# A Complexity Indicator for 4D Flight Trajectories Based on Conflict Probability

Xiongwen Qian, Jianfeng Mao

*Abstract*— **In this paper, a complexity indicator for 4D flight trajectories is developed based on conflict probability. A 4D trajectory is modeled as piecewise linear segments connected by waypoints. The position of each aircraft is modeled as a 2D Gaussian random variable and an approximation of the conflict probability between two aircrafts is deduced analytically over each segment. Based on such conflict probability, a complexity indicator is constructed for the whole trajectory. Numerical examples show that the proposed complexity indicator is able to reflect the complexity of 4D trajectories perceived by air traffic controllers.**

## I. Introduction

An Air Traffic Management (ATM) system is a system that coordinates aircraft to ensure safety and enhance efficiency during travelling. The current ATM system is ground-based, following a centralized control system pattern. Airspace is divided into sectors. A team of air traffic controllers is assigned to be in charge of each sector. After take-off, aircraft flies along standardized airways traversing sectors in sequence according to its flight plan, receiving directions from air traffic controllers in each sector, until destination airport is approached.

With the development of global economy, air traffic volume is undergoing a rapid growth, particularly in emerging-market countries. Air travel in 2012 is higher than 2011 in all regions of the world with significant growth of 9% in Asia and 6% in Latin America [1]. The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) estimates that air traffic in the Asia Pacific region will triple by 2030 [2]. The rapid growth of air traffic volume is placing extreme challenges on the current ATM system. When air traffic volume approaches or exceeds the limit that air traffic controllers can handle, the risk of separation failure among aircraft is increasing, which substantially threatens the safety of air transportation.

Initiatives to address the imminent air traffic challenges are underway, such as the Next Generation Air Transportation System (NextGen) [3] project in the USA and the Single European Sky ATM Research (SESAR) [4] project in Europe. Singapore also established Air Traffic Management Research Institute (ATMRI) [5] to carry out research seeking solutions for ATM transformation in Asia-Pacific region. Both NextGen and SESAR envision a future ATM system in which aircraft is given more flexibility in selecting preferred en-route trajectory and takes more responsibility on self-separation with the assistance of Airborne Separation Assistance Systems (ASASs). ATM will shift from sector-based to trajectory-based operations in which 4D (space plus time) trajectory is calculated and followed using advanced navigation systems. Due to the high level of automation of future ATM system, air traffic controllers will spend most time on surveillance and will not maneuver the air traffic unless the interference is very necessary. Meanwhile, air traffic controllers are still to be responsible for the safety of air traffic, so the complexity of 4D trajectories under monitoring will have huge impact on air traffic controllers' workload.

The workload issue of air traffic controllers has received extensive studies [6]. In [7], air traffic controllers' task processes are identified and classified into two types: mental process and physical process. It is pointed that controllers' workload heavily comes from mental process. However, mental workload is difficult to measure directly and accurately. A number of factors may influence mental workload and among them the complexity of air traffic situation itself is a critical one. Here air traffic complexity means the inherent difficulty within the given air traffic situation that an air traffic controller is facing to manage safely. A comprehensive review of air traffic complexity can be found in [8], where existing metrics of air traffic complexity are categorized into six groups: Aircraft Density (AD), Dynamic Density (DD), Interval Complexity (IC), Fractal Dimension (FD), Input-Output (IO) Approach and Intrinsic Complexity Metrics, and among them, Intrinsic Complexity Metrics are regarded as the most promising one for the new generation ATM system. Two classes of Intrinsic Complexity Metrics are proposed. The first class is geometrical approach where complexity is a function of relative position vectors of aircraft [9]. One problem encountered while implementing this complexity metric is that a lot of weight coefficients have to be tuned by experience and by situation. The second class is based on dynamical system models which are velocity vector fields constructed from regression [10]. The obtained dynamical system models are used to describe trajectories of aircraft and according to these models air traffic complexity metrics are computed. One potential drawback of this approach is that the trajectories of aircraft described by the dynamical system models could be very different from the real trajectories that aircraft are flying, so the computed complexity metrics are very likely to be inaccurate.

