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FAA UAS R&D Timeline

2004
- Establishment of initial WJHTC UAS Modeling and Simulation Capability
- RQ-7B Shadow, MQ-9 Predator B Performance Model Verifications/Demo
- RQ-7B Shadow UAS Operational Assessment: Cherry Point, NC
- Multi-UAS Operational Assessment: Class D Airspace
- Initial NAS Integration Simulation-1
- UAS NAS Integration: RQ-7B Shadow with FMS Simulation
- UAS NextGen Demonstrations – NASA, DHS/CBP, USAF, ERAU
- ScanEagle Performance Model Verification – Boeing/Insitu

2008

2010
- NASA UAS in the NAS Project (In progress)
- UAS R&D organized within a Portfolio

2012
- FAA UAS Integration Concept of Operations V2.0 (Maturation underway)
- DoD UAS Airspace Integration Joint Test (2012-2015)

2013
- UAS Test Sites (AK, NV, NY, ND, TX, VA)
- Integration of UAS into the FAA NAS Enterprise Architecture
- NASA UAS Traffic Management Research Transition Team

2015
- UAS Center of Excellence (MSU - ASSURE)

Present
- UAS FY15 - FY16 R&D Initiatives in Progress
Present FAA Sponsored Research

- DAA System Certification Obstacles
- Integration of ACAS-Xu into DAA
- UAS C2 Link Compatibility
- UAS Human Factors Considerations
- UAS Enroute Contingency Operations (pilot & ATC procedures)
- Analysis of Test Site Safety Data
- sUAS Well Clear Definition
- sUAS DAA required for BVLOS (Limited portions of NAS)
- sUAS Control & Non-Payload Communications (SWaP)
- Validation of sUAS Industry Consensus Standards for airworthiness
- UAS Airborne Collision Severity Thresholds
- UAS Ground Collision Severity Thresholds
- UAS Noise Certification
Emerging Commercial UAS Operational Environments (OE)

I. “Manned like” IFR
UAS will be expected to meet certification standards and operate safely with traditional air traffic and ATM services. (DRM: Internet Provider)

II. Tweeners
Flights at altitudes below critical NAS infrastructure, and transitioning low altitude and traditional aircraft operations. (DRM: Inspection)

III. Low Altitude Populated
Must interface with dense controlled air traffic environments as well as operate safely amongst the traffic in uncontrolled airspace. (DRM: Package Delivery)

IV. Low Altitude Unpopulated
Low risk BVLOS rural operations without aviation services. (DRM: Agriculture)
R&D Concerns for UAS Integration

• Lack of Clear Research Questions to Support Policy Decisions
• Ambiguity of Architecture, Technology Levels and Con-Ops
  – CNS, Level of Automation, Vehicle Performance, Data Structures
  – Dynamic Environment
  – Need for Reference Placeholders (Architecture, Con-Ops)
• Diversity of UAS Operating Environments and Platforms
  – Segregated (Low Altitude, High Altitude)
  – Integrated (Mid Altitudes)
• Urgency Driving Piecemeal Approach
• Need to Leverage Initial Efforts
  – Operating Statistics and Pathfinder Efforts
• Role of NASA, DOD, International
  – NAS Integration
  – Vehicle Technologies
Breakout Discussion Application of Research

• What are the key and emerging challenges to:
  • Enabling
  • Enhancing
  • Reducing restrictions on your current and desired public & commercial UAS operations?

• What research is required to address these challenges?