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The General Principle

- **Networked systems can impose safety envelopes**
  - This is the intent of the air traffic control system
- **Networks fail**
  - E.g. Malicious pilots can ignore air traffic control directives
- **Components can locally impose safety envelopes**
  - Tighter envelopes may be required when networks fail
- **Software-driven control systems enable imposition of safety envelopes at all levels of the network hierarchy**
  - Air traffic control
  - Individual aircraft
  - Individual engine
  - Individual part

**Principle:**

*Integrated Safety Envelopes*
Flexible Networked Systems with Rich Functionality

Networked embedded system... with a rich set of safe behaviors
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Compromised Networked Systems
Falls back to Less Functionality

Compromised system... has fewer safe behaviors

Principle:
*Integrated Safety Envelopes*
Hierarchical Networked Systems
With Locally Defined Safety Envelopes

Compromised subsystem...

Principle:
Integrated Safety Envelopes

behavior within locally defined safety envelopes
Illustration of the Principle: Softwalls

- Enforce no-fly zones in the on-board avionics.
- Carry on-board a 3-D database with "no-fly-zones".
- Localization technology identifies aircraft position.
  - GPS + inertial navigation system
- System is not networked and not hackable.
- Improves aircraft safety
  - prevents controlled flight into terrain.

Principle:
- Maximize pilot authority
- Subject to the no-fly zone constraint
- Maintain aircraft responsivity
No-Fly Zone with Harsher Enforcement

There are already regions of space into which aircraft can’t fly. The idea is to make some of these virtual.
Trajectory with Maximally Uncooperative Pilot

Assumptions:
- speed: 0.1 miles/sec = 360 miles/hour
- Max rate of turn: $M = \frac{2\pi}{20}$ radians/sec
- min turning radius: speed/M = 0.32 miles

- pilot turns towards the wall
- bias starts, pilot counteracts
- pilot controls saturate
- pilot regains steerage towards wall
Aircraft is Diverted by a Blending Controller, which Combines a Bias with Pilot Directives

Sailing analogy: weather helm

Even with weather helm, the craft responds to fine-grain control as expected.
Related Methods

- Ground proximity warning systems
- Automatic ground avoidance systems
- TCAS & ACAS - collision avoidance
- Potential field methods for air-traffic control

These all share one feature: localization of safety envelopes.
Issues

• Reducing pilot authority is dangerous
  - reduces ability to respond to emergencies
Is There Any Aircraft Emergency Severe Enough to Justify Trying to Land on Fifth Ave?
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No-Fly Zone with Harsher Enforcement

There is no override in the cockpit that allows pilots to fly through this.
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Localization Issues

GPS falls back to Inertial navigation

Accurate, robust localization technology is an essential technology.

“Localization” is the technology for reliably and accurately knowing the location of an object.
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Deployment

- Fly-by-wire aircraft
  - a software change
- Older aircraft
  - autopilot level?
- Phase in
  - prioritize airports
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**Deployment could take too long**
- software certification
This seems largely orthogonal of air traffic control, and could complement safety methods deployed there. It is self-contained on a single aircraft. Improves robustness of any air traffic control system.
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• Fully automatic flight control is possible
  - throw a switch on the ground, take over plane
UAV Technology
(Unoccupied Air Vehicle)

e.g. Global Hawk
(Northrop Grumman)

Technology Support Working Group (TSWG), office of the Secretary of Defense, recommends against any partial control approach. Their feeling is that there is only one feasible strategy: a single trigger, either on-board or remote control, that would assume complete control and take the plane to a safe base.

Northrop Grumman has such a system in the Global Hawk UAV that some believe can be dropped-in to passenger airliners.
Potential Problems with Switching to Ground Control When Threat is Detected

- Human-in-the-loop delay on the ground
  - authorization for takeover
  - delay recognizing the threat

- Security problem on the ground
  - hijacking from the ground?
  - takeover of entire fleet at once?

- Requires radio communication
  - hackable
  - jammable

This does not follow the principle of Integrated Safety Envelopes
Integrated Safety Envelopes
Research Agenda

• Defining hierarchical safety envelopes
  - Model-based design
• Fault and threat detection
  - On-line models
• Fault and threat isolation
  - Mode changes to impose safety envelopes
• Predictable mode transitions
  - Avoid emergent behavior, propagating effects
• Adapting existing systems
  - Models must include the phase-in transition
• Policy issues
  - Limiting authority
Conclusions

• Don’t have to choose between large, centralized control, and decentralized, semi-autonomous actors.
  - Use both
  - Failures or threats ⇒ tighter safety envelopes

• Need control algorithms that maintain safe operating parameters and maximize local authority subject to the safety constraints.