

SUBJECT : **Flight Crew Alerting**
REQUIREMENTS incl. Amdt. : CS 25.1322 at Amdt. 20
ASSOCIATED IM/MoC¹ : Yes ☐ / No ☒
ADVISORY MATERIAL : AMC 25.1322

Table of Contents

SUBJECT.....	1
INTRODUCTORY NOTE:	2
ABBREVIATIONS:	2
IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUE:.....	2
DEV-F25.1322-01	8
1. APPLICABILITY.....	8
2. APPLICABLE ESSENTIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR AIRWORTHINESS OF REGULATION (EU) 2018/1139 (Annex II).....	9
3. MITIGATING FACTORS	9

¹ Associated Interpretative Material and/or Means of Compliance may be published for awareness only and they are not subject to public consultation.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE:

The following Deviation (DEV) shall be subject to public consultation in accordance with EASA Management Board decision 12/2007 dated 11 September 2007, Article 3 (2.) which states:

"2. Deviations from the applicable airworthiness codes, environmental protection certification specifications and/or acceptable means of compliance with Part 21, as well as important special conditions and equivalent safety findings, shall be submitted to the panel of experts and be subject to a public consultation of at least 3 weeks, except if they have been previously agreed and published in the Official Publication of the Agency. The final decision shall be published in the Official Publication of the Agency."

ABBREVIATIONS:


none

IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUE:

CS 25.1322 specified the following:

- a) (...)
- b) Alerts must conform to the following prioritisation hierarchy based on the urgency of flight crew awareness and response:
 - (1) Warning: For conditions that require immediate flight crew awareness and immediate flight crew response.
 - (2) Caution: For conditions that require immediate flight crew awareness and subsequent flight crew response.
 - (3) Advisory: For conditions that require flight crew awareness and may require subsequent flight crew response.
- c) Warning and Caution alerts must:
 - (...)
 - (2) provide timely attention-getting cues through at least two different senses by a combination of aural, visual, or tactile indications;
 - (...)
- d) (...)
- e) Visual alert indications must:
 - (1) conform to the following colour convention:
 - (i) Red for Warning alert indications.
 - (ii) Amber or yellow for Caution alert indications.
 - (iii) Any colour except red or green for Advisory alert indications.
 - (...)
- f) (...)

An alerting system that aids the flight crew in identifying non-normal operational or aeroplane system conditions and in responding in an appropriate and timely manner is an essential feature of every flight deck design.

 European Union Aviation Safety Agency	Consultation paper Deviation	Doc. No. : DEV-F25.1322-01 Issue : 1 Date : 10 Oct 2022 Proposed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Final <input type="checkbox"/> Deadline for comments: 31 Oct 2022
--	---	--

The design proposed by the Applicant Dassault Aviation for the Falcon 6X is not fully compliant with the paragraphs mentioned above as it retains the Legacy Falcon cockpit philosophy where:

- “Red” color is used for situations associated with loss of basic features such as attitude, airspeed, altitude, guidance cues and AP disconnection.
- “Amber” color is used for situations associated with non-normal system conditions (including miscompare of source data).

The tables here below report the identified non-compliances along with the details on the flight phases in which they are identified.

Table 1 details the scenarios linked to System Status Flags, while Table 2 is about Approach Flags.

ID	Flight Phase	Abnormal condition	Non Compliance (description)	Non Compliance (req. para)
1	Take-Off	Miscompare of IAS (indicated airspeed) ATT (attitude) FPV (Flight Path vector)	For this scenario the design is not compliant since: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant has declared this alert as a Warning whereas the alert has been designed as a Caution. This misclassification results in a non compliance to CS25.1322(b)(1). • Warning situations require a red visual indication as imposed by CS25.1322(e)(1)(i). 	CS25.1322(b)(1) CS25.1322(e)(1)(i)
2	Climb Cruise Descent	Miscompare of IAS (indicated airspeed) ATT (attitude) FPV (Flight Path vector)	For this scenario the design is not compliant since: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant has declared this alert as a Warning whereas the alert has been designed as a Caution. This misclassification results in a non compliance to CS25.1322(b)(1). • Warning situations require a red visual indication as imposed by CS25.1322(e)(1)(i). 	CS25.1322(b)(1) CS25.1322(e)(1)(i)



