATENCY**

3.1 The purpose of this section is to provide guidance on how FSTD latency tests should be conducted and how measurements should be taken. The description below is for the classic non-computer-controlled aeroplane.

3.2 Nine latency tests are required. Tests are required in roll, pitch and yaw axes for the take-off, cruise and approach or landing configurations. The tolerances employed are the same as those specified for the transport delay tests. Flight test data are required to support these tests.

3.3 The objective of the test is to compare the recorded response of the FSTD to that of the actual aeroplane data in the take-off, cruise and approach or landing configuration for abrupt pilot control inputs in all three rotational axes. The intent is to verify that the FSTD system response time beyond the aeroplane response time (as per the manufacturer's data) does not exceed the tolerances required in the validation test tables and that the motion and visual cues relate to actual aeroplane responses. To determine aeroplane response time, acceleration in the appropriate corresponding rotational axis is preferred.

3.4 Because the test tolerance is a small time value measured in ms, it is essential that aeroplane and FSTD responses be measured accurately to enable a meaningful test result.

### 3.5 Aeroplane response time

3.5.1 This test is a timing check of the motion, visual system and cockpit instruments to check the computational delay of the FSTD computer architecture. As aeroplane data are employed as the benchmark, it is necessary to establish the aeroplane response time for each test case to enable the FSTD response time to be isolated.

3.5.2 It is difficult to establish when the aeroplane will have first moved as the result of the pilot control input in the selected axis, as the control input is unlikely to have been a step input. In order to establish a clear methodology for determining the initial aeroplane movement for the purpose of this test, it has been necessary to define the initial movement as the point when the angular acceleration in the appropriate axis reaches 10 per cent of the maximum angular acceleration experienced. The elapsed time between the pilot control input and the aeroplane reaching 10 per cent of its maximum acceleration in ms should be used as the aeroplane response time.

3.6 FSTD response time — motion system. The FSTD response time for motion will be the elapsed time in ms between the pilot control input and the first discernible motion movement recorded by the accelerometers mounted on the motion platform. The latency for the motion system will be the FSTD response time (motion system) minus the aeroplane response time in ms. This time is subject to the test tolerance.

3.7 FSTD response time — visual system. The FSTD response time for visual system will be the elapsed time in ms between the pilot control input and the first discernible visual change measured as appropriate for the visual system. The latency for the visual system will be the FSTD response time (visual system) minus the aeroplane response time in ms. This time is subject to the test tolerance.

Note.— Visual system response time is measured to the beginning of the frame in which a change occurs.

3.8 FSTD response time - cockpit instrument. The FSTD response time for cockpit instrument will be the elapsed time in ms between the pilot control input and the first discernible change measured as appropriate on the selected cockpit instrument. The latency for the cockpit instrument will be the FSTD response time (cockpit instrument) minus the aeroplane response time in ms. This time is subject to the test tolerance.

3.9 Computer-controlled aeroplanes and other special cases. Guidance already provided above for the transport delay tests for computer-controlled aeroplanes and other special cases can be applied to the latency tests.



**Figure G-2. Transport delay with avionics elements** 

 $\mathcal{L}=\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  , where  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ 

## **Attachment H**

## **RECURRENT EVALUATIONS — PRESENTATION OF VALIDATION TEST DATA**

## **1. BACKGROUND**

1.1 During the initial evaluation of an FSTD the MQTG is created. This is the master document, as amended, to which FSTD recurrent evaluation test results are compared.

1.2 Chapter 2, Section 2.5 describes the process for evaluation of validation test results for both initial and recurrent evaluations. The process will vary depending on the fidelity level of the FSTD feature being evaluated. Establishment of the MQTG is an important step in preparation for subsequent recurrent evaluations. Where the fidelity level is S, the approved data remain the baseline for recurrent evaluations. Where fidelity levels are G or R, with possible exceptions for sound and motion (see 1.3.2 below), the MQTG is a record of the reference data standard established during the initial evaluation and is the baseline for subsequent recurrent evaluations.

1.3 The currently accepted method of presenting recurrent validation test results is to provide FSTD results overplotted with the approved data, MQTG results or reference data standard. Test results are carefully reviewed to determine if the test is within the Appendix B tolerances. This can be a time consuming process, particularly when the data exhibit rapid variations or for an apparent anomaly requiring engineering judgment in the application of the tolerances. In these cases, the solution is to compare the results to the MQTG, and if they are the same, the test is accepted. Both the FSTD operator and the CAA are looking for any variance in FSTD validation test results since initial qualification.

1.3.1 Where the fidelity level is R and S and small deviations from the MQTG are seen, the test result is acceptable if the test is within the Appendix B tolerances when measured against the approved data.

- 1.3.2 Where the fidelity level is R, for Type V sound and Type VII sound and motion only:
	- a) in cases where approved subjective development has not been used and small deviations from the MQTG results are seen, the test result may still be acceptable if the test is within the Appendix B tolerances when measured against the approved data; and
	- b) in cases where approved subjective development has been used, the test result will be acceptable if the test is within the Appendix B tolerances when measured against the MQTG or reference data standard.

1.3.3 Where the fidelity level is G, the test result will be acceptable if the test is within the Appendix B tolerances when measured against the MQTG or reference data standard.

## **2. PRESENTATION OF RECURRENT EVALUATION TEST RESULTS**

2.1 The method described below to present recurrent validation test results is offered solely to promote greater efficiency for FSTD operators while conducting recurrent FSTD validation testing. The efficiency gain arises from the ability to immediately identify, regardless of the experience of the individual conducting or assessing the test, any variance between the MQTG and recurrent validation test results. This method may only be practically used when the FSTD uses automatic testing, which is strongly recommended to demonstrate consistent repeatability of validation test results.

2.2 FSTD operators are encouraged to overplot recurrent validation test results with MQTG results or reference data standard. As every MQTG test result is essentially a "foot-print" test for the FSTD, any variance in a validation test result will be readily apparent. A variance occurring in an established FSTD is probable indication of change. Unless there has been a software modification or hardware change, the variance may indicate hardware wear or some other drift or degradation issue. A consistent recurrent validation test result that differs from the MQTG for a new FSTD may indicate the MQTG test is at fault and should be updated. This should normally only occur during the first recurrent evaluation(s).

2.3 The FSTD operator should have the capability to overplot the recurrent result against the approved data, MQTG results or reference data standard. Plotting capability should be available for both automatic (if applicable) and manual validation test results.

2.4 For all FSTD types, any variations between recurrent evaluation test results and MQTG test results or reference data standard are a probable indication of change. Investigation of any variance between the MQTG and recurrent FSTD performance should be conducted, particularly if these variations exceed tolerances explained above and if they cannot easily be explained, but this is left to the discretion of the FSTD operator and the CAA.

 $\mathcal{L}=\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  , where  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  , we have the set of  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ 

## **Attachment I**

# **GUIDANCE ON DESIGN AND QUALIFICATION OF NON-TYPE-SPECIFIC FSTDs**

## **1. BACKGROUND**

Unlike type-specific FSTDs, non-type-specific FSTDs are intended to be representative of a group or class of aeroplanes. In other industry documents, the expression "generic device" has normally been used to designate such non-typespecific devices. However, in this attachment, the expression "generic device" has been replaced by "non-type-specific" to preclude confusion with the simulation feature fidelity G. It further reduces the implication that non-type-specific FSTDs are exclusively linked to G simulation feature fidelity levels as they could include R or even S fidelity levels of another aeroplane type than the main one of interest for the training programme. The guidance given in this attachment is applicable to the standard ICAO Type I to IV device categories, as defined in Chapter 2, Table 2-1.

## **2. DESIGN STANDARDS**

## 2.1 Simulated aeroplane configuration

2.1.1 The configuration chosen should sensibly represent the aeroplane or aeroplanes likely to be used in the training programme. Areas such as general layout, seating, instruments and avionics, control type, control force and position, performance and handling, and engine configuration should be representative of the class of aeroplane or the aeroplane itself.

2.1.2 It would be in the interest of all parties to engage in early discussions with the CAA to broadly agree a suitable configuration, the so-called "designated aeroplane configuration". Ideally any such discussion would take place in time to avoid any delays in the design/build/acceptance/qualification process thereby ensuring a smooth entry into service.

2.2 Flight deck. The flight deck should be representative of the designated aeroplane configuration. To ensure a good training environment, the flight deck should be sufficiently enclosed to minimize any distractions. The controls, instruments and avionics controllers should be representative with respect to touch, feel, layout, colour and lighting to create a positive learning environment and to allow for a good transfer of training to the aeroplane.

2.3 Flight deck components. As with any training device, the components used within the flight deck area do not need to be aeroplane parts. However, any parts used should be representative of typical training aeroplanes and should be robust enough to endure the training tasks. With the current state of technology, the use of simple flat display technology-based representations and touch-screen controls to represent objects other than basic push-button types of controls would not be acceptable. The training tasks envisaged for non-type-specific FSTDs are such that appropriate layout and feel is very important. For example, the altimeter sub-scale knob needs to be physically located on the altimeter. The use of flat display technologies with physical overlays incorporating operational switches/knobs/buttons replicating an aeroplane instrument panel may be acceptable.

### 2.4 Data package

2.4.1 The data for the aerodynamics model, flight controls and engines should be soundly based on the designated aeroplane configuration. It is not acceptable and would not support good training if the models merely represented a few key configurations bearing in mind the extent of the credits available.

2.4.2 Validation data may be derived from a specific aeroplane within the group of aeroplanes that the FSTD is intended to represent, or they may be based on information from several aeroplanes within that group, reflecting the designated aeroplane configuration. It is recommended that the intended validation data together with a substantiation report be submitted to the CAA for evaluation and approval prior to the commencement of the manufacturing process.

2.4.3 For validation tests with G fidelity requirements where the required tolerances are CT&M, validation data are not required. Rather, subjective testing of the FSTD will be used to produce a baseline (footprint) objective test result, against which the recurrent test result will be compared during recurrent evaluations. In this case, an engineering report should be provided. This report may include flight test data, manufacturer's design data, information from the flight manual and maintenance manuals, results of approved or commonly accepted simulations or predictive models, recognized theoretical results, information from the public domain, or other sources as deemed necessary by the FSTD manufacturer to substantiate the proposed model.

2.4.4 Data collection and model development. A basic requirement for any modelling is the integrity of the mathematical equations and models used to represent the flying qualities and performance of the designated aeroplane configuration being simulated. The models should be continuous and demonstrate the correct trend and magnitude throughout the required training flight envelope. Additional data to refine the non-type-specific model can be obtained from many sources, such as aeroplane design data, flight and maintenance manuals, observations on the ground and in flight, etc., without necessarily having to conduct expensive, dedicated flight testing. Data obtained on the ground and in flight can be measured and recorded using a range of simple means such as video cameras, paper and pencil, stopwatch and new technologies (e.g. GPS).

2.4.5 Any such data gathering should take place at representative masses and centres of gravity. Development of such a data package, including the justification and the rationale for the design and intended performance, the measurement methods and recorded parameters (e.g. mass, cg, atmospheric conditions), should be carefully documented and available for inspection by the CAA as part of the qualification process.

2.5 Flight controls. There can be a strong interaction between the flight control forces and the effects of both the engines and the aerodynamic configuration. For this reason an active force feedback cueing system in which forces vary not only with position but with configuration (speed, flaps, trim) will be necessary for the representative R fidelity level of the flight controls and forces simulation feature. For the representative R1 and generic G fidelity levels of the same simulation feature, a passive force cueing system utilizing springs would be acceptable. It should be emphasized that it is vitally important to prevent negative learning and that negative characteristics would not be acceptable.

