

Motivation and Key Issues

- FAA traditional focus on flight safety extended to include national security
- Civil and commercial market for UASs inhibited by lack of access to the NAS
- Historically UAS's presented no conflict with manned aircraft
- UA community needs regulatory documents for operations in the NAS



Approach

- Survey GA manufacturers to identify elements necessary for FAA certification
- Develop checklist of major steps in the certification process
- Probe UAS community to assess level of technology relative to GA community
- Analyze results of the assessment & establish level of UAS airworthiness
- Identify major gaps relative to FAA certification

- Principal Investigators & Researchers
 - Walter Horn
 - Allison Crockett
- FAA Technical Monitor
 - Tong Vu
- Other FAA Personnel Involved
 - Xiaogong Lee
 - Curtis Davies



1. Literature review of FAA certification requirements	Nov. 1, 2006
2. Identify specific segments of FAA regulations for initial focus	Nov.1, 2006
3. Literature review of UAS products	Dec.1, 2006
4. Identify contact points in general aviation companies	Dec. 1, 2006
5. Create and distribute survey for GA airworthiness representatives	Feb. 1, 2007
6. Analyze data of GA survey and draw conclusions	Mar. 1, 2007
7. Create initial matrix of key certification steps	Mar. 1, 2007
8. Identify contacts in key UAS companies	May 1, 2007
9. Create survey for UAS company contact points	May 1, 2007
10. Distribute survey to UAS contacts	May 1, 2007
11. Analyze results of survey and create follow-up interview questions	Jun. 1, 2007
12. Follow-up interviews with UAS company contact points	Aug. 1, 2007
13. Analyze data and draw conclusions	Aug. 15, 2007
14. Write final report	Aug. 15, 2007

- Compile information on all classes of UASs currently in production , but
- Concentrate on those UAS's that would likely fit, on the basis of mass and geometry, into the Part 23 category of aircraft.

Focus Segment of Airworthiness Standards



Initial focus in the following sections of the CFR 14 Part 23 Airworthiness Standards:

Subpart C – Structures

- 23.305 Strength and deformation
- 23.307 Proof of Structure
- 23.571 Metallic pressurized cabin structures
- 23.572 Metallic wing, empennage, and associated structures
- 23.573 Damage tolerance and fatigue evaluation of structure

Subpart D – Design and Construction

- 23.603 Materials and workmanship
- 23.605 Fabrication methods
- 23.613 Material strength properties and design values-



Schedule of Tasks for Technology Assessment of Airworthiness of UAS's

Activity	2006					2007							
	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug
Lit. review of FAA cert. req.		█	█										
Identify focus segments of FAA regs	█	█	█										
Lit. review of UAS products	█	█	█	█	█	█							
Identify GA contacts	█	█	█	█	█	█							
Create/distribute GA survey for GA			█	█	█	█	█						
Identify UAS contacts				█	█	█	█	█	█				
Analyze GA survey results						█	█	█					
Create matrix of key cert. steps						█	█	█					
Create UAS survey							█	█	█				
Distribute UAS survey									█				
Analyze survey results; create questions										█			
Follow-up interviews with UAS contacts											█	█	
Analyze data and draw conclusions										█	█	█	█
Write final report											█	█	█









Company	UAV Name	Photo	Avail.	Wt. (lbs) (w/o payload)	Payload wt. (lbs)	Length (ft)	Wing Span (ft)	Speed (knots)	Oper. Alt. (ft.)	Endurance	Mission/User
	WASP Micro Air Vehicle			0.4	0.1	0.7	1.1	1.5	1,200	60 mins	Organic Squad level Reconnaissance & Surveillance, Light Infantry Military Operations on Urban Terrain
	SWIFT			6.1		3.0	3.8	2.6	100-500		Light Infantry Military, Dismounted Urban Warfare, Remote Reconnaissance and Surveillance, Force Protection and Convoy Security.
	PUMA			12.0		5.9	8.5	22.9	100-500		Extended Duration Surveillance, Light Infantry Military Operations on Urbanized Terrain, Dismounted Urban Warfare.
	DRAGON EYE			4.5	1.0	2.4	3.8	19.0	1,000	40-60 mins	Over the Hill Reconnaissance/Marine Corps
	Hornet			0.4	0.1	0.58	1.25				
	RAVEN RQ-11B			4.0	2.0	3.4	4.3	2.9	1,000	1.5 hrs	Over the Hill Reconnaissance/ Army, Air Force, SOCOM
Rotomotion, LLC	SR100 VTOL SR20 Electric VTOL SR200 VTOL			18 10 50							
IAI Israel Aircraft Industries	Mosquito			1.1		1.0	1.1		300		
Lockheed Martin	FPASS			7.0	1.0	2.7	4.3		1,000	1 hr	Force Protection/Air Force
AV AeroVironment's	Pointer		No	10.0	2.0	6.0	9.0	2.3	3,000	1 hr	Special Operations /SOCOM/Air Force
Advanced Ceramics	Silver Fox			20.0	5.0	4.8	7.8				



