

Evaluation of Departure Pushback Time Assignment Considering Uncertainty Using Real Operational Data

9th SESAR Innovation Days

Ryota Mori (ENRI)









Background (1)

- Aviation growth causes airport congestions.
 - Both departure and arrival aircraft wait in long queues.
 - → This research focuses on controlling departure aircraft.
- Pushback time control management (called TSAT operation: Target Start-up Approval Time) is promising.
 - Benefit
 - Reduce taxi-out time by waiting at the spot → save fuel
 - Disadvantage
 - Take-off delay (throughput loss) due to too late pushback time assigned





Background (2)

- Take-off delay (throughput loss) using TSAT is caused by departure uncertainty.
 - No take-off delay occurs if everything is known in advance.
 - TOBT (Target Off-Block Time: estimated time of aircraft ready for pushback) is the biggest uncertainty factor
- There are few researches to investigate the actual departure uncertainty.

→ Therefore, this research will

- Investigate the actual departure uncertainty using real operational data at a mid-size French airport.
 - One month data in 2018 is available.
 - A single runway is used for departure only.
 - TSAT operation is already introduced.
- Compare several pushback time assignment algorithms and evaluate TSAT performance using "real" departure uncertainty environment.





General TSAT assignment







TOBT accuracy





- TOBT can be updated anytime.
 - TOBT accuracy is expected to become better as time progresses.
- According to the result,
 - TOBT accuracy is about 5 minutes of SD just before pushback.
 - TOBT-AOBT is always negative.
 - TOBT tends to be set earlier than actual.





Example of TOBT update history



- Some aircraft do not update TOBT even if the aircraft cannot leave the gate around TOBT.
 - These aircraft are also considered in the simulation by using the TOBT update history.





Two methods for TSAT assignment (1)

Constant buffer method



- The buffer (= TTOT-ETOT = wait in a departure queue) is set constant when TSAT is assigned.
- Most existing TSAT assignment systems use this method.





Two methods for TSAT assignment (2)

Constant queueing number method



- Keep the target queueing number in each time slot.
- Previous research confirmed that this method outperforms the constant buffer method.
 - Later slides shows both results.



9 th SESAR Innovation Days 2 – 6 December 2019, Athens, Greece







Simulation accuracy



- Simulation is conducted assuming AOBT_{sim} = AOBT_{act}.
 - ATOT_{sim} is expected to be the same as ATOT_{act}.
 - Average of 100 times simulation.
 - Simulation seems to model the airport traffic reasonably.





Waiting time in a departure queue



• Waiting time is caused by

Congestion at the runway

• CTOT

- CTOT: Controlled Take-Off Time
 - The aircraft has to take-off after CTOT due to ATC requirement.
- Larger waiting time is observed with larger traffic.
- Waiting time caused by CTOT is about 40% of total waiting time.
- Waiting time per aircraft is at most about 1 minute.







Waiting time on Day 29



- The maximum waiting time caused by runway congestion is less than 5 minutes.
 - TOBT accuracy is 5-7 minutes of SD.
- TSAT is not expected to work at this airport.





Waiting time saved and delay caused by TSAT



Total waiting time saved by TSAT [minutes]

- As for CTOT aircraft, 18 minutes waiting time is saved while 0.6 minutes delay is caused.
- As for other aircraft, waiting time saved is nearly equal to delay caused by TSAT.
 - TSAT does not work well.





Heavy traffic simulation

- Single day traffic is not heavy enough to use TSAT at this airport.
- Double day traffic is assumed.
 - 2 days traffic are merged on a single day.
 - No effect (e.g. gate congestion) is considered due to double traffic.
 - Heavy traffic situation can be easily simulated.
 - TOBT/CTOT history can be used.





Waiting time in a departure queue assuming double traffic



- On a single day, waiting time is about 100 minutes.
- Assuming double traffic, minimum about 200 minutes (1.06 min/aircraft), maximum about 2200 minutes (7.39 min/aircraft).





Waiting time saved and delay caused by TSAT (double traffic)



- Much larger waiting time saved is observed due to double traffic.
- As expected, the constant queueing number method outperforms the constant buffer method.







Waiting time on Day 25 and 26



- Overall, waiting time more than 15 minutes is saved by TSAT.
 - SD of TOBT accuracy is 5-7 minutes, so the result is expected.





Summary

- TOBT accuracy is investigated using real operational data.
 - SD of TOBT accuracy is at least 5 minutes.
- Two TSAT assignment algorithms are evaluated with the simulation model developed with data.
 - Constant queueing number method outperforms constant buffer method.
- Traffic at the considered airport is too small, and the use of TSAT is not beneficial.
 - Assuming double traffic, TSAT will potentially work.
- Further TOBT accuracy improvement will be necessary in the future.