## **3. VISUAL SYSTEM**

3.1 The emergence of lower-cost raster-only daylight systems is recognized for non-type-specific FSTDs. The adequacy of the performance of the visual system will be determined by its ability to support the intended training tasks, e.g. "visual cueing sufficient to support changes in approach path by using runway perspective".

3.2 For non-type-specific FSTDs, collimated visual optics are probably not necessary. A single-channel direct viewing system would probably be acceptable as no training credits for landing will be available. Distortions due to noncollimation would only become significant during on-ground or near-to-the-ground operations. The risk in using that approach is that, should the device be subsequently upgraded to conduct training for multi-crew operations, the noncollimated visual system may be unacceptable.

3.3 Where an FSTD does not simulate a particular aeroplane type, the design of the out-of-flight-deck view should be matched to the visual system so that the pilot has a FOV sufficient for the intended training tasks. For example, during an instrument approach, the pilot should be able to see the appropriate visual segment at decision height. Additionally, where the aeroplane deviates from the normal approach path, undue loss of visual reference should not occur during the subsequent correction.

#### **4. SYSTEM INTEGRITY**

4.1 For a non-type-specific FSTD, a transport delay test may be used to demonstrate that the FSTD system does not exceed the permissible delay. However, for such an FSTD using simple models, a statement of compliance may be acceptable in lieu of a test.

4.2 The maximum permissible transport delay and tests to determine compliance with this requirement may be found in Attachment G.

#### **5. TESTING/EVALUATION**

5.1 To ensure that an FSTD meets its design criteria initially and periodically throughout its life, a system of objective and subjective testing will be used.

5.2 The validation tests specified in Appendix B can be carried out by a suitably skilled person and the results recorded manually. Bearing in mind the cost implications, the use of automatic recording and testing increases the repeatability of the achieved results and is therefore encouraged.

5.3 The tolerances specified in Appendix B are designed to ensure that the FSTD meets its original target criteria year after year. It is therefore important that such target data are carefully derived and values are agreed with the appropriate CAA in advance of any formal qualification process. For initial qualification, it is highly desirable that the FSTD meet its design criteria within the listed tolerances. However, unlike the tolerances stipulated for type-specific devices, the tolerances stated for non-type-specific FSTDs are purposely intended to be used to ensure repeatability during the life of the FSTD and in particular at each recurrent evaluation.

5.4 A number of tests within the QTG have had their tolerances reduced to CT&M thereby avoiding the need for specific validation data. The use of CT&M is not to be taken as an indication that certain areas of simulation can be ignored. For such tests, the performance of the FSTD should be appropriate and representative of the aeroplane being simulated and should under no circumstances exhibit negative characteristics. Where CT&M is used as a tolerance, it is strongly recommended that an automatic recording system be used to produce footprint tests thereby avoiding the effects of possible divergent subjective opinions during recurrent evaluations.

5.5 Longitudinal change force tests. For the Type II and IV devices, it is acceptable to use change force tests instead of the longitudinal power, flap and gear change dynamics tests. The purpose of these change force tests is to simply reproduce the control force feeling during recurrent evaluations. However, if automatic testing is used, a change dynamics test is equally acceptable. If not otherwise stated, these tests should be conducted in the following way:

- a) trim the aeroplane in straight and level flight in the most suitable configuration;
- b) initiate the configuration change (power, flap or gear change);
- c) maintain the airspeed constant using the pitch control (or as an alternate procedure, maintain the altitude of the original trimmed conditions); and
- d) measure the required pitch control force change.
- 5.6 The subjective tests listed in Appendix C should be carried out by a suitably qualified and experienced pilot.

 $\mathcal{L}=\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  , where  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ 

## **Attachment J**

## **APPLICABILITY OF CAA REGULATION AMENDMENTS TO FSTD DATA PACKAGES FOR EXISTING AEROPLANES**

### **1. GENERAL POLICY**

1.1 Except where specifically indicated otherwise within the table of FSTD validation tests in Appendix B, validation data for QTG objective tests are expected to be derived from aeroplane flight tests.

1.2 Ideally, data packages for all new FSTDs will fully comply with the current standards for qualifying FSTDs.

1.3 For types of aeroplanes first entering into service after the publication of an amendment of the CAA regulations, the provision of acceptable data to support the FSTD qualification process is a matter of planning and regulatory agreement (see Attachment A).

1.4 For aeroplanes type-certificated prior to the applicability of a new amendment of CAA regulations, it may not always be possible to provide the required data for any revised or additional objective test cases compared to the previous amendments of the regulations. After prototype certification, manufacturers do not normally keep flight test aeroplanes available with the required instrumentation to gather additional data. In the case of flight test data gathered by independent data providers, it is most unlikely that the test aeroplane will still be available.

1.5 Notwithstanding the above discussion, the preferred source of validation data is flight test, though other types of data may be acceptable (see, for example, Attachment B). It is expected that best endeavours will be made by data suppliers to provide the required flight test data. If any flight test data exist that address the requirement (collected during the certification or any other flight test campaign), such test data should be provided. If any possibility exists to obtain these flight test data during the occasion of a new flight test campaign, this should be done and provided in the data package at the next issue. Where flight test data are genuinely not available, alternative sources of data may be acceptable using the following hierarchy of preferences:

- a) flight test at an alternate but near-equivalent condition/configuration substantiated by one or more rationale(s) to explain the choice;
- b) data from an audited engineering simulation from an acceptable source (for example, meeting the guidelines laid out in Attachment B), or as used for aeroplane certification;
- c) aeroplane performance data published by the aeroplane manufacturer in documents such as the aeroplane flight manual, operations manual, performance engineering manual or equivalent, or other approved published sources (e.g. production flight test schedule) for the following tests:
	- 1) 1.c (1) normal climb all engines operating;
	- 2) 1.c (2) one-engine-inoperative 2nd segment climb;
	- 3) 1.c (3) one-engine-inoperative en-route climb;
- 4) 1.c (4) one-engine-inoperative approach climb for aeroplanes with icing accountability;
- 5) 1.e (3) stopping distance, wheel brakes, wet runway; and
- 6) 1.e (4) stopping distance, wheel brakes, icy runway; and
- d) where no other data are available, then the following sources may be acceptable subject to a case-bycase review with the CAA concerned, taking into consideration the level of qualification sought for the FSTD:
	- 1) unpublished but acceptable sources (e.g. calculations, simulations); or
	- 2) footprint test data from the actual FSTD undergoing qualification, validated by pilot subjective assessment.

1.6 In certain cases, it may make good engineering sense to provide more than one test to support a particular objective test requirement. An example might be a  $V_{\text{mag}}$  test, where the flight test engine and thrust profile do not match the simulated engine. The  $V_{mag}$  test could be run twice, once with the flight test thrust profile as an input and a second time with a fully integrated response to a fuel cut on the simulated engine.

1.7 For aeroplanes type-certificated prior to the date of applicability of an amendment to the CAA regulations, an FSTD operator may, after reasonable attempts have failed to obtain suitable flight test data, indicate in the MQTG where flight test data are unavailable or unsuitable for a specific test. For each case, where the preferred data are not available, a rationale should be provided laying out the reasons for the non-compliance and justifying the alternate data/test(s) used.

1.8 These rationales should be clearly recorded within the validation data roadmap (VDR) in accordance with and as defined in Attachment D.

1.9 It should be recognized that there may come a time when there is so little compatible flight test data available that new flight test data may be required to be gathered.

#### **2. RECOMMENDATION FOR THE USE OF FOOTPRINT TESTS**

2.1 Only when all other alternative possible sources of data have been thoroughly sought without success may a footprint test be acceptable, subject to a case-by-case review with the CAA concerned taking into consideration the level of qualification sought for the FSTD.

- 2.2 Footprint test data should be:
	- a) constructed with initial conditions and the FSTD being set up in the configuration required for the required data (e.g. correct engine thrust rating);
	- b) a manoeuvre representative of the particular aeroplane being simulated;
	- c) based on a footprint test manoeuvre manually flown by a type-rated pilot (see note below) who is current on type and approved by the CAA;
	- d) constructed from validation data obtained from the footprint test manoeuvre and transformed into an automatic test;
- e) used in an automatic test run as a fully integrated test with pilot input controls;
- f) automatically run for the initial qualification and recurrent evaluation supplemented, whenever possible, with flight test data which will further substantiate the intended purpose and key aspects of the test being presented; and
- g) supplemented, whenever possible, with flight test data which will further substantiate the intended purpose and key aspects of the test being presented.

Note.— The pilot flying the manoeuvre should sign off the complete test as being fully representative.

2.3 A clear rationale should be included in the QTG for each footprint test. These rationales should be added to and clearly recorded within the VDR in accordance with and as defined in Attachment D.

2.4 Where the number of footprint tests is deemed by the CAA to be excessive, the FSTD level of qualification may be affected and lowered. The CAA should review each area of validation test data that proposes the use of footprint tests as the basis for the validation data. Consideration should be given to the extent to which footprint tests are used in any given area. For example, it would be unacceptable if all or the vast majority of take-off tests were proposed as footprint tests, with little or no flight test data being presented. It should be recognized, therefore, that it may be necessary for new flight test data to be gathered if the use of footprint tests becomes excessive, not just overall, but also in specific areas.

2.5 For recurrent evaluation purposes a close match is to be expected (see Attachment H). Validation tests using footprint data, which do not meet the test criteria, should be addressed to the satisfaction of the CAA.

 $\mathcal{L}=\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  , where  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  , we have the set of  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ 

2.6 The CAA should be consulted well in advance of the QTG submission if footprint tests are to be used.

## **Attachment K**

## **GUIDANCE FOR THE QUALIFICATION OF AN FSTD HEAD-UP DISPLAY (HUD)**

## **1. APPLICABILITY**

1.1 This procedure applies to all FSTDs with a head-up display (HUD) installation.

1.2 For the purposes of this attachment, "HUD" will be used as a generic term for any alternative aeroplane instrument system which displays information to a pilot through a combiner glass in the normal "out-the-window" view.

1.3 This attachment details one means to evaluate and qualify an FSTD HUD system. If an FSTD operator desires to use other means, a proposal should be submitted to the CAA for review and approval.

1.4 QTGs for new, updated or upgraded FSTDs incorporating a HUD system should contain a HUD statement of compliance (SOC). The SOC should be an attestation that HUD hardware and software, including associated displays, function the same way as that installed in the aeroplane. A block diagram describing the input and output signal flow and comparing it to the aeroplane configuration should support this SOC.

## **2. FSTD/HUD STANDARDS**

2.1 Whether the HUD system is an actual aeroplane system or is software simulated, the system should be shown to perform its intended function for each operation and phase of flight.

2.2 An active display (repeater) of all parameters displayed on the pilot's combiner should be located on the instructor operating station (IOS), or at another location approved by the CAA. Display format of the repeater should replicate that of the combiner.

## **3. OBJECTIVE TESTING**

3.1 Static calibration tests should be included for HUD attitude alignment in the QTG. These tests may be combined with the alignment tests for the FSTD visual system. For additional information, see Appendix B.

3.2 HUD systems that are software simulated (not being an actual aeroplane system) should include latency/throughput tests in all three axes. The HUD system display should be within 100 ms of the control input.

### **4. SUBJECTIVE TESTING**

4.1 The CAA evaluator should evaluate accurate replication of HUD functions.

4.2 The ground and flight tests that should be conducted for the qualification of HUD systems are listed below and may be combined with subjective manoeuvres not dedicated to HUD testing. Only those phases of flight for which the particular HUD system is authorized should be tested. The evaluation should be conducted using daylight, dusk and night conditions.