On the other hand, traffic complexity is closely coupled to conflict probability which is a mathematical measurement of the likelihood of conflict occurring. Two aircraft are defined to be in conflict if their relative distance is less than 5 nautical miles horizontally and 1000 feet vertically. R. A. Paielli and H. Erzberger modeled the error between real aircraft position and estimate as a 2D Gaussian random variable [11]. The error

X. Qian and J. Mao are with the School of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, 639798 (e-mail: xqian003@ e.ntu.edu.sg; jfmao@ntu.edu.sg).

comes from uncertain factors such as winds. Under the assumption that the relative velocity of two aircraft remains constant (both in magnitude and direction) during encounter or period of potential conflict, analytical form of conflict probability is derived. Building on the result of [11], an approximate analytical form of instantaneous conflict probability is proposed in [12], where the conflict probability at one given moment in time is calculated. In [13], the true trajectory of one aircraft is modeled as a sum of nominal trajectory and 2D Brownian Motion. Thus the variance in cross-track or along-track direction grows with time. Using this model, the probability that one aircraft flies through the vicinity of a given airspace point in the future given time period is derived. After considerable approximation, an analytical solution for this probability is reached. Finally, air traffic metrics are constructed based on this probability.

It is worth noticing that regarding the air traffic complexity metrics mentioned above, nearly all of them are designed to evaluate the complexity of a sector of airspace at an instantaneous moment. Although D. Delahaye and S. Puechmorel extended the dynamical-system-based complexity into time-space domain in [10], due to its computational intensiveness, no numerical result is given. The complexity proposed in [13] can be trajectory-based and overtime, but its computation is intractable and analytical solution is only available after several approximations whose impact on the accuracy of the complexity metric is unknown.

In this paper, we propose a complexity indicator to describe the level of complexity of interactions among 4D trajectories. The indicator is trajectory-based and is an aggregate metric overtime. It is based on the conflict probability proposed in [11] but is without the assumption of constant velocity over the whole trajectory. Numerical results show that the proposed indicator is in consistent with human's intuition of flight trajectory complexity. Analytical form for the computation of the indicator is available after reasonable approximation. For the simplicity of exposition, following discussion are restricted to 2D plane, which corresponds to the level flight case in practice. However, it is possible to generalize to 3D case and the related work is underway.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II the model for 4D trajectory and the randomness of aircraft position is presented. Section III gives the computational method for the complexity indicator over trajectories. Numerical examples are given in Section IV. Finally, Section V concludes the paper.

## II. MODEL FORMULATION

As the envisioned future ATM is based on 4D trajectory, it is desired to have a quantitative evaluation for the complexity of a set of planned 4D trajectories. Lower complexity is preferred since it implies lower workload of air traffic controllers and higher flexibility and robustness of 4D trajectories. Trajectories with fewer intersections and maintaining sufficient separations are perceived as less complex by air traffic controllers [7] as shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1. Comparison of two sets of trajectories: (a) more complex trajectories and (b) less complex trajectories

In practice, each aircraft in travel follows its individual flight plan which contains information about the locations and times of way points the aircraft should visit one by one and the velocities for moving between them. In this paper, the nominal trajectory of one aircraft is modeled as piecewise linear with waypoints connecting segments. Along each segment, it is assumed that the velocity is constant. We denote the sequence of way points as $\{P_j\}_{j=0,\cdots,n}$, $P_j \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and the sequence of velocities as $\{V_j\}_{j=1,\cdots,n}$, $V_j \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and $n$ is the total number of segments of this piecewise linear trajectory. The end time of each segment is recursively calculated by

$$T_j = \frac{\|P_j - P_{j-1}\|}{\|V_j\|} + T_{j-1}$$

for $j = 1, \ldots, n$, and let $T_0 = 0$. So the velocity and nominal position of the aircraft at time $t \in [T_{j-1}, T_j)$ are given by, respectively, $V(t) = V_j$ and $\bar{P}(t) = P_{j-1} + V_j(t - T_{j-1})$. Furthermore, denote the heading angle of the aircraft during segment $j$ as $\theta_j$, which is the angle that vector $P_j - P_{j-1}$ makes with the $x$ axis of the global coordinate $x$-$y$ in which $\{P_j\}_{j=0,\cdots,n}$ and $\bar{P}(t)$ are given as shown in Figure 2.

