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Trajectory Negotiation

• Advantages
  – Enables flight operators to tailor trajectories based on preferences
  – Enables better utilization of available airspace resources
    • Reducing delay & increasing throughput
  – Increases predictability

• Barriers
  – Routes must be operationally acceptable

Can we automatically generate a TOS with high probability of operational acceptance?
Literature Review

• Commercial TOS generators under development, accounting for historical usage

• Studies completed on operational acceptability

• Models generating strategic routes using optimization, constrained to meet criteria that make it operationally acceptable

• Previous NASA work uses machine learning to predict operational acceptability of airborne reroute requests
Objective

Automatically generate routes that have high probability of operational acceptance

Method: Use machine learning to train predictors on operational acceptance of strategic routes
Approach to TOS Generation

1. Identify available trajectory options
   - Based on historical routes

2. Down-select trajectory options
   - Using route clustering
   - Defines set of geographically distinct routes

3. Predict operational acceptability
   - Using machine learning algorithms
   - Given static and dynamic conditions

4. Select TOS
   - Based on location of constraint and probability of trajectory acceptance by ATC
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- Apply Hierarchical clustering
- Dissimilarity metric calculated as Euclidean distance between trajectories
  - Each trajectory represented by a fixed length vector
  - Linear interpolation of 2D spatial position for 200 evenly spaced points

\[
\begin{align*}
tr_i &= (x_{i1}, y_{i1}, x_{i2}, y_{i2}, \ldots, x_{iN}, y_{iN}) \\
tr_j &= (x_{j1}, y_{j1}, x_{j2}, y_{j2}, \ldots, x_{jN}, y_{jN}) \\
\ldots \\
\
d_{ij} &= \sqrt{(x_{i1} - x_{j1})^2 + (y_{i1} - y_{j1})^2 + \ldots + (x_{iN} - x_{jN})^2 + (y_{iN} - y_{jN})^2}
\end{align*}
\]
2. Down-Select Trajectory Options

- Apply Hierarchical clustering
- Dissimilarity metric calculated as Euclidean distance between trajectories
- Number of clusters identified based on maximizing avg. Silhouette score

\[ S = \frac{\min(\text{intercluster dist.}) - \text{intracluster dist.}}{\max(\min(\text{intercluster dist.}), \text{intracluster dist.})} \]

\[ \bar{S} = \frac{1}{N_r} \sum_{i=1}^{N_r} S_i \]

- Minimum number of clusters set to 15
2. Down-Select Trajectory Options

- Apply Hierarchical clustering
- Dissimilarity metric calculated as Euclidean distance between trajectories
- Number of clusters identified based on maximizing avg. Silhouette score
  - For flight from Jacksonville Sector 52 to Newark Airport: 16 clusters
- Most commonly flown trajectory in each cluster identified for further analysis
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• Train machine learning algorithms on historical flight plan amendment data
  – Based on static and dynamic conditions impacting flight

• Select algorithm based on predictive performance using cross validation

• Apply chosen algorithm to predict operational acceptance for down-selected trajectory options

Given flight location and destination

Jacksonville Sector 52
Fort Lauderdale Airport
Newark Airport
Training Data

- **Positive class**: Strategic historical flight plan amendments
  - Initiated by Traffic Management Unit (TMU)
  - Filter for amendments:
    - Through multiple Center facilities
    - Excluding direct routings

- **Negative class**: Generated artificially
  - Potential alternative amendments identified and assumed unacceptable
  - Identified using historical data and clustering
Features

• Static features
  – Historical usage
  – Relative flight duration
• Dynamic features
  – Imbalance between demand and capacity
Features

1. Historical Usage
   - Count of historical usage
   - Count as reroute
   - Full trajectory
   - Minimum across waypoint pairs
   - Difference in counts between original route and amendment
Features

2. Flight Duration
   - Flight duration from amendment to destination
   - Difference in amendment duration relative to original flight plan
   - Number of sectors between amendment and destination
   - Difference in number of sectors between amendment and destination relative to original flight plan
3. Demand to Capacity Imbalance

- Projected demand calculated using NASA Future ATM Concepts Evaluation Tool (FACET)
- Capacity defined by sector Monitor Alert Capacity and weather impact
3. Demand to Capacity Imbalance

- Projected demand calculated using NASA Future ATM Concepts Evaluation Tool (FACET)
- Capacity defined by sector Monitor Alert Capacity and weather impact
  - Forecast weather impact based on percentage overlap between sector and Convective Weather Avoidance Model (CWAM) polygons
  - 60%, 70% and 80% probability of deviation CWAM polygons used
- Multiple metrics calculated:
  - Average demand/capacity
  - Maximum demand/capacity
  - Number of sectors over capacity
  - Whether any sector was over capacity
  - Difference between sum of demand/capacity on amendment and original
Model Selection

- Model performance estimated using 10-fold cross validation
- 9,356 observations: 36.8% positive, 63.2% negative
- Synthetic Minority Over-Sampling Technique (SMOTE) applied to balance dataset

![Accuracy Chart]

- Logistic Regression
- Multi-Layer Perceptron
- SVM-Linear Kernel
- SVM-Sigmoid Kernel
- Random Forest
- Ada Boost
Feature Importance

- Max Sector Dem./MAP of Amendment
- Diff. Sum Center CWAM Overlap 60%
- Amendment duration
- No. Sectors in Amendment
- Diff. Sum Sector Dem./Reduced Cap. 70%
- Diff. Sum Sector Dem./MAP
- Diff. Sum Sector Dem./Reduced Cap. 80%
- Diff. in No. Sectors
- Diff. Sum Sector Dem./Reduced Cap. 60%
- Diff. in Duration
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- TOS selected based on:
  - Probability of operational acceptance
  - Location of constraint
- Other factors may also be important
  - Wind optimality
  - Fueling
  - Equipage
Sample Application: Pre-Departure
Sample Application: Pre-Departure
Sample Application: Pre-Departure

1. Identify available trajectory options based on historical routes

Dallas-Fort Worth Airport → Newark Airport
Sample Application: Pre-Departure

2. Down-select trajectory options using clustering

Dallas-Fort Worth Airport

Newark Airport
Sample Application: Pre-Departure

3. Predict operational acceptability using machine learning

Dallas-Fort Worth Airport

Newark Airport

Probability of Acceptance by ATC
Sample Application: Pre-Departure

4. Select TOS based on operational acceptability and location of constraint.
Sample Application: Pre-Departure

4. Select TOS based on operational acceptability and location of constraint
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Conclusions

• Machine learning validation results indicate operational acceptability may be predictable with high accuracy
• Approach developed to automatically generate TOSs
  – Incorporated with other capabilities, may be useful in route generation
• Most important features describe difference between amendment and original route for:
  – Flight duration
  – Demand to capacity imbalance
• Could enable more effective trajectory negotiation
  – Could enable flight operators to automatically generate routes with high operational acceptability, and therefore have increased predictability
  – Could enable airlines to effectively submit preferences