- a) pre-flight inspection of the HUD system;
- b) taxi:
	- 1) HUD taxi guidance;
	- 2) combiner horizon matches the visual horizon within the manufacturer's tolerance;
- c) take-off:
	- 1) normal take-off in visual meteorological conditions (centreline guidance if available);
	- 2) instrument take-off using the lowest RVR authorized for the particular HUD;
	- 3) engine-out take-off;
	- 4) maximum demonstrated crosswind take-off;
	- 5) wind shear during take-off;
- d) in-flight:
	- 1) climb;
	- 2) turns;
	- 3) cruise;
	- 4) descent;
- e) approaches:
	- 1) normal approach in visual meteorological conditions;
	- 2) ILS approach with a crosswind:
		- flight path vector should represent the inertial path of the aeroplane;
		- course indication matches the track over the ground;
		- HUD combiner should not excessively degrade the approach lights;
	- 3) engine-out approach and landing;
- 4) non-precision approach;
- 5) circling approach, if applicable;
- 6) missed approach normal and engine-out;
- 7) maximum demonstrated crosswind approach and landing;
- 8) wind shear on approach;
- f) malfunctions:
	- 1) malfunctions causing abnormal pre-flight tests;
	- 2) malfunctions logically associated with training during take-off and approach; and
	- 3) malfunctions associated with any approved flight manual abnormal procedures which are not included above.

4.3 Some HUD systems have been certified without emergency power backup. Therefore, they will blank out and effectively reboot if any temporary power loss occurs. This should be confirmed by checking the manufacturer's data.

 $\mathcal{L}=\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  , where  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  , we have the set of  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ 

## **Attachment L**

# **GUIDANCE FOR THE QUALIFICATION OF AN FSTD ENHANCED FLIGHT VISION SYSTEM (EFVS)**

## **1. APPLICABILITY**

1.1 This procedure applies to all FSTDs with an enhanced flight vision system (EFVS) installation and is in addition to the head-up display (HUD) requirements detailed in Attachment K.

1.2 For the purposes of this attachment, "EFVS" will be used as a generic term for any alternative aeroplane visual enhancement aid using imaging sensors, such as an infrared radiometer or a radar, which displays information to a pilot through a HUD combiner glass in the normal "out-the-window" view.

1.3 This attachment details one means to evaluate and qualify an FSTD EFVS system. If an FSTD operator desires to use other means, a proposal should be submitted to the CAA for review and approval.

1.4 QTGs for new, updated or upgraded FSTDs incorporating an EFVS system should contain an EFVS statement of compliance (SOC). The SOC should be an attestation that the EFVS hardware and software, including associated displays and annunciation, function in the same way or in an equivalent way to the system(s) installed in the aeroplane. A block diagram describing the input and output signal flow and comparing it to the aeroplane configuration should support this SOC.

## **2. FSTD/EFVS STANDARDS**

2.1 Whether the EFVS system is an actual aeroplane system or is software simulated, the system should be shown to perform its intended function for each operation and phase of flight.

- 2.2 The FSTD requirements for qualifying an EFVS system in an FSTD are:
	- a) the EFVS FSTD hardware/software, including associated flight deck displays and annunciation, should function in the same or in an equivalent way to the EFVS system installed in the aeroplane;
	- b) an active display (repeater) of the pilot's combiner should be located on the instructor operating station (IOS), or at another location approved by the CAA. It should include a duplicate display of the EFVS and HUD scene, as seen through the pilot's HUD combiner glass or the cockpit flight displays; and
	- c) a minimum of one aerodrome should be modelled for EFVS. That model should have an ILS and a non-precision approach (with VNAV if required by the AFM for that aeroplane type) available. In addition to EFVS modelling, the aerodrome model should meet all other applicable visual requirements for that device.

### **3. OBJECTIVE TESTING**

Both on-ground and flight tests are required for qualification. Computer-generated FSTD test results should be provided for each test. The FSTD test results should be recorded on appropriate media acceptable to the CAA. Time histories are required unless otherwise indicated. See Appendix B for the specific test requirements.

### **4. SUBJECTIVE TESTING**

4.1 Handling qualities, performance, and FSTD systems operation, while using the EFVS system, should be subjectively assessed.

4.2 The ground and flight tests and other checks required for qualification of the EFVS system are listed below. The evaluation should be conducted using daylight, dusk, and night conditions, daylight being the most difficult to simulate.

- a) pre-flight inspection of the EFVS system to include all EFVS warnings and annunciations;
- b) taxi:
	- 1) parallax caused by sensor position;
	- 2) ground hazards, especially other aeroplanes;
	- 3) signs may appear as a block (unreadable) due to the absence of temperature variation between the letters and the background, with an infrared sensor;
- c) take-off:
	- 1) normal take-off in night visual meteorological conditions;
	- 2) instrument take-off with visual system visibility set to enable an RVR of 180 m (600 ft);
- d) in flight:
	- 1) image horizon should be conformal with the visual and combiner horizons;
	- 2) visual meteorological conditions night or dusk scene; a thunderstorm should be detected out to a distance of at least 37 km (20 NM);
- e) approaches:
	- 1) normal approach in night visual meteorological conditions;
	- 2) ILS approach;
	- 3) non-precision approach;
	- 4) missed approach;

 Note.— Emphasis should be placed on the FSTD's capability to demonstrate that the EFVS system is able to display the required visual cues for the pilot to descend below the published decision
height (DH). The HUD should continue to provide glide path and alignment information between DH and touchdown. During landing roll-out, visual alignment information should be available to the pilot through the HUD.

- f) visual segment and landing:
	- 1) from non-precision approach;
	- 2) from precision approach;
- g) abnormal procedures:
	- 1) EFVS malfunctions on the ground; and
	- 2) EFVS malfunctions in the air.

4.3 Due to the uniqueness of this system and the normal FSTD environmental visual selections, the IOS should have pre-set weather conditions for EFVS operations. Recommended settings are such that EFVS "visual" reference can be attained at approximately 150 m (500 ft) AGL, at CAT I and EFVS authorized minima, and below minima to force a go-around.

 $\mathcal{L}=\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  , where  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  , we have the set of  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ 

### **Attachment M**

# **GUIDANCE FOR THE EVALUATION OF A FLIGHT PROCEDURES TRAINING DEVICE (FPTD)**

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 FSTD operators have used flight procedures training devices (FPTD), previously referred to as part task trainers, for many years as an integral part of their training programme. This attachment provides guidance on the evaluation of FPTDs and may be useful in assessing their acceptability for use in an air operator's approved training programme.

1.2 Some FPTDs have been used to acquire flight time training credits, while others have not. Those that provide flight time training credits have been qualified by the CAA. Within the context of this attachment, a flight time training credit is accredited time used to reduce required flight training time in the aeroplane or in a higher level FSTD. An FSTD operator considering an FPTD qualification should refer to Parts I and III and consult its CAA.

### **2. REQUIREMENTS**

2.1 An FPTD is an aeroplane type-specific device to be used to train for explicit tasks. It does not have to fly or have flight controls. It should have at least one system simulated. This device can range in complexity from very simple to very sophisticated, i.e. from a simple programming unit for an FMS control and display unit to a full size flight deck that replicates all auto-flight functions of the aeroplane. Flat panel trainers have significant utility in an FSTD operator's ground school programme and, particularly with some associated hardware, may also be useful as an FPTD within the air operator's approved training programme.

2.2 Table M-1 contains the minimum requirements for an FPTD. The first column in the table provides the requirement number from the table in Appendix A. There are no validation test requirements. The FPTD is meant to be evaluated through the applicable tests of Appendix C to Part III.

2.3 Table M-2 is a suggested method of recording the training and possible checking capability when using the FPTD. The table is generic and meant to cover most aeroplane types and systems. The FSTD operator is encouraged to modify the table to meet its needs by adding new events and/or deleting extraneous items. The recommended use of Table M-2 is for the FSTD operator to record all the intended training tasks in the table. During the FPTD evaluation, the CAA would accept or reject the use of the FPTD for each listed task. This will prevent wasting time in trying to determine every task that the FPTD could be capable of when the FSTD operator only intends to utilize the FPTD for a limited list of tasks.

2.4 Table M-3 is a suggested method to record the functionalities available in the instructor operating station to support the training tasks.

2.5 The information in the tables should be considered to be a "living document" allowing the FSTD operator to approach the CAA for changes.





### **Table M-1. FPTD requirements**

### Part II. Flight Simulation Training Device Criteria

Attachment M. Guidance for the evaluation of a flight procedures training device (FPTD) II-Att M-3





 Note.— The numbering of the first column of Table M-1 corresponds to the numbering of the relevant requirements listed in Appendix A.

### **Table M-2. Suggested list of training and checking tasks for an FPTD**

#### LEGEND

- N device is not suitable or not applicable to task.
- 1 suitable for procedural knowledge training.
- 2 suitable for skill training related to task (T).
- 3 suitable for manoeuvre training and checking for the task (TP).







### Part II. Flight Simulation Training Device Criteria

Attachment M. Guidance for the evaluation of a flight procedures training device (FPTD) II-Att M-7







### Part II. Flight Simulation Training Device Criteria

Attachment M. Guidance for the evaluation of a flight procedures training device (FPTD) II-Att M-9









\_

**Table M-3. Instructor operating station functions** 

### **Attachment N**

## **ALTERNATE REFERENCE LINE EVALUATION METHOD FOR FLIGHT CONTROL DYNAMICS EVALUATION**

### **1. BACKGROUND**

1.1 When evaluating a flight control dynamic response, the periods, amplitudes and residual band are defined with respect to a reference line, which is the steady state value of the control. This selection is made since it is assumed that the steady state value is representative of the control's rest position throughout the test. For standard irreversible control systems, this is very often a valid assumption. However, in the case of reversible control systems, for example, aerodynamic forces on the control surfaces influence the instantaneous rest position<sup>1</sup> of the control. During the dynamic test, the control's rest position will vary in response to the variance of the flight conditions. In such a case, the instantaneous rest position and steady state value at the end of the test are not equivalent. When the tolerances are applied to the entire dynamic response based on the steady state value, they may become incorrect and lead to problems evaluating the cases.

1.2 In such cases, an alternate reference line may be used, which attempts to better approximate the true rest position of the control throughout a step response. That reference line is obtained as described in section 2 below.

### **2. ALTERNATE REFERENCE LINE**

2.1 On the control position curve, identify median points, defined as points on the control position curve located equidistantly between two consecutive peaks, measured vertically (see Figure N-1). The last median point is the first point where the dynamic portion of the response has ended rather than the mid-point between the last peak and the end of the dynamic portion.

2.2 Join the median points to produce the "line of medians". Then, identify reference points, defined as the intersection of a vertical line passing through a position peak and the line of medians (see Figure N-2).

2.3 The first reference point is the last control position before the start of the excitation. When this part of the data is not available, project the first available reference point horizontally to time zero. The last reference point is simply the last median point.

2.4 Link all the reference points to obtain the alternate reference line (see Figure N-2), and append the final non-dynamic portion to it.

<sup>1.</sup> The rest position is defined as the position where the control would eventually settle if no pilot force were applied to it (left free). This position may or may not be affected by the aerodynamic conditions, the aeroplane configuration and the acceleration it is subjected to. It will depend on the type of flight control system in the aeroplane. Typically, reversible control systems will be affected while irreversible systems will not. The instantaneous rest position is defined as the theoretical rest position at a particular point in time and at the same conditions at that moment.