Following [11], we assume that the real trajectory of the aircraft is the sum of nominal trajectory $\bar{P}(t)$ and estimate error $\varepsilon(t)$ which follows a 2D Gaussian distribution, i.e.

$$P(t) = \bar{P}(t) + \varepsilon(t)$$

and $\varepsilon(t) \sim N_2(0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}(t))$. The covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}(t)$ for $t \in [T_{j-1}, T_j)$ is given by




Figure 2. Illustration of piecewise linear trajectory and position uncertainty

$$\mathbf{\Sigma}(t) = \mathbf{R}(\theta_j)\bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}}\mathbf{R}(\theta_j)^T$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}} = \mathrm{diag}(\sigma_a^2, \sigma_c^2)$ is the covariance matrix in the local coordinate $\alpha$-$\beta$ with its horizontal axis pointing along the velocity of the aircraft, and $\mathbf{R}(\theta)$ is the rotation matrix such that

$$\mathbf{R}(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos\theta & -\sin\theta \\ \sin\theta & \cos\theta \end{bmatrix}$$

Note that in our model, the along-track variance $\sigma_a$ and cross-track variance $\sigma_c$ are constant for the aircraft. Although in [11], it is pointed out that along-track variance tends to grow approximately linear with time, it also states that with improved wind modeling or with low-bandwidth control of along-track position, the growth rate of along-track variance can be reduced. With the development of modern aeronautic technologies, such as the Global Position System (GPS), Automatic Dependence Surveillance-Broadcast (ADS-B) and Flight Management Systems (FMS), the along-track estimate error has been very near to constant. As a result, the previous along-track time-variant assumption could be reasonably simplified to time-invariant one.

## III. Computational Method

### A. A Pair of One-segment Linear Trajectories

Consider aircraft A flying with constant velocity $V^A$ from waypoint $P_0^A$ to $P_1^A$ and aircraft B flying with constant velocity $V^B$ from waypoint $P_0^B$ to $P_1^B$ as shown in Figure 3. Suppose these two aircraft start at the same time $T_s$ and arrive at their next way points at the same time $T_f$, and they may encounter at some $T_e \in [T_s, T_f]$.The real trajectories of the two aircraft are

$$P^A(t) = \bar{P}^A(t) + \varepsilon^A$$
$$P^B(t) = \bar{P}^B(t) + \varepsilon^B$$

and the covariance matrices of estimate errors of aircraft A and B are $\mathbf{\Sigma}^A$ and $\mathbf{\Sigma}^B$ respectively. Thus relative position of the two aircraft in the global coordinate $x$-$y$ is

$$\Delta P^{AB}(t) = \Delta\bar{P}^{AB}(t) + \varepsilon^{AB}$$




Figure 3. Illustration of two aircraft flying one-segment linear trajectoires

where $\Delta\bar{P}^{AB}(t) = \bar{P}^A(t) - \bar{P}^B(t)$ , and $\varepsilon^{AB} \sim N_2\left(0, \mathbf{\Sigma}^{AB}\right)$ in which $\mathbf{\Sigma}^{AB} = \mathbf{\Sigma}^A + \mathbf{\Sigma}^B$ under the assumption that $\varepsilon^A$ and $\varepsilon^B$ are independent. So $\Delta P^{AB}(t) \sim N_2\left(\Delta\bar{P}^{AB}(t), \mathbf{\Sigma}^{AB}\right)$ and $\Delta P^{AB}(t)$ is the position of aircraft A with reference to aircraft B who is residing on the origin in global coordinate $x$-$y$ as shown in Figure 4(a). Since the error covariance matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}^{AB}$ is assigned to aircraft A, aircraft A is called the stochastic aircraft. The other aircraft, aircraft B, has no uncertainty and is called reference aircraft. A coordinate shift is then carried out so the coordinate origin is relocated to aircraft A, and aircraft B is moving as shown in Figure 4(b). In the shifted coordinate $x'$-$y'$, the nominal position of aircraft B is $-\Delta\bar{P}^{AB}(t)$ and the real position of aircraft A follows $N_2(0, \mathbf{\Sigma}^{AB})$. Consequently, the deterministic movement of aircraft and uncertainty of aircraft position are split.

