

Surface CDM Team (SCT) CDM Automation Team (CAT)

Meeting Notes

January 16, 2015



CDM
Collaborative
Decision Making

Joint SCT/CAT Meeting
January 16, 2015

In attendance:

Frank McIntosh, FAA, CDM/International Manager, CDM Lead
Jim Hamilton, UPS, CDM Lead
Keith Alexander, FAA, SCT Co-Lead
Bernie Davis, AAL, SCT
Tim Reid, DAL, SCT
Ron Ooten, SWA, SCT
Charlie Mead, AAL, SCT and CAT Co-Lead
Jill Sparrow, CAT Co-Lead
Lenard Carter, FAA, CAT
Gino Siller, FAA, CAT
Brett Gilbertson, DAL, CAT
Mike McAfee, FDX, CAT
Scott Fritz, AAL, CAT
RB Haggerty, A4A, CAT
Jim McClay, NBAA, CAT
Susan Passmore, FAA
Tony Colavito, MITRE
Carol Huegel, FAA
Isacc Robeson, Metron Aviation

The Surface CDM Team (SCT) and CDM Automation Team (CAT) met to begin work on Tasking #55: Data Quality Report Card/Surface Data Element Integration. The teams began by reviewing the task with the CDM Co-Leads Frank McIntosh and Jim Hamilton. The CDM Co-Leads clarified that the task provides a 'clean slate' to revise the current data quality report card metrics and to approve or revise the surface metrics proposed by the FAA Surface Office.

The CAT provided a presentation on the existing data quality web site and report card. Current report card measures Time Out Cancels, Cancels that Flew, and Undeclared Flights. The report card contains grades A, B, C and F. Currently, there are no penalties for bad grades, nor rewards for good grades. The data quality website/report card also has several items that need to be fixed. I.E. Some carriers are listed under the wrong MAJOR, some flight series appear incorrect for users who are subcarriers for more than one MAJOR and data has been missing in the bar graphs since August 24, 2014.

The team began discussion about what should be measured and what purpose the metrics serve. Topics included possibly measuring data for flights only if they impact or impacted by a TMI

such as a Reroute, Yellow/Red Sector, GDP/AFP/GS, etc.; Measuring data quality that impacts the arrival of a flight (ETE or ETA estimates); Measuring data quality for only specific airports or markets; and Measuring data quality for only certain time frames of the day.

The FAA Surface Office provided the teams a briefing on the 11 new surface data elements that will be included in TFMS Release 11 (see Figure 1). Sources for some these elements may not exist yet, for example Earliest Off Block Time (EOBT) will be derived, in order, from LGTD, PGTD, SGTD or IGTD. (Jill expressed concern with data quality metrics would use EOBT when that field is populated using different departure time values.) Some of the ‘new’ elements are identical to current existing data elements. I.E. AOBT, ATOT, ALDT and AIBT equate to OOOI data. These elements were renamed in an effort to align with ICAO standards. Jill noted that if the existing elements and new elements can be populated using different sources, it is possible to have differing data when it should instead be matching. For example, if AOBT and OUT are provided by CDM message and user submits data for both, the fields have potential to not match if type is made in the CDM message.

Surface CDM Data Element	Existing TFMS Data Element
AOBT	OUT
ATOT	OFF
ALDT	ON
AIBT	IN
Aircraft Tail / Registration Number	[none currently existing]
EOBT	Approximation can be derived from existing data elements (LGTD, PGTD, SGTD, IGTD)
Flight Cancelation	Via FX message
Flight Intent	[none currently existing]
Gate Assignment (Arrival and Departure)	[none currently existing]
IOBT	IGTD
ERTD (a.k.a PWUP)	ERTD

Figure 1, Surface Data Elements

The surface briefing included Key Performance Areas (KPA) that the Surface Office has been developing with the assistance of the Surface Outreach group. Data Quality is one of the defined KPAs, and within this KPA there are Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) which use the accuracy and timeliness of data at different time frames prior to departure. The suggested metrics would measure data accuracy at different time intervals prior to departure, use point values that are higher in value for the time frames closer to departure time, and would provide a data quality report which would measure each flight based on the percentage of points that are applicable and achieved.

After the Surface Office briefing, the team discussed how to proceed with Tasking #55. This tasking will be a challenge. We need to determine what we should measure in order to have meaningful metrics that can provide value to the NAS. We discussed the current CDM data quality metrics, nothing that very little, if anything, has been done with the current DQ report card. Several team members felt the suggested KPIs from the Surface Office seemed like valuable metrics. Several different issues were noted: We need to determine value of new or revised metrics? What do we do with current DQ web site and report card? Do we recommend CSG use KPIs as suggested by Surface Office? Do we add to those KPIs? If so, do we measure all CDM data or only data for specific TMIs, airports, markets, city pairs, time of day? We also need to look at other factors that impact the data. For example, message from ERAM that generate departure messages for the wrong flight when aircraft has wrong beacon code, or changes to Ptime that are made by an FAA facility. The team agreed to meet in February to continue work on metrics.

Next Meetings: February 17, 2015 at ATCSCC
CDM General Session March 24-25

Collaborative
Decision Making