**Figure N-1. Locating median points** 



**Figure N-2. Producing the final alternate reference line** 

### **3. TOLERANCES**

The final alternate reference line (see Figure N-3) may be used to calculate the conventional tolerances described in Appendix B, paragraph 3.2.2.2. Note that the residual band  $T(A_d)$  should be at a distance of ±5 per cent of  $A_d$  or ±0.5 per cent of the total control travel (stop to stop) from the alternate reference line. Its shape will therefore follow the alternate reference line.



**Figure N-3. Tolerances applied using the alternate reference line** 

\_

# **Attachment O**

# **GUIDANCE FOR ENVIRONMENT — ATC**

1. It is recognized that the flight simulation and training industry is currently developing training requirements and applications to enhance the simulation of the ATC environment. The use of simulated ATC environment in training is still in the adoption, testing and refinement stages of its life cycle.

2. The features and requirements contained in Appendices A, B and C in Parts II and III of this manual concerning simulated ATC environment are not mandatory for either training approval or FSTD qualification at this time. The content of these appendices should be used as guidance to industry for the continued development and refinement of simulated ATC environment in FSTDs and other flight training tools. Further guidance material will be published in subsequent amendments to this manual when sufficient experience has been gathered and requirements further reviewed and matured by industry.

3. Primary efforts by industry should be aimed at delivering simulated ATC environment throughout the MPL and other ab initio flight training programmes, including initial TR. Once simulated ATC environment has been introduced and validated, the benefits will be highly advantageous to all subsequent advanced training.

4. Experience has already demonstrated that early exposure to the ATC environment, even prior to first FSTD training, would be of significant benefit to student pilots. Training organizations should give consideration to extending simulated ATC environment training using Flight Procedures Training Devices (FPTDs) and other mobile or classroom-based tools. Attachment M contains guidance for the evaluation of FPTDs.

5. Further information that may be of help to FSTD operators and vendors on simulated ATC environment is available in ARINC Report 439 (see Chapter 2, 2.3.3).

 $\mathcal{L}=\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  , where  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  , we have the set of  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ 

### **Attachment P**

# **FSTD QUALIFICATION GUIDANCE FOR UPSET RECOVERY/STALL/ICING MANOEUVRES**

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 This attachment consists of the supplemental guidance material that is recommended for use in the acceptable means of compliance to qualify an FSTD for the conduct of training in approach to stall manoeuvres, stall manoeuvres beyond the critical angle of attack (applicable only if required by the national regulations or elected by the FSTD operator), upset recovery manoeuvres and flight in engine or airframe icing conditions, as a complement to the FSTD requirements in Appendices A, B and C to Parts II and III.

1.2 Although consulted throughout the development of both Doc 10011 — Manual on Aeroplane Upset Prevention and Recovery Training and this manual, aeroplane original equipment manufacturers (OEMs) may at some point develop differing guidance regarding recovery techniques to address these areas of training. In such instances, OEM guidance should take precedence over recommendations contained within these manuals.

### **2. STALL MANOEUVRE EVALUATION**

2.1 Fidelity requirements. The objective testing requirements as defined for the stall manoeuvre are intended to validate:

- a) aeroplane type-specific recognition cues of the first indication of the stall (such as stall warning system and/or aerodynamic stall buffet);
- b) aeroplane type-specific recognition cues of an impending aerodynamic stall; and
- c) recognition cues and handling qualities from the stall break through recovery that are sufficiently exemplar of the aeroplane being simulated to allow successful completion of the stall entry and recovery training tasks, as may be prescribed in national regulations.

For the purposes of stall manoeuvre evaluation, the term "exemplar" is defined as a level of fidelity that is type-specific of the aeroplane being simulated to the extent that the training objectives can be satisfactorily accomplished.

2.2 Statement of compliance (SOC). Traditionally, flight test collected data have been the preferred data source for FSTD objective evaluation required for qualification. It is recognized, however, that strict time-history-based evaluation against flight test data may not adequately validate the aerodynamics model in an unstable flight regime, such as stalled flight, particularly in cases where significant deviations are seen in the aeroplane's stability and control. As a result, the SOC-based approach for evaluating the aerodynamics model at angles of attack approaching the stall was implemented to allow for the aerodynamics modeller and data provider to develop enhanced exemplar stall models which are based upon generally accepted engineering and scientific principles. Examples may include:

a) stall models developed using the aeroplane OEM's engineering simulation;

- b) wind tunnel or established analytical methods to extend stall modelling sufficiently to achieve an exemplar full stall and recovery; and
- c) expert input from a pilot who has full-stall experience in the aeroplane being simulated.

As described in the objective testing section, stall qualification requires SOCs detailing the information described in 2.3 through 2.5 below.

2.3 Aerodynamics modelling. The SOC should identify the sources of data used to develop the aerodynamics model. Of particular interest is a mapping of test points in the form of an alpha/beta envelope plot for a minimum configuration set of flaps up and flaps down. The envelopes are defined in section 3 below and examples can be found in Appendix 3-D of the Airplane Upset Recovery Training Aid (see Chapter 2, 2.3). For the flight test data, a list of the types of manoeuvres used to define the aerodynamics model for angle of attack ranges greater than the first indication of stall is to be provided per flap setting. To allow for full stall training where angle of attack excursions may briefly exceed the critical angle of attack while executing a recovery, model validation and/or analysis should be conducted through at least 10 degrees beyond the critical angle of attack. In cases where limited data are available to model and/or validate the stall characteristics due to safety of flight issues, the data provider is expected to make a reasonable attempt to develop a stall model through analytical methods and utilization of the best available data.

2.3.1 At a minimum, the following stall model features should be incorporated into the aerodynamics model as appropriate, and addressed in the SOC where applicable for the aeroplane type:

- a) degradation in static/dynamic lateral and/or directional stability;
- b) degradation in control response (pitch, roll, yaw);
- c) uncommanded roll acceleration or roll-off requiring significant control deflection to counter;
- d) apparent randomness or non-repeatability;
- e) changes in pitch stability;
- f) Mach effects; and
- g) stall buffet.

An overview of the methodology used to address these features should be provided.

2.4 Subjective assessment. The stall model should be evaluated by an SME pilot with knowledge of the cues necessary to accomplish the required training objectives and experience in conducting stalls in the type of aeroplane being simulated. It may be appropriate for a CAA to consult, in some cases, with an aeroplane manufacturer on the designation of an SME. An SME cannot be self-proclaimed. The designation of an SME is related to a certain type of aeroplane and manoeuvres and is linked to the SME's recency of experience in the manoeuvres on the aeroplane type. Final evaluation and approval of the operator's FSTD should be accomplished by an SME pilot with knowledge of the training requirements to conduct the stall training tasks. The purpose of the subjective evaluation is to provide an additional layer of protection to ensure FSTD fidelity. The intent is for the simulation to be qualified initially only once by an SME. Objective recording can then be made and used without an SME for initial or recurrent qualification of FSTDs for the same aeroplane make, model and series. This evaluation may be conducted in the operator's FSTD or in an "audited" engineering simulation. The engineering simulation can then be used to provide, in addition to the stall model, objective validation test cases and subjective evaluation guidance material to the FSTD operator for evaluation of the implemented model.

2.5 Where available, documentation, including validation test documentation from an acceptable provider, OEM documentation or other source documentation related to stall training tasks for the aeroplane being simulated should be utilized. Particular emphasis should be placed upon recognition cues of an impending aerodynamic stall (such as the stall buffet or lateral and/or directional instability), stall break (g-break, pitch break, roll-off departure, etc.), response of aeroplane automation (such as autopilot and autothrottles) and the necessary control input required to execute an immediate recovery.

2.6 Stick pusher system modelling. For aeroplanes equipped with a stick pusher system, the required SOC should verify that the stick pusher system/stall protection system has been modelled, programmed and validated using the aeroplane manufacturer's design data or other approved data source. At a minimum, the following characteristics should be addressed in the SOC:

- a) stick pusher activation logic;
- b) stick pusher system dynamics, control displacement, and forces; and
- c) stick pusher cancellation logic.

#### **3. UPSET RECOVERY MANOEUVRE EVALUATION**

- 3.1 Basic requirements. The basic elements for the qualification of upset recovery training manoeuvres are:
	- a) to verify that the FSTD can be expected to remain within its designed validation envelope during the execution of approved upset recovery training tasks; and
	- b) to provide the instructor/evaluator with a minimum set of feedback tools to properly evaluate the trainee's performance in accomplishing an upset recovery training task.

3.2 Flight envelopes definition. For the purposes of this attachment, the term "flight envelope" refers to the entire domain in which the FSTD is capable of being flown with a degree of confidence that the FSTD responds similarly to the aeroplane. This envelope can be further divided into three subdivisions (see Appendix 3-D of the Airplane Upset Recovery Training Aid):

- a) Flight test validated region. This is the region of the flight envelope which has been validated with flight test data, typically by comparing the performance of the FSTD against the flight test data through tests incorporated in the QTG and other flight test data utilized to further extend the model beyond the minimum requirements. Within this region, there is high confidence that the FSTD responds similarly to the aeroplane. Note that this region is not strictly limited to what has been tested in the QTG; as long as the aerodynamics mathematical model has been conformed to the flight test results, that portion of the mathematical model can be considered to be within the flight test validated region.
- b) Wind tunnel and/or analytical region. This is the region of the flight envelope for which the FSTD has not been compared to flight test data, but for which there has been wind tunnel testing and/or the use of other reliable predictive methods (typically by the aeroplane manufacturer) to define the aerodynamics model. Within this region, there is moderate confidence that the FSTD responds similarly to the aeroplane.
- c) Extrapolated region. This is the region extrapolated beyond the flight test validated and wind tunnel/analytical regions. The extrapolation may be a linear extrapolation, a holding of the last value before the extrapolation began, or some other set of values. If these extrapolated data are provided by the aeroplane or FSTD manufacturer, it is a "best guess" only. Within this region, there is **low** confidence that the FSTD responds similarly to the aeroplane. Brief excursions into this region may still retain a moderate confidence level in FSTD fidelity. However, the instructor should be aware that the FSTD's response may deviate from the actual aeroplane.

3.3 Instructor feedback mechanism. For the instructor/evaluator to provide feedback to the trainee during upset prevention and recovery training (UPRT), additional information should be accessible that indicates the fidelity of the simulation, the magnitude of trainee's flight control inputs and aeroplane operational limits that could potentially affect the successful completion of the manoeuvre(s). Additionally, key aeroplane parameters, such as altitude and aeroplane attitudes should be presented. While outside the scope of an FSTD qualification document, it is essential that the training provider ensure that UPRT instructors have been properly trained to interpret the data provided by these IOS feedback tools. Satisfactory feedback should be provided in three principal areas, as discussed below:

- a) FSTD validation envelope. The FSTD should employ a method to record the FSTD's fidelity with respect to the FSTD validation envelope. This should be displayed as an angle of attack versus sideslip (alpha/beta) envelope cross-plot on the IOS or other alternate method to clearly convey the FSTD's fidelity level during the manoeuvre. The cross-plot should display the relevant validity regions for flaps up and flaps down at a minimum. This presentation should include a time history of the manoeuvre relative to the fidelity ranges and should be available for debriefing. Refer to Carbaugh<sup>1</sup> for the limitations associated with this display. Satisfactory training for FSTD instructors is necessary on the alpha/beta envelope cross-plot so that they interpret it appropriately.
- b) Flight control inputs. The FSTD should employ a method for the instructor/evaluator to assess the trainee's flight control inputs during the upset recovery manoeuvre. Additional parameters, such as cockpit control forces (forces applied by the pilot to the controls) and the flight control law mode for flyby-wire aeroplanes, should be portrayed in this feedback mechanism as well as for debriefing. For passive sidesticks, whose displacement is the flight control input, the force applied by the pilot to the controls does not need to be displayed. This tool should include a time history of flight control positions.
- c) Aeroplane operational limits. The FSTD should provide the instructor/evaluator with information concerning the aeroplane operating limits. The parameters of the aeroplane being simulated should be displayed dynamically in real time and recorded for debrief purposes. The time history should be displayed graphically in a manner and format that makes information available and useful to the instructor. The ability to record and playback these parameters is strongly encouraged.

