

GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY AERONAUTICAL CHARTING FORUM 06-01

April 19 – 20, 2006

Recommendation Document

Subject: Missed Approach Leg Length and Direction

Background/Discussion: Current instrument approach procedure specifications do not require the depiction of directional value, distance and minimum altitude on legs comprising the missed approach procedure. This information is currently required only on terminal routes and the procedure track. The rationale was that the missed approach for conventional procedures did not lend itself to being described in terms of distance. However, with RNAV (GPS) procedures, missed approach procedure legs many times are described in terms of distance. In order to standardize the information depicted along route legs, missed approach procedure legs will contain, when applicable, the same information as terminal routes and procedure tracks.

Recommendation: To depict legs in the missed approach procedure with the directional value, distance and minimum altitude, if designated, in the same manner as terminal routes.

Comments: This recommendation affects IACC Specification 4, Instrument Approach Procedures and Airport Diagrams.

Submitted by: Eric Secretan

Organization: National Aeronautical Charting Office

Phone: 301-713-3631

Fax:

E-mail: eric.secretan@faa.gov

Date: April 1, 2006

MEETING 06-01: Mr. Eric Secretan, NACG, submitted this issue and provided the following briefing. Historically the missed approach on conventional procedures was extremely short and usually involved climbing turns to a NAVAID for holding. However, with RNAV procedures, the missed approach procedure legs are described in terms of distance. Current specifications do not require the depiction of headings or distance information. The recommendation is on those procedures, to depict course and distance information along segments of the missed approach procedure, in the same manner as terminal routes, using the information provided on the 8260 procedure source. The altitude information in the examples provided by the NACG is in error and should not be shown. Mr. Secretan reported that this issue was submitted from a recommendation from the last ACF. Mr. Brad Rush, NFPO, concurred with the basic concept as long as the altitude information is not shown. Mr. Rush recommended that AFS-410 comment on the issue. Mr. James Spencer, NAVFIG, inquired if inset boxes or mileage breaks would be used. Mr. Secretan responded that each procedure would need to be analyzed, both inset boxes and mileage breaks could be used. Mr. Rush questioned the computation of courses for CF legs used in some RNAV procedures stating a magnetic facility must be used. Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, stated that these magnetic values are only a reference.
ACTION: MPOC.

MEETING 06-02: Ms. Valerie Watson, Cartographic standards reported that RD 635 was submitted to the IACC. Both FAA representatives and NGA/OMS are ready to sign. However, NGA/PVA is staffing the issue. Mr. Danny Shelton, NGA/PVA reported that PVA concurs with the RD and is ready to sign. **ACTION:** NGA/PVA

Editor's note: As of the print date of these minutes NGA/PVA is reconsidering their position and staffing the issue.

MEETING 07-01: Mr. John Moore NACO, reported that RD-635 was submitted and signed by IACC. Mr. Eric Secretan NACO, stated that it would be implemented shortly.
CLOSED.