Consultation paper

Deviation

Doc. No. : DEV-F25.1322-01

Issue : 1

Date : 10 Oct 2022

Proposed ☒ Final ☐

Deadline for comments: 31 Oct 2022

ID	Flight Phase	Abnormal condition	Non Compliance (description)	Non Compliance (req. para)
3	Approach Landing	Miscompare of IAS (indicated airspeed) ATT (attitude) FPV (Flight Path vector) HDG (Heading) ALT (Altitude)	For this scenario the design is not compliant since: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant has declared this alert as a Warning whereas the alert has been designed as a Caution. This misclassification results in a non compliance to CS25.1322(b)(1). Warning situations require a red visual indication as imposed by CS25.1322(e)(1)(i). 	CS25.1322(b)(1) CS25.1322(e)(1)(i)
4	Take-Off	Loss of RA (radioaltitude) ALT (altitude) HDG (Heading) VS (vertical speed) LOC (Localizer)	For this scenario the design is not compliant since: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant has declared this alert as a Caution whereas the alert has been designed as a Warning. This misclassification results in a non compliance to CS25.1322(b)(2). Caution situations require a amber visual indication as imposed by CS25.1322(e)(1)(ii). 	CS25.1322(b)(2) CS25.1322(e)(1)(ii)
5		Loss of LOC (Localizer)	For this scenario the design is not compliant since: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant has declared this alert as a Advisory whereas the alert has been designed as a Warning. This misclassification results in a non compliance to CS25.1322(b)(3). Advisory situations require a visual indication not red or green as imposed by CS25.1322(e)(1)(iii). 	CS25.1322(b)(3) CS25.1322(e)(1)(iii)

Consultation paper

Deviation

Doc. No. : DEV-F25.1322-01

Issue : 1

Date : 10 Oct 2022

 Proposed ☒ Final ☐

Deadline for comments: 31 Oct 2022

ID	Flight Phase	Abnormal condition	Non Compliance (description)	Non Compliance (req. para)
6	Climb Cruise Descent	Loss of IAS (indicated airspeed) RA (radioaltitude) ALT (altitude) HDG (Heading) VS (vertical speed)	For this scenario the design is not compliant since: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant has declared this alert as a Caution whereas the alert has been designed as a Warning. This misclassification results in a non compliance to CS25.1322(b)(2). Caution situations require a amber visual indication as imposed by CS25.1322(e)(1)(ii). 	CS25.1322(b)(2) CS25.1322(e)(1)(ii)
7	Approach Landing	Loss of RA (radioaltitude) VS (vertical speed)	For this scenario the design is not compliant since: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant has declared this alert as a Caution whereas the alert has been designed as a Warning. This misclassification results in a non compliance to CS25.1322(b)(2). Caution situations require a amber visual indication as imposed by CS25.1322(e)(1)(ii). 	CS25.1322(b)(2) CS25.1322 (e)(1)(ii)

Table 1 – System Status Flags: Cases and Non-Compliances

ID	Approach Type	Abnormal condition	Non Compliance (description)	Non Compliance (requirement)
8	Non precision approaches: LOC B/C (Back Course) LOC/DME	Loss of ILS beam ² while flying the approach manually using FD or raw data. Red flag LOC displayed	For this scenario the design is not compliant since there is a lack of attention getting through a second sense (only the visual cue is available).	CS25.1322(c)(2)
9	Precision approach: ILS CAT1	Loss of ILS beam ² while flying the approach manually using FD or raw data. Red flag LOC and G/S displayed		
10	Non precision Approaches: LNAV LNAV/VNAV	Loss of a required system for approach Amber CAS Message displayed	For this scenario the design is not compliant since: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant has declared this alert as a Warning whereas the alert has been designed as a Caution. This misclassification results in a non compliance to CS25.1322(b)(1). Warning situations require a red visual indication as imposed by CS25.1322(e)(1)(i). 	CS25.1322(b)(1) CS25.1322(e)(1)(i)

Table 2 – Approach Flags: Cases and Non-Compliances

² The loss of ILS beam is not due to an airborne system failure.

DEV-F25.1322-01**Deviation****Flight Crew Alerting****1. APPLICABILITY**

CS-25 large aeroplanes

1.1 AFFECTED CS

The following paragraphs of CS-25 are affected to which compliance cannot be demonstrated for the alerts and messages as detailed below:

- CS 25.1322 “Flight Crew Alerting”
 - a) ...
 - b) Alerts must conform to the following prioritisation hierarchy based on the urgency of flight crew awareness and response:
 - (1) Warning: For conditions that require immediate flight crew awareness and immediate flight crew response.
 - (2) Caution: For conditions that require immediate flight crew awareness and subsequent flight crew response.
 - (3) Advisory: For conditions that require flight crew awareness and may require subsequent flight crew response.
 - c) Warning and Caution alerts must:
 - (2) provide timely attention-getting cues through at least two different senses by a combination of aural, visual, or tactile indications;
 - d) ...
 - e) Visual alert indications must:
 - (1) conform to the following colour convention:
 - (i) Red for Warning alert indications.
 - (ii) Amber or yellow for Caution alert indications.
 - (iii) Any colour except red or green for Advisory alert indications.
 - f) ...