3.4 Specifically, it is highly recommended that the display should represent the load factor and speeds with a boundary of operational load and airspeed limits. This display should be constructed in accordance with the OEM's data and should incorporate the OEM's operating recommendations.

3.5 An example of an FSTD "alpha/beta" envelope cross-plot, V-n display and IOS feedback mechanism used by an FSTD manufacturer is shown in Figures P-1, P-2 and P-3.

Note 1.— In Figure P-1, the dots are green, orange and red if within the flight test, wind tunnel or extrapolation validated areas of the flight model, respectively. The yellow dot is a time reference since the start of the plot (here 22 seconds). There is one data dot for every second but the user can select the number of displayed plot points (here 8).

Note 2.— In Figure P-2, the dots are green, orange and red if within the green normal envelope, the caution envelope (outside the green normal envelope and bounded by the  $V_{SS}$  speed at 1-g, the dotted orange lines and the stall curve between 1-g and 2.5-g) and outside those two envelopes, respectively. The yellow dot is a time reference since the start of the plot (here 57 seconds). There is one data dot for every second but the user can select the number of displayed plot points.

 $\overline{a}$ 1. Carbaugh David, AIAA 2008-6866, Simulator Upset Recovery Training and Issues

### Part II. Flight Simulation Training Device Criteria Attachment P. FTSD qualification guidance for upset recovery/stall/icing manoeuvres II-Att P-5





**Figure P-1. Example of alpha/beta envelope plot** 



**Figure P-2. Example of V-n display** 





**Figure P-3. Example of an instructor feedback display** 

### **4. ENGINE AND AIRFRAME ICING EVALUATION**

4.1 Basic requirements. This section applies to all FSTDs that are used to satisfy training requirements for engine and airframe icing. New general requirements and objective requirements for FSTD qualification have been developed to define aeroplane-specific icing models that support training objectives for the recognition and recovery from an in-flight ice accretion event.

4.2 Ice accretion models should be developed to account for training the specific skills required for recognition of ice accumulation and execution of the required response. The qualification of engine and airframe icing simulation consists of the following elements that should be considered when developing ice accretion models for use in training:

- a) ice accretion models should be developed in a manner to contain aeroplane-specific recognition cues as determined with aeroplane OEM's supplied data or other suitable analytical methods; and
- b) at least one qualified ice accretion model should be objectively tested to demonstrate that the model has been implemented correctly and generates the correct cues as necessary for training.

4.3 SOC. The required SOC should contain the following information to support qualification as described in the table of general requirements:

- a) a description of expected aeroplane-specific recognition cues and degradation effects due to a typical in-flight icing encounter. Typical cues or effects may include loss of lift, decrease in stall angle of attack, change in pitching moment, decrease in control effectiveness and changes in control forces in addition to any overall increase in drag. This description should be based on relevant source data, such as aeroplane OEM's supplied data, accident/incident data or other acceptable data source. Where a particular airframe has demonstrated vulnerabilities to a specific type of ice accretion (due to accident/incident history), which may require specific training (such as supercooled large-droplet icing or tailplane icing), ice accretion models should be developed that address the training requirements; and
- b) a description of the data sources utilized to develop the qualified ice accretion models. Acceptable data sources may be, but are not limited to, flight test data, aeroplane OEM's engineering simulation data or other analytical methods based upon established engineering principles.

4.4 Objective demonstration test. The purpose of the objective demonstration test is to demonstrate that the ice accretion models as described in the SOC have been implemented correctly and demonstrate the proper cues and effects as defined in the approved data sources. At least one ice accretion model should be selected for testing and included in the MQTG. Two tests are required to demonstrate engine and airframe icing effects. One test will demonstrate the FSTDs baseline performance without icing, and the second test will demonstrate the aerodynamic effects of ice accretion relative to the baseline test.

4.5 Recorded parameters. In each of the two required MQTG tests, a time history recording should be made of the following parameters:

- a) altitude;
- b) airspeed;
- c) normal acceleration;
- d) engine power settings;
- e) angle of attack and pitch attitude;
- f) roll angle;
- g) flight control inputs;
- h) stall warning and stall buffet threshold of perception; and
- i) other parameters as necessary to demonstrate the effects of ice accretion.

4.6 **Demonstration manoeuvre.** The FSTD operator should select an ice accretion model as identified in the SOC for testing. The selected manoeuvre should demonstrate the effects of ice accretion at high angles of attack from a trimmed condition through approach to stall and "full" stall as compared to a baseline (no ice build-up) test. The ice accretion models should demonstrate the cues necessary to recognize the onset of ice accretion on the airframe, lifting surfaces and engines, and provide exemplar degradation in performance and handling qualities to the extent that a recovery can be executed. Typical ice accretion effects that may be present depending upon the aeroplane being simulated include:

- a) decrease in stall angle of attack;
- b) increase in stall speed;
- c) increase in stall buffet threshold of perception speed;
- d) changes in pitching moment;
- e) changes in stall buffet characteristics;
- f) changes in control effectiveness or control forces; and
- g) engine effects (power variation, vibration, etc.).

Tests may be conducted by initializing and maintaining a fixed amount of ice accretion throughout the manoeuvre to evaluate the effects.

 $\mathcal{L}_\text{max}$  , where  $\mathcal{L}_\text{max}$  is the set of the se

# **MANUAL OF CRITERIA FOR THE QUALIFICATION OF FLIGHT SIMULATION TRAINING DEVICES**

**Volume I** 

**Aeroplanes** 

**Part III** 

**Flight Simulation Feature and Fidelity Level Criteria**

# **Chapter 1**

# **GLOSSARY OF TERMS, ABBREVIATIONS AND UNITS**

 $\mathcal{L}_\text{max}$  , where  $\mathcal{L}_\text{max}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_\text{max}$ 

The terms, abbreviations and units used in this document are described in Part II, Chapter 1.

## **Chapter 2**

## **INTRODUCTION**

Note.— In this part, all references to an appendix point to content in Part III of this document unless otherwise indicated.

### **2.1 PURPOSE**

2.1.1 Part III provides the information to determine the requirements and qualification criteria for an aeroplane FSTD defined using the process described in Part I, Chapter 3, from the simulation features according to training task considerations. It also establishes the performance and documentation requirements for evaluation by CAAs of the defined FSTDs used for training and testing or checking of flight crew members. The process described in Part I of this Volume is new, but the requirements and methods of compliance were derived from the extensive experience of CAAs and industry.

2.1.2 Part III is intended to provide the means for a CAA to validate the definition of a new FSTD type or variant of an existing FSTD type and to qualify such an FSTD, subsequent to a request by an applicant, through initial and recurrent evaluations of the FSTD. Further, this document is intended to provide the means for a CAA of other States to accept the qualifications granted by the State which conducted the initial and recurrent evaluations of an FSTD, without the need for additional evaluations, when considering approval of the use of that FSTD by applicants from their own State.

### **2.2 BACKGROUND**

2.2.1 The availability of advanced technology has permitted greater use of FSTDs for training and testing or checking of flight crew members. The complexity, costs and operating environment of modern aeroplanes also have encouraged broader use of advanced simulation. FSTDs can provide more in-depth training than can be accomplished in aeroplanes and provide a safe and suitable learning environment. Fidelity of modern FSTDs is sufficient to permit pilot assessment with assurance that the observed behaviour will transfer to the aeroplane. Fuel conservation and reduction in adverse environmental effects are important by-products of FSTD use.

2.2.2 The FSTD requirements provided in this chapter are derived from training requirements which have been developed through a training task analysis, the details of which are fully presented in Part I. Part I also defines the process for identifying a new FSTD that may be a variation of one of the existing FSTD types defined in Part II, or may be unique. Part III provides the information to enable identification of the requirements and testing for such a new FSTD.

2.2.3 The MPL content is preliminary and offers a means by which the FSTD requirements may be satisfied but should not be treated as the only means by which the FSTD requirements of an MPL programme may be met. The relevant text in this manual will be updated when the pertinent information from the completion of the MPL programmes implementation phase becomes available.

2.2.4 The summary matrix example (see Table 2-1) should be used to define the new FSTD type by correlating the appropriate training tasks for a given training type against fidelity levels for key simulation features. The resulting FSTD types should have the capability to be used in the training and, if applicable, testing or checking towards the chosen training tasks in relation to licences or ratings. Training types that can be used for this process are those listed in Part I, Chapter 4. The introduction of a new training type, new tasks or variations in tasks may not be supported by this document and would require the appropriate training task analysis by an authorized body before they could be considered for the process used here. The terminology used in the table below for training type, device feature and level of fidelity of device feature is defined as follows:

#### 2.2.4.1 Training types:



2.2.4.2 FSTD features:

Flight Deck Layout and Structure Flight Model (Aerodynamics and Engine) Ground Handling Aeroplane Systems (ATA Chapters) Flight Controls and Forces

Sound Cues Visual Cues Motion Cues

Environment — ATC Environment — Navigation Environment — Atmosphere and Weather Environment — Aerodromes and Terrain

Miscellaneous — (Instructor Operating Station, etc.)

### 2.2.4.3 Device feature fidelity level:



For detailed definitions of fidelity levels S, R, G and N, see Chapter 1, Section 1.1.
#### 2.2.5 Training codes:

2.2.5.1 Device qualified as T only. The introduction of a specific training task. The training accomplished may be credited towards the issuance of a licence, rating, or qualification, but the training would not be completed to proficiency. The fidelity level of one or more of the simulation features may not support training-to-proficiency.

2.2.5.2 Device qualified as TP. The introduction, continuation, or completion of a specific training task. The training accomplished may be credited towards proficiency and/or the issuance of a licence, rating, or qualification, and the training is completed to proficiency. The fidelity level of all simulation features supports training-to-proficiency.

#### **Table 2-1. FSTD Summary Matrix Example of a** ∆ **(Delta) Device**

Note.— Guidance on the qualification criteria determination process is contained in Part I, Chapter 3.



2.2.6 Notes for the use of Table 2-1 to define the desired ∆ (delta) device type:

2.2.6.1 Selection of a unique set of training tasks from Part I, Appendix C for the desired training programme will identify the fidelity level signatures of the FSTD features for those tasks. Populating the table with these feature fidelity levels and use of the roll-up process (selection of the highest fidelity level for each feature) will result in the ∆ device feature fidelity signature. Another consideration in the definition of the device is that individual feature fidelity levels cannot be treated in isolation. The training device will be used in an integrated manner and certain features may have a dependency upon other features for integrated operation. This may result in the FSTD fidelity level signature having to be altered to ensure compatibility among dependent features. Paragraphs 2.2.6.3 and 2.2.6.4 below describe the treatment of integrated feature fidelity levels for validation testing and functions and subjective testing.

2.2.6.2 Correlation of the new device feature fidelity signature against the information provided in Appendix A will provide the necessary requirements for the ∆ device type.

2.2.6.3 Correlation of the new device feature fidelity signature against the information provided in Appendix B will provide the necessary validation tests for the ∆ device type. Examples of the inter-dependency of features which require the same fidelity level for various integrated tests are provided in the validation test tables in Appendix B. For the purpose of evaluation, the fidelity of a set of integrated features is only as good as the lowest individual fidelity level found within that set of integrated features.

