

## Can machine learning help improving environmental impact assessment ?

**Gabriel JARRY** 





#### **Operational context**



#### Current trend to control pollutant emissions and noise











#### Limitation examples



#### **Geometric CDO**

#### Level flight











#### Limitation examples



#### Geometric CDO

#### Level flight











## Philosophy













## Proof of concept





#### Input parameters

15pts every 4s (1min)

altitude (ft), ground speed (kts), vertical speed (ft/min)











#### Models error quantification



Parameter	Metric	Mean Score
Fuel Flow	Pearson Correlation	0.938
Fuel consumption	ME	3.8%
Landing Gear	Distance MAE	0.99NM
Flap Setting	Distance MAE	1.28NM





A Machine Learning & Environmental Impact Gabriel JARRY



dgac

DSNA







Machine Learning & Environmental Impact Gabriel JARRY

8









Machine Learning & Environmental Impact Gabriel JARRY



dgac

D S N A















#### Limitation examples



Altitude

---- Flaps 1

**Fuel Flow** 

#### **Geometric CDO** Altitude Noise Metric 0.21 Flaps 1 ----Noise Metric 0.11 Altitude (ft) Altitude (ft) Complementary C metrics enable a more precise Fuel Flow Fuel Metric 0.2 impact estimate Fuel Metric 0.08 1500 · (kd/µ) 1250 · (kd/µ) 1000 · (kd/µ) 0 ·

Level flight





Distance to Threshold (NM)

Machine Learning & Environmental Impact **Gabriel JARRY** 



Distance to Threshold (NM)



## **Granularity of metrics**

















## Real time extension for ATC (POC)



Atypical approach detection



SESAR digital academy



Machine Learning & Environmental Impact Gabriel JARRY 13



## Next step and improvments















### Conclusions

- Machine Learning could enables the improvement of system evaluation metrics such as environmental metrics
- Machine Learning could contribute to a collaborative ground/onboard improvement of the overall efficiency of the ATM system











# Thank you for your attention !











## Appendix : Generalization B737



Parameter	Metric	Mean Score LFPO	Mean Score GMAD
Fuel Flow	Pearson Correlation	0.917	0.921
Fuel consumption	ME	4.35%	4.86%
Landing Gear	Distance MAE	1.23 NM	1.86NM











#### Appendix : Generalization A330





Parameter	Metric	Mean Score LFPO
Fuel Flow	Pearson Correlation	0.930
Fuel consumption	ME	4.84%
Landing Gear	Distance MAE	1.63 NM