Extra Large USAs



Company	UAV Name	Photo	Avail.	Wt. (lbs) (w/o payload)	Payload wt. (lbs)	Length (ft)	Wing Span (ft)	Speed (knots)	Oper. Alt.(ft.)	Endur. (hrs)	Mission/User
BOEING	X-45C (L) Manned/Unmanned Light Helicopter			36,500	4,500	39	49	460	40,000	7	Air Force and Navy
	Global Hawk (RQ-4A)		Yes	26,700	1950	44.4	116.2	350/340	65,000	32	Persistent High Altitude Surveillance & Reconnaissance
NORTHROP GRUMMAN	Global Hawk (RQ-4B)		Yes	32,250	3000	47	130.9	340/310	60,000	28	Persistent High Altitude Surveillance & Reconnaissance
	Fire Scout										
	Hunter										
	Killerbee										
	X-47B UCAS			46,000	4,500	38	62	460	40,000	9	Air Force and Navy
General Atomics Aeronautical Systems	ALTUS I					22	55		45,000		Ideal for Communications relay, cellular relay and commercial applications
	ALTUS II					22	55		65,000		Ideal for Communications relay, cellular relay and commercial applications
	PROWLER II		No	200	50	13.9	24	172/63	21,000	6	
	MARINER					36	86	240	52,000		Long-Endurance Navy and Homeland Security Applications
	PREDATOR B (MQ-9A)			10,500	750	36	66	220	50,000	30	Multi-Mission ISR/ Air Force
	ALTAIR					36	86	220	52,000		High-Altitude Scientific Research
	WARRIOR					36	48.7				

Information Sought With Original General Aviation Survey



- Identify company's last aircraft to receive FAA certification.
- Relative to that particular aircraft, provide the following information regarding company's process to demonstrate compliance with each of the focus sections of Part 23 regulations:
 - Identify major elements of procedure to demonstrate compliance (analytical validation procedures, test validation procedures, material selection and quality control procedures, manufacture quality and control procedures, system quality and reliability procedures, and other compliance procedures)
 - Identify major equipment necessary for compliance
 - Identify size and quality of workforce necessary for compliance
 - Estimate man-hours devoted to certification process



- Felt that the general aviation community would not respond to the survey sufficiently

Key Elements of Approach After Course Correction

1. Modified GA survey to retrieve information on how new technologies are incorporated in the airframe certification process.
2. Renew efforts to develop a thorough understanding of FAA regulations regarding airframe structures.
3. Explore avenues that might provide information that would lead to an understanding of existing UAS airframe technologies.
4. Use the results of steps 2 and 3 above to determine any gaps between current FAA regulations and the UAS airframe technologies.
5. Prepare the survey to be administered to the UAS manufacturers based on the outcomes of steps 2 and 3 above, with an emphasis on how to address the gaps identified in step 4 above.





- Meeting with Project Monitor, Tong Vu to discuss plans for remaining period of the project
- Agreement that GA community will have no incentive to respond to the survey; thus will probably half-heartedly repond, or fail to respond altogether
- Try a new approach to surveying the UAS community, that does not depend on the results of the GA survey
- This approach requires our distilling the requirements of Part 23 to a much smaller set of distinct requirements that we can use to examine the airframe airworthiness capability of the UAS manufacturing community.



- Distill Subparts C and D of the CFR 14 Part 23 to a set of key requirements
- Contact UAS contacts to get information on their compliance with the key requirements of Sub-Parts C and D
- Construct a matrix to summarize the results
- Procedure should include a mechanism to identify miscellaneous issues that fall outside the set of key requirements of the regulations
- Try to compare the technology issues of DoD aircraft specifications with corresponding FAA regulations

Table Summarizing Level of Compliance with Key Requirements of Regulations

Point Company	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
A				10%		80%	80%					
B											10%	
C									20%			
D												
E									80%			
F												
G									20%			
H	10%						10%				80%	
I	70%	80%										20%
J	20%						20%				80%	
Total	80%	98%	90%	91%	100%	78%	81%	90%	52%	70%	675	52%



Future need

Thorough examination of Part 23 (Subpart C - Structures and Subpart D - Design and Construction) to determine specific subsections that are relevant to the airworthiness of both manned aircraft and unmanned aircraft systems, subsections that are not relevant to UAS airworthiness, and create additional subsections of the regulations that are necessary for unmanned aircraft, but are not germane for manned aircraft.