2.2.6.4 Correlation of the new device feature fidelity signature against the information provided in Appendix C will provide the necessary functions and subjective tests for the ∆ device type. The functions and subjective tests are all executed in an environment where FSTD features are used in a fully integrated manner. The integrated nature of the testing environment prevents these functions and subjective tests from being classified by feature fidelity level. Where any new type of FSTD is created, it will inevitably have a collection of different feature fidelity levels in its construction, which precludes the possibility of classifying tests for those "device types" using the categories G, R and S. To avoid the possibility of confusion by associating tests for those "device types" with G, R and S, the feature fidelity levels are not presented in the table in Appendix C. Instead, the complete functions and subjective tests list as used in Part II, Appendix C is provided with a single blank column under the heading "Applicability". For any new device type created, an appropriate functions and subjective tests list will have to be defined from this master list. This should be done by analysis of the applicable training tasks that the device will support as presented in Part I and by entering ticks in the "Applicability" column for appropriate test cases. This list needs to be agreed with the relevant CAA. Examples of this can be seen in Part II, Appendix C where similar exercises were conducted for device Types I to VII.

2.2.6.5 The "Miscellaneous" simulation feature does not appear in the table because it is not addressed by the training task analysis. Judgement should be applied to determine which "Miscellaneous" items are required.

2.2.7 The FSTD general and technical requirements defined in Appendix A are grouped by device feature and fidelity level. The FSTD validation tests and functions and subjective tests found in Appendices B and C are grouped by relevant device feature and fidelity level.

2.2.8 If considering using this process, the appropriate CAA should be consulted very early.

# **2.3 RELATED READING MATERIAL**

2.3.1 Applicants seeking FSTD evaluation, qualification and approval for use of aeroplane FSTDs should consult references contained in related documents published by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), the International Air Transport Association (IATA) and the Royal Aeronautical Society (RAeS) referring to and/or dealing with the use of FSTDs and technical and operational requirements relevant to FSTD data and design. Applicable rules and regulations pertaining to the use of FSTDs in the State for which the FSTD qualification and approval is requested should also be consulted. These are referred to in Part II, Chapter 2, 2.3.2 and 2.3.3.

2.3.2 It is important to regularly monitor regulatory guidance material on the CAA web sites to understand the latest regulatory opinion on new technology or practices.

# **2.4 FSTD QUALIFICATION**

2.4.1 In dealing with FSTDs, CAAs differentiate between the technical criteria of the FSTD and its use for training/testing and checking. The FSTD should be evaluated by the CAA taking into consideration the aeroplane manufacturer's recommended training practices. Qualification is achieved by comparing the FSTD performance against the criteria specified in the Qualification Test Guide (QTG) for the qualification level sought.

2.4.2 The validation, functions and subjective tests required in the QTG enable the CAA to "spot check" the performance of the FSTD in order to confirm that it represents the aeroplane in some significant training and testing or checking areas. Without such spot checking, using the QTG, FSTD performance cannot be verified in the time normally available for the regulatory evaluation. It should be clearly understood that the QTG does not provide for a rigorous examination of the quality of the simulation in all areas of flight and systems operation. The full testing of the FSTD is intended to have been completed by the FSTD manufacturer and its operator prior to the FSTD being submitted for the regulatory evaluation and prior to the delivery of the results in the QTG. This "in depth" testing is a fundamental part of the whole cycle of testing and is normally carried out using documented acceptance test procedures in which the test results are recorded. These procedures will test the functionality and performance of many areas of the simulation that are not addressed in the QTG as well as such items as the instructor operating station.

2.4.3 Once the FSTD has been qualified, the authority responsible for oversight of the activities of the user of the FSTD can approve what training tasks can be carried out. This determination should be based on the FSTD qualification, the availability of FSTDs, the experience of the FSTD user, the training programme in which the FSTD is to be used and the experience and qualifications of the pilots to be trained. This latter process results in the approved use of an FSTD within an approved training programme.

#### **2.5 TESTING FOR FSTD QUALIFICATION**

2.5.1 The FSTD should be assessed in those areas which are essential to completing the flight crew member training and testing or checking process. This includes the FSTD's longitudinal and lateral-directional responses; performance in take-off, climb, cruise, descent, approach and landing; all-weather operations; control checks; and pilot, flight engineer and instructor station functions checks. The motion, visual and sound systems should be evaluated to ensure their proper operation.

2.5.2 The intent is to evaluate the FSTD as objectively as possible. Pilot acceptance, however, is also an important consideration. Therefore, the FSTD should be subjected to the validation tests listed in Appendix B and the functions and subjective tests in Appendix C. Validation tests are used to objectively compare FSTD and aeroplane data to ensure that they agree within specified tolerances. Functions tests are objective tests of systems using aeroplane documentation. Subjective tests provide a basis for evaluating the FSTD capability to perform over a typical training period and to verify correct operation and handling characteristics of the FSTD.

2.5.3 Tolerances listed for parameters in Appendix B should not be confused with FSTD design tolerances and are the maximum acceptable for FSTD qualification.

2.5.4 The validation testing for initial and recurrent evaluations listed in Appendix B should be conducted in accordance with the FSTD type against approved data. An optional process for recurrent evaluation using MQTG results as reference data is described in Part II, Attachment H.

2.5.4.1 Where the fidelity level is S, the initial and recurrent evaluations should be based on objective evaluation against approved data. For evaluation of FSTDs representing a specific aeroplane type, the aeroplane manufacturer's validation flight test data is preferred. Data from other sources may be used, subject to the review and concurrence of the CAA responsible for the qualification. The tolerances listed in Appendix B are applicable for the initial evaluation.

Alternatively, the recurrent evaluation can be based on objective evaluation against MQTG results as described in Part II, Attachment H.

2.5.4.2 Where the fidelity level is R, the initial and recurrent validation will be based on objective evaluation against approved data for a class of aeroplane with the exception of aeroplane type specific FSTDs (sound and motion systems) where these evaluations are against aeroplane type-specific data. For initial evaluation of FSTDs representing a class of aeroplane, the aeroplane manufacturer's validation flight test data are preferred. Data from other sources may be used, subject to the review and concurrence of the CAA responsible for the qualification.

2.5.4.2.1 For motion and sound systems, where approved subjective development is submitted for the initial evaluation, the QTG should contain both:

- a) the original objective test results showing compliance to the validation flight test data; and
- b) the "improved" results, based upon approved subjective development against the validation flight test data. If approved subjective development is used, the MQTG result for those particular cases will become the reference data standard. Recurrent validations should be objectively measured against the reference data standard.

2.5.4.2.2 The tolerances listed in Appendix B are applicable for both initial and recurrent evaluations except where approved subjective development is used for motion and sound systems.

2.5.4.2.3 Alternatively, the recurrent evaluation can be based on objective evaluation against MQTG results as described in Part II, Attachment H.

2.5.4.3 Where the fidelity level is G, the initial validation will be based on evaluation against approved data, where available, complemented if necessary by approved subjective development, to determine a reference data standard. Correct trend and magnitude (CT&M) tolerances can be used for the initial evaluation only. Recurrent validations should be objectively measured against the reference data standard. The tolerances listed in Appendix B are applicable for recurrent evaluations and should be applied to ensure the device remains at the standard initially qualified.

2.5.5 Requirements for generic or representative FSTD data are defined below.

2.5.5.1 Generic or representative data may be derived from a specific aeroplane within the class of aeroplanes the FSTD is representing or it may be based on information from several aeroplanes within the class. With the concurrence of the CAA, it may be in the form of a manufacturer's previously approved set of validation data for the applicable FSTD. Once the set of data for a specific FSTD has been accepted and approved by the CAA, it will become the validation data that will be used as reference for subsequent recurrent evaluations with the application of the stated tolerances.

2.5.5.2 The substantiation of the set of data used to build validation data should be in the form of a "Reference Data" engineering report and should show that the proposed validation data are representative of the aeroplane or the class of aeroplanes modelled. This report may include flight test data, manufacturer's design data, information from the aeroplane flight manual (AFM) and maintenance manuals, results of approved or commonly accepted simulations or predictive models, recognized theoretical results, information from the public domain, or other sources as deemed necessary by the FSTD manufacturer to substantiate the proposed model.

2.5.6 In the case of new aeroplane programmes, the aeroplane manufacturer's data, partially validated by flight test data, may be used in the interim qualification of the FSTD. However, the FSTD should be re-qualified following the release of the manufacturer's data obtained during the type certification of the aeroplane. The re-qualification schedule should be as agreed by the CAA, the FSTD operator, the FSTD manufacturer and the aeroplane manufacturer. For additional information, see Part II, Attachment A.

2.5.7 FSTD operators seeking initial or upgrade evaluation of an FSTD should be aware that performance and handling data for older aeroplanes may not be of sufficient quality to meet some of the test standards contained in this manual. In this instance it may be necessary for an FSTD operator to acquire additional flight test data.

2.5.8 During FSTD evaluation, if a problem is encountered with a particular validation test, the test may be repeated to ascertain if test equipment or personnel error caused the problem. Following this, if the test problem persists, an FSTD operator should be prepared to offer alternative test results which relate to the test in question.

2.5.9 Validation tests which do not meet the test criteria should be satisfactorily rectified or a rationale should be provided with appropriate engineering judgement.

#### **2.6 QUALIFICATION TEST GUIDE (QTG)**

2.6.1 The QTG is the primary reference document used for the evaluation of an FSTD. It contains FSTD test results, statements of compliance and other information to enable the evaluator to assess if the FSTD meets the test criteria described in this manual.