1.2 Pre-Conditions for Application of the Deviation

Exceptional deviation with a limited number of CS 25.1322 non-compliances that can be well covered by adequate mitigations. Full CS 25.1322 Amdt. 20 or higher Amdt. compliance required with the next change to Type Certificate that affects those functions.

2. APPLICABLE ESSENTIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR AIRWORTHINESS OF REGULATION (EU) 2018/1139 (Annex II)

The following paragraphs of the “*Essential Requirements for Airworthiness*” as defined in Annex II of Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 are affected by the actual design:

Paragraph 1.3.4:

“Information needed for the safe conduct of the flight and information concerning unsafe conditions must be provided to the crew or maintenance personnel, as appropriate, in a clear, consistent and unambiguous manner. Systems, equipment and controls, including signs and announcements must be designed and located to minimise errors which could contribute to the creation of hazards.”

and

paragraph 2.3(c):

“Crew compartments, as appropriate to the type of operations, must be arranged in order to facilitate flight operations, including means providing situational awareness, and management of any expected situation and emergencies. The environment of crew compartments must not jeopardise the crew's ability to perform their tasks and its design must be such as to avoid interference during operation and misuse of the controls.”


3. MITIGATING FACTORS

The following mitigating factors have been identified as alternative means to ensure compliance with the above identified essential requirements.

Table 3 details the mitigating factors for the non-compliances described in Table 1 (System Status Flags), while Table 4 details the mitigating factors for the non-compliances described in Table 2 (Approach Flags).

ID	Flight Phase	Abnormal condition	Mitigation
1	Take-Off	Miscompare of IAS (indicated airspeed) ATT (attitude) FPV (Flight Path vector)	Addition of an AFM memory item for the identified Warnings linked to primary flight parameters, requesting the flight crew to immediately revert to the Electronic Stand-by Instrument
2	Climb Cruise Descent	Miscompare of IAS (indicated airspeed) ATT (attitude) FPV (Flight Path vector)	Addition of an AFM memory item for the identified Warnings linked to primary flight parameters, requesting the flight crew to immediately revert to the Electronic Stand-by Instrument
3	Approach Landing	Miscompare of IAS (indicated airspeed) ATT (attitude) FPV (Flight Path vector) HDG (Heading) ALT (Altitude)	Addition of an AFM memory item for the identified Warnings linked to primary flight parameters, requesting the flight crew to immediately revert to the Electronic Stand-by Instrument
4	Take-Off	Loss of RA (radioaltitude) ALT (altitude) HDG (Heading) VS (vertical speed) LOC (Localizer)	Addition in the AFM of the necessary crew instructions and information (e.g. memory item)
5			
6	Climb Cruise Descent	Loss of IAS (indicated airspeed) RA (radioaltitude) ALT (altitude) HDG (Heading) VS (vertical speed)	Addition in the AFM of the necessary crew instructions and information (e.g. memory item)
7	Approach Landing	Loss of RA (radioaltitude) VS (vertical speed)	Addition in the AFM of the necessary crew instructions and information (e.g. memory item)

Table 3 - System Status Flags: Cases and Mitigations

 European Union Aviation Safety Agency	Consultation paper Deviation	Doc. No. : DEV-F25.1322-01 Issue : 1 Date : 10 Oct 2022 Proposed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Final <input type="checkbox"/> Deadline for comments: 31 Oct 2022
--	---	--

ID	Approach Type	Abnormal condition	Mitigation
8	Non precision approaches: LOC B/C (Back Course) LOC/DME	Loss of ILS beam ³ while flying the approach manually using FD or raw data. Red flag LOC displayed	Addition of dedicated mention in the AFM to detail the flight deck effect (removal of Flight Director / Raw data) which may stop the procedure. and Addition of dedicated AFM procedures along with limitation for higher minima to mitigate the lack of aural alert
	Precision approach: ILS CAT1	Loss of ILS beam ² while flying the approach manually using FD or raw data. Red flag LOC and G/S displayed	
10	Non precision Approaches: LNAV LNAV/VNAV	Loss of a required system for approach Amber CAS Message displayed	Addition of dedicated mention in the AFM to detail the flight deck effect (amber CAS message) which may stop the procedure. This AFM mention will remind the current design specificities on the need for immediate actions with the goal to enhance the flight crew decision making.

Table 4 - Approach Flags: Cases

³ The loss of ILS beam is not due to an airborne system failure.