- 2.6.2 The applicant should submit a QTG which includes:
	- a) a title page including (as a minimum) the
		- 1) FSTD operator's name;
		- 2) aeroplane model and series or class, as applicable, being simulated;
		- 3) FSTD qualification level;
		- 4) CAA FSTD identification number;
		- 5) FSTD location;
		- 6) FSTD manufacturer's unique identification or serial number; and
		- 7) provision for dated signature blocks:
			- i) one for the FSTD operator to attest that the FSTD has been tested using a documented acceptance testing procedure covering flight deck layout, all simulated aeroplane systems and the Instructor Operating Station, as well as the engineering facilities, the motion, visual and other systems, as applicable.
			- ii) one for the FSTD operator to attest that all manual validation tests have been conducted in a satisfactory manner using only procedures as contained in the QTG manual test procedure;
			- iii) one for the FSTD operator to attest that the functions and subjective testing in accordance with Appendix C have been conducted in a satisfactory manner; and
			- iv) one for the FSTD operator and the CAA indicating overall acceptance of the QTG;
- b) an FSTD information page providing (as a minimum):
	- 1) applicable regulatory qualification standards;
	- 2) the aeroplane model and series or class, as applicable, being simulated;
	- 3) the aerodynamic data revision;
	- 4) the engine model(s) and its(their) data revision(s);
	- 5) the flight control data revision;
	- 6) the avionic equipment system identification and revision level when the revision level affects the training and testing or checking capability of the FSTD;
	- 7) the FSTD manufacturer;
	- 8) the date of FSTD manufacture;
	- 9) the FSTD computer identification;
	- 10) the visual system type and manufacturer;
	- 11) the motion system type and manufacturer;
	- 12) three or more designated qualification visual scenes; and
	- 13) supplemental information for additional areas of simulation which are not sufficiently important for the CAA to require a separate QTG;
- c) a table of contents to include a list of all QTG tests including all sub-cases, unless provided elsewhere in the QTG;
- d) a log of revisions and/or list of effective pages;
- e) a listing of reference and source data for FSTD design and test;
- f) a glossary of terms and symbols used;
- g) a statement of compliance (SOC) with certain requirements; SOCs should refer to sources of information and show compliance rationale to explain how the referenced material is used, applicable mathematical equations and parameter values and conclusions reached (see the "Comments" column of Appendices A and B for SOC requirements);
- h) recording procedures and required equipment for the validation tests;
- i) the following items for each validation test designated in Appendix B:
	- 1) Test number. The test number which follows the numbering system set out in Appendix B;
	- 2) Test title. Short and definitive, based on the test title referred to in Appendix B;
- 
- 3) Test objective. A brief summary of what the test is intended to demonstrate;
- 4) Demonstration procedure. A brief description of how the objective is to be met. It should describe clearly and distinctly how the FSTD will be set up and operated for each test when flown manually by the pilot and, when required, automatically tested;
- 5) References. References to the aeroplane data source documents including both the document number and the page/condition number and, if applicable, any data query references;
- 6) Initial conditions. A full and comprehensive list of the FSTD initial conditions;
- 7) Test parameters. A list of all parameters driven or constrained during the automatic test;
- 8) Manual test procedures. Procedures should be self-contained and sufficient to enable the test to be flown by a qualified pilot, by reference to flight deck instrumentation. Reference to reference data or test results is encouraged for complex tests, as applicable. Manual tests should be capable of being conducted from either pilot seat, although the cockpit controller positions and forces may not necessarily be available from the other seat;
- 9) Automatic test procedures. A test identification number for automatic tests should be provided;
- 10) Evaluation criteria. The main parameter(s) under scrutiny during the test;
- 11) Expected result(s). The aeroplane result, including tolerances and, if necessary, a further definition of the point at which the information was extracted from the source data;
- 12) Test result. FSTD validation test results obtained by the FSTD operator from the FSTD. Tests run on a computer, which is independent of the FSTD, are not acceptable; the results should:
	- a) be computer generated;
	- b) be produced on appropriate media acceptable to the CAA conducting the test;
	- c) be time histories unless otherwise indicated and:
		- i) should plot for each test the list of recommended parameters contained in the Aeroplane Flight Simulator Evaluation Handbook, Volume I (see Part II, Chapter 2, 2.3.3);
		- ii) be clearly marked with appropriate time reference points to ensure an accurate comparison between FSTD and aeroplane;
		- iii) the FSTD result and validation data plotted should be clearly identified; and
		- iv) in those cases where a "snapshot" result in lieu of a time history result is authorized, the FSTD operator should ensure that a steady state condition exists at the instant of time captured by the "snapshot";
	- d) be clearly labelled as a product of the device being tested;
	- e) have each page reflect the date and time completed;
	- f) have each page reflect the test page number and the total number of pages in the test;
- g) have parameters with specified tolerances identified, with tolerance criteria and units given. Automatic flagging of "out-of-tolerance" situations is encouraged; and
- h) have incremental scales on graphical presentations that provide the resolution necessary for evaluation of the tolerance parameters shown in Appendix B to Part II or III, as appropriate.
- 13) Validation data.
	- a) Computer-generated displays of flight test data overplotted with FSTD data should be provided. To ensure authenticity of the validation data, a copy of the original validation data, clearly marked with the document name, page number, the issuing organization and the test number and title as specified in 1) and 2) above, should also be provided;
	- b) aeroplane data documents included in the QTG may be photographically reduced only if such reduction will not cause distortions or difficulties in scale interpretation or resolution; and
	- c) validation data variables should be defined in a nomenclature list along with sign convention. This list should be included at some appropriate location in the QTG;
- 14) Comparison of results. The accepted means of comparing FSTD test results to the validation data is overplotting;
- j) a copy of the applicable regulatory qualification standards, or appropriate sections as applicable, used in the initial evaluation, and
- k) a copy of the validation data roadmap (VDR) to clearly identify (in matrix format only) sources of data for all required tests including sound and vibration data documents.

2.6.3 The QTG will provide the documented proof of compliance with the FSTD validation tests in Appendix B. FSTD test results should be labelled using terminology common to aeroplane parameters as opposed to computer software identifications. These results should be easily compared with the supporting data by employing overplotting or other acceptable means. For tests involving time histories, the overplotting of the FSTD data to aeroplane data is essential to verify FSTD performance in each test. The evaluation serves to validate the FSTD test results given in the QTG.

#### **2.7 MASTER QUALIFICATION TEST GUIDE (MQTG)**

2.7.1 During the initial evaluation of an FSTD, the MQTG is created. This is the master document, as amended in agreement with the CAA, to which FSTD recurrent evaluation test results are compared.

2.7.2 After the initial evaluation, the MQTG is available as the document to use for recurrent or special evaluations and is also the document that any CAA can use as proof of an evaluation and current qualifications of an FSTD when approval for the use of the particular FSTD is requested for a specific training task.

#### **2.8 ELECTRONIC QUALIFICATION TEST GUIDE (eQTG)**

Use of an eQTG may reduce costs, save time and improve timely communication, and is becoming a common practice. ARINC Report 436 provides guidelines for an eQTG (see Part II, Chapter 2, 2.3.3).

#### **2.9 QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AND CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT**

2.9.1 A quality management system, which is acceptable to the CAA, should be established and maintained by the FSTD operator to ensure the correct maintenance and performance of the FSTD. The quality management system may be based upon established industry standards, such as ARINC Report 433 (see Part II, 2.3.3).

2.9.2 A configuration management system should be established and maintained to ensure the continued integrity of the hardware and software as from the original qualification standard, or as amended or modified through the same system.

#### **2.10 TYPES OF EVALUATIONS**

2.10.1 An initial evaluation is the first evaluation of an FSTD to qualify it for use. It consists of a technical review of the QTG and a subsequent on-site validation of the FSTD to ensure it meets all the requirements of this manual.

2.10.2 Recurrent evaluations are those that may be accomplished periodically to ensure that the FSTD continues to meet its qualification level.

2.10.3 Special evaluations are those that may be accomplished resulting from any of the following circumstances:

- a) a major hardware and/or software change which may affect the handling qualities, performance or systems representations of the FSTD;
- b) a request for an upgrade for a higher qualification level; and
- c) the discovery of a situation that indicates the FSTD is not performing at its initial qualification standard.

*Note.— Some of the above circumstances may require establishing revised tests leading to an amendment of the MQTG.* 

#### **2.11 CONDUCT OF EVALUATIONS**

*Note.— The* Manual on the Approval of Training Organizations *(Doc 9841) contains guidance on the recognition by other States of an FSTD qualification issued by a State, including for the initial qualification of an FSTD that already holds a qualification issued by another State*.

#### **2.11.1 Initial FSTD evaluations**

2.11.1.1 An FSTD operator seeking qualification of an FSTD should make the request for an evaluation to the CAA of the State in which the FSTD will be located.

2.11.1.2 A copy of the FSTD's QTG, with annotated test results, should accompany the request. Any QTG deficiencies raised by the CAA should be corrected prior to the start of the evaluation.

2.11.1.3 The request for evaluation should also include a statement that the FSTD has been thoroughly tested using a documented acceptance testing procedure covering flight deck layout, all simulated aeroplane systems and the instructor operating station as well as the engineering facilities, motion, visual and other systems, as applicable. In addition, a statement should be provided that the FSTD meets the criteria described in this manual. The applicant should further certify that all the QTG tests for the requested qualification level have been satisfactorily conducted.

# **2.11.2 Modification of an FSTD**

2.11.2.1 An update is a result of a change to the existing device where it retains its existing qualification level. The change may be approved through a recurrent evaluation or a special evaluation if deemed necessary by the CAA, according to the applicable regulations in effect at the time of initial qualification.

2.11.2.2 If such a change to an existing device would imply that the performance of the device could no longer meet the requirements at the time of initial qualification, but that the result of the change would, in the opinion of the CAA, clearly mean an improvement to the performance and training capabilities of the device altogether, then the CAA may accept the proposed change as an update while allowing the device to retain its original qualification level.

2.11.2.3 An upgrade is defined as the raising of the qualification level of a device, which can only be achieved by undergoing an initial qualification according to the latest applicable regulations.

2.11.2.4 In summary, as long as the qualification level of the device does not change, all changes made to the device should be considered to be updates pending approval by the CAA. An upgrade and consequent initial qualification according to latest regulations is only applicable when the FSTD operator requests a higher qualification level for the FSTD.

## **2.11.3 Temporary deactivation of a currently qualified FSTD**

2.11.3.1 In the event an FSTD operator plans to remove an FSTD from active status for a prolonged period, the appropriate CAA should be notified and suitable controls established for the period the FSTD is inactive.

2.11.3.2 An understanding should be arranged with the CAA to ensure that the FSTD can be restored to active status at its originally qualified level.

#### **2.11.4 Moving an FSTD to a new location**

2.11.4.1 In instances where an FSTD is to be moved to a new location, the appropriate CAA should be advised of the planned activity and provided with a schedule of events related thereto.

2.11.4.2 Prior to returning the FSTD to service at the new location, the FSTD operator should agree with the appropriate CAA which of the validation and functional tests from the QTG should be performed to ensure that the FSTD performance meets its original qualification standard. A copy of the test documentation should be retained with the FSTD records for review by the appropriate CAA.

#### **2.11.5 Composition of an evaluation team**

2.11.5.1 For the purposes of qualification of an FSTD, an evaluation team is usually led by a pilot inspector from the CAA along with engineers and a type-qualified pilot.

2.11.5.2 The applicant should provide technical assistance in the operation of the FSTD and the required test equipment. The applicant should make available a suitably knowledgeable person to assist the evaluation team as required.

2.11.5.3 On an initial evaluation, the FSTD manufacturer and/or aeroplane manufacturer should have technical staff available to assist as required.

#### **2.11.6 FSTD recurrent evaluations**

2.11.6.1 Following satisfactory completion of the initial evaluation and qualification tests, a system of periodic evaluations should be established to ensure that FSTDs continue to maintain their initially qualified performance, functions and other characteristics.

2.11.6.2 The CAA having jurisdiction over the FSTD should establish the time interval between the recurrent evaluations.

#### **2.12 ADOPTION OF THIS MANUAL INTO THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK**

The articulation of Volume I of this manual and its amendments into the regulatory framework is the responsibility of the various CAAs through national regulatory documents such as FAA 14 CFR Part 60, EASA CS-FSTD (A) or other equivalent document (see Part II, Chapter 2, 2.3.2).

#### **2.13 FUTURE UPDATES OF THIS MANUAL**

Part II, Appendix D describes the process to be used for proposed future updates to this manual.

#### **2.14 EVALUATION HANDBOOKS**

The Aeroplane Flight Simulator Evaluation Handbook, as amended, is a useful source of guidance for conducting the tests required to establish that the FSTD under evaluation complies with the criteria set out in this manual. This twovolume document can be obtained through the Royal Aeronautical Society (see Part II, Chapter 2, 2.3.3).

#### **2.15 GUIDANCE ON "GRANDFATHERED" RIGHTS**

2.15.1 The regulatory standards for the qualification of FSTDs will continue to develop to cater for: changing training needs; data revisions; relocations; the introduction of new equipment, procedures and technologies and mandated measures to address safety issues. The introduction of changes to the regulatory standards should not necessarily result in making existing qualified FSTDs obsolete. To enable accredited training to continue on them, "grandfathering" of the qualification should be applied. This allows continued training on the device provided it continues to meet the qualification standard achieved at its initial qualification.

2.15.2 When CAA's implement these technical requirements into their regulations they should make provisions for the grandfathering of FSTDs that are in existence, on order, or under development. In addition, the regulations should include provisions to retroactively mandate certain updates that are considered important for aviation safety.

 $\mathcal{L}=\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  , where  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$  , we have the set of  $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{L}}$ 

# **Appendix A**

# **REQUIREMENTS FOR FEATURE FIDELITY LEVELS**

# **INTRODUCTION**

This appendix describes the methodology to create and test a bespoke device to meet specified training criteria, employing the training requirements and features defined in Part I. The validation tests and functions and subjective tests listed in Appendices B and C should also be consulted when determining the requirements for qualification. Certain requirements included in this appendix should be supported with a statement of compliance (SOC) and, in some designated cases, an objective test. The SOC should describe how the requirement was met, such as gear modelling approach, coefficient of friction sources, etc. In the following tabular listing of FSTD criteria, requirements for SOCs are indicated in the comments column.



#### **1. REQUIREMENT — FLIGHT DECK LAYOUT AND STRUCTURE**













# **2. REQUIREMENT — FLIGHT MODEL (AERO AND ENGINE)**









### **3. REQUIREMENT — GROUND REACTION AND HANDLING CHARACTERISTICS**







# **4. REQUIREMENT — AEROPLANE SYSTEMS (ATA)**









# **5. REQUIREMENT — FLIGHT CONTROLS AND FORCES**









# **6. REQUIREMENT — SOUND CUES**







## **7. REQUIREMENT — VISUAL CUES**












#### **8. REQUIREMENT — MOTION CUES**











#### **9. REQUIREMENT — ENVIRONMENT — ATC**



































#### **10. REQUIREMENT — ENVIRONMENT — NAVIGATION**





### **11. REQUIREMENT — ENVIRONMENT — ATMOSPHERE AND WEATHER**



**Feature Technical Requirement Environment — Atmosphere**  and Weather **G G** R1 R S **Comments** 11.3 WEATHER EFFECTS  $11.3.$ S | N/A. 11.3.R The following weather effects as observed on  $\checkmark$  | A subjective test is required. See Appendix C the visual system should be simulated and for similar examples. respective instructor controls provided. (1) Multiple cloud layers with adjustable  $\checkmark$  Not required for IR and MPL2 (T). bases, tops, sky coverage and scud effect. (2) Storm cells activation and/or deactivation.  $\begin{vmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{vmatrix}$   $\checkmark$  Not required for IR and MPL2 (T). (3) Visibility and runway visual range (RVR),  $\checkmark$  Objective test required. See Appendix B, test including fog and patchy fog effects. 4.d (visual ground segment). Not required for IR and MPL2 (T). (4) Effects on ownship external lighting.  $\vert \cdot \vert \cdot \vert \cdot \cdot \vert$  Not required for IR and MPL2 (T). (5) Effects on airport lighting (including variable intensity and fog effects). (6) Surface contaminants (including wind  $\checkmark$  | Not required for IR and MPL2 (T). blowing effect). (7) Variable precipitation effects (rain, hail,  $\checkmark$  | Not required for IR and MPL2 (T). snow). (8) In-cloud airspeed effect. (9) Gradual visibility changes entering and breaking out of cloud.  $\checkmark$  | Not required for IR and MPL2 (T). (10) Atmospheric model that supports representative effects of wake turbulence and mountain waves to support the training tasks. The wake turbulence model should support Several wake turbulence and mountain wave the representative effects of wake turbulence models should be offered to support variety in on the aeroplane being simulated. The wake the training. The model effects should be model provides training for the recognition appropriately related to the aeroplane being and corrective pilot actions throughout the simulated. The use of scenarios is flight regime. encouraged. The mountain wave model should support the atmospheric climb, descent, and roll rates which can be encountered in mountain wave and rotor conditions. 11.3.G The following weather effects as observed on A subjective test is required. See Appendix C. the visual system should be simulated and respective instructor controls provided. -----------------------------(1) Visibility.





#### **12. REQUIREMENT — ENVIRONMENT — AERODROMES AND TERRAIN**









#### **13. REQUIREMENT — MISCELLANEOUS**











\_

## **Appendix B**

# **VALIDATION TESTS FOR FEATURE FIDELITY LEVELS**

For detailed information for these tests see Part II, Appendix B, sections 1 to 3.

 Note.— Where a validation test has a dependency upon more than one FSTD fidelity feature and it is important for these fidelity levels to be the same, the validation test section is annotated to this effect to highlight the importance of the features' inter-dependency for cohesive testing.

#### **Test Tolerance Flight Condition G R1 R S Comments**  1. PERFORMANCE 1.a **Taxi** For validation tests in this section the following device features should be to the same fidelity level: — flight model; — ground handling; — flight controls and forces; and — aeroplane systems. 1.a  $(1)$  Minimum radius turn. ±0.9 m (3 ft) or ±20% of aeroplane turn radius. Ground.  $\|\cdot\|$   $\|\cdot\|$  Plot both main and nose gear loci and key engine parameter(s). Data for no brakes and the minimum thrust required to maintain a steady turn except for aeroplanes requiring asymmetric thrust or braking to achieve the minimum radius turn. 1.a  $(2)$  Rate of turn versus nosewheel steering angle (NWA). ±10% or ±2°/s of turn rate. Ground.  $\|\cdot\|$   $\|\cdot\|$  Record for a minimum of two speeds, greater than minimum turning radius speed with one at a typical taxi speed, and with a spread of at least 5 kt. 1.b **Take-off** For validation tests in this section the following device features should be to the same fidelity level: — flight model; — ground handling; — flight controls and forces; and — aeroplane systems. Note.— All aeroplane manufacturer commonly-used certificated take-off flap settings should be demonstrated at least once either in minimum unstick speed (1.b.3), normal take-off (1.b.4), critical engine failure on take-off (1.b.5) or crosswind takeoff (1.b.6). 1.b  $(1)$  Ground acceleration time and distance. For level S: ±1.5 s or ±5% of time. ±61 m (200 ft) or ±5% of distance. Take-off.  $\|\cdot\|$   $\|\cdot\|$  Acceleration time and distance should be recorded for a minimum of 80% of the total time from brake release to  $V_r$ . May be combined with normal take-off (1.b.4) or rejected take-off (1.b.7). Plotted data should be shown using appropriate scales for each portion of the manoeuvre. For level R or R1: ±1.5 s or ±5% of  $\checkmark$   $\checkmark$

time.

### **TABLE OF FSTD VALIDATION TESTS**




























## Manual of Criteria for the Qualification III-App B-16 of Flight Simulation Training Devices — Volume I


































































































\_

# **Appendix C**

## **FUNCTIONS AND SUBJECTIVE TESTS**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 Accurate replication of aeroplane systems functions should be checked at each flight crew member position. This includes procedures using the AFM and checklists. Handling qualities, performance and FSTD systems operation as they pertain to the actual aeroplane, as well as FSTD cueing (e.g. visual cueing and motion cueing) and other supporting systems (e.g. IOS), should be subjectively assessed. Prior coordination with the CAA responsible for the evaluation is essential to ensure that the functions tests are conducted in an efficient and timely manner and that any skills, experience or expertise required by the evaluation team are available.

1.2 The necessity of functions and subjective tests arises from the need to confirm that the simulation has produced a totally integrated and acceptable replication of the aeroplane. Unlike the objective tests listed in Appendix B, subjective testing should cover areas of the flight envelope that may reasonably be reached by a trainee. Like the validation tests, the functions and subjective tests conducted during the initial evaluation are only a "spot check" and not a rigorous examination of the quality of the simulation in all areas of flight and systems operation. The FSTD operator should have completed the acceptance testing of the FSTD with support from the FSTD manufacturer prior to the device being submitted for the initial evaluation to be conducted by the CAA evaluator(s).

1.3 At the request of an FSTD operator, the FSTD may be assessed for a special aspect of a relevant training programme during the functions and subjective portion of an evaluation. Such an assessment may include a portion of a line-oriented flight training (LOFT) scenario or special emphasis items in the training programme. Unless directly related to a requirement for the current qualification level, the results of such an evaluation would not affect the FSTD's current qualification status.

1.4 Functions tests should be run in a logical flight sequence at the same time as performance and handling assessments. This also permits the FSTD to run for two to three hours in real time, without repositioning of flight or position freeze, thereby permitting proof of reliability. A useful source of guidance for conducting the functions and subjective tests is published in the RAeS Aeroplane Flight Simulator Evaluation Handbook, Volume II (see Part II, Chapter 2, 2.3).

1.5 The FSTD should be assessed to ensure that repositions, resets and freezes support efficient and effective training.

1.6 At the time of writing, simulated ATC environment was still in the early stages of its development and adoption. As a result, training approval and device qualification for this subject has not yet been proven by experience. Until such a time, it is envisaged that the evaluation of FSTD simulated ATC environment capability will be conducted via training approval and not as part of FSTD qualification.

1.7 The FSTD should be assessed to ensure that simulated ATC environment supports the specific training task (for example, as needed for MPL/ab initio training) in an efficient and effective manner. Emphasis should be on the approval of those functions that support key training objectives, rather than those that attempt to provide a high fidelity synthetic representation of real-world operations.

1.8 Since the requirements for simulated ATC environment are intentionally non-prescriptive, assessment will be largely subjective. The qualification of the FSTD should not be withheld, restricted or simulated ATC environment annotated as a "non-qualified task" as a result of non-compliance. However, if the system does not meet the criteria of a largely subjective evaluation, the training task should not be approved.

1.9 Further guidance on approval and qualification will be published in subsequent updates or amendments to this document when sufficient experience has been gathered by industry.

### **2. TEST REQUIREMENTS**

2.1 The ground and flight tests and other checks required for qualification are listed in the following Table of Functions and Subjective Tests. The table includes manoeuvres and procedures (both conventional and performancebased navigation) to ensure that the FSTD functions and performs appropriately for use in pilot training and testing or checking in the manoeuvres and procedures normally required of an approved training programme.

2.2 Some manoeuvres and procedures include pilot techniques and features of advanced technology aeroplanes and innovative training programmes. For example, "continuous descent final approach technique" and "high angle of attack manoeuvring" are included to provide an alternative to "dive and drive final approaches" and "approach to stall", respectively. For the latter, such an alternative is necessary for aeroplanes employing flight envelope limiting technology.

2.3 A representative selection of systems functions should be assessed for normal and, where appropriate, alternate operations. Normal, abnormal and emergency procedures associated with a flight phase should be assessed during the evaluation of manoeuvres or events within that flight phase. The effects of the selected malfunctions should be sufficient to correctly exercise the aeroplane-related procedures, normally contained in a quick reference handbook (QRH). Systems are listed separately under "any flight phase" to ensure appropriate attention to system checks.

#### **3. TABLE OF FUNCTIONS AND SUBJECTIVE TESTS**

 Note 1.— The Functions and Subjective Tests are all executed in an environment where FSTD features are used in a fully integrated manner. The integrated nature of the testing environment prevents these functions and subjective tests from being classified by feature fidelity level. Where any new type of FSTD is created, it will inevitably have a collection of different feature fidelity levels in its construction, which precludes the possibility of classifying tests for those "device types" using the categories G, R and S. To avoid the possibility of confusion by associating function and subjective tests for those "device types" with G, R and S, the feature fidelity levels are not presented in this table. Instead, the complete Functions and Subjective Tests list as used in Part II, Appendix C is provided with a single blank column under the heading "Applicability". For any new device type created, an appropriate Functions and Subjective Tests list will have to be defined from this master list. This should be done by analysis of the applicable training tasks that the device will support as presented in Part I and by entering ticks in the "Applicability" column for appropriate test cases. This list will have to be agreed with the relevant CAA. Examples of this can be seen in Part II, Appendix C where similar exercises were conducted for device Types I to VII.

Note 2.— "Other" means any other test as applicable to the aeroplane being simulated and as applicable to the FSTD type.








































**— END —** 