Two aircraft are in conflict in the horizontal plane if their relative horizontal distance is smaller than $\rho_0 = 5$ nautical miles. In the coordinate $x'$-$y'$, a conflict zone can be defined as

$$Z(t) = \left\{ \left\| \rho + \Delta P^{AB}(t) \right\| < \rho_0, \rho \in \mathbb{R}^2 \right\}$$

So the instantaneous conflict probability at time $t$ is

$$cp_{inst}(t) = \int_{\rho \in Z(t)} N_2(0, \mathbf{\Sigma}^{AB}) d\rho$$

In general, there is no analytical solution to $cp_{inst}(t)$. R. A. Paielli and H. Erzberger [11] proposed an algorithm that through a well-designed coordinate transformation $T$, in the new coordinate $u$-$v$ the covariance matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}^{AB}$ is transformed to an identity matrix $I$ which implies a standard 2D Gaussian distribution whose contours are circles. In addition, after coordinate transformation $T$, the relative velocity of the two aircraft is always pointing to the negative direction of axis $u$. Meanwhile, at the same time, the circular conflict zone becomes an ellipsis after the transformation. Although standard 2D Gaussian distribution seems simpler, its integration over ellipsis is still difficult. Finally, R. A. Paielli and H. Erzberger [11] approximated the integration by integrating over an extended infinite rectangular conflict zone as shown in Figure 4(c).




Figure 4. Illustration of coordinate transforms: (a) relative position in coordinate $x$-$y$ (b) relative position in coordinate $x'$-$y'$ (c) Integration over infinite retangular in coordinate $u$-$v$ (d) Integration over finite retangular in coordinate $u$-$v$

In summary,

$$cp_{inst}(t) \approx cp_{approx} = \int_{v_c-\Delta v}^{v_c+\Delta v}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} N_2(0,I)dudv$$
$$= \int_{v_c-\Delta v}^{v_c+\Delta v} N(0,1)dv \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} N(0,1)du$$
$$= \int_{v_c-\Delta v}^{v_c+\Delta v} N(0,1)dv$$
$$= \Phi(v_c+\Delta v)-\Phi(v_c-\Delta v)$$

where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the cumulative density function of standard normal distribution; $v_c$ is the second element of vector $T\left(-\Delta P^{AB}(t)\right)$; $\Delta v = \rho_0\sqrt{\dfrac{a}{ac-b^2}}$ and $(T^{-1})^T(T^{-1}) = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ b & c \end{bmatrix}$.

Our objective is to develop an indicator describing the level of complexity of the interaction between two aircraft trajectories over time period $[T_s, T_f]$. After analyzing the algorithm proposed in [11], we can see that by the approximation that integrating over the infinite rectangular instead of the ellipse of safety zone, in fact the algorithm is calculating a conflict probability over time period $[-\infty, +\infty]$, rather than the instantaneous conflict probability at time $t$. Such observation reveals the possibility to adapt conflict probability $cp_{approx}$ to a complexity indicator, as conflict avoidance is the key purpose of air traffic controllers.

In order to obtain a conflict over time period $[T_s, T_f]$, it is natural to confine the integration from over infinite rectangular to finite one as shown in Figure 4(d). The finite rectangular corresponds to the area which is swept over by the ellipse of safety zone around aircraft B in the coordinate $u$-$v$ during time period $[T_s, T_f]$. As a result, the complexity indicator of one segment is reached as

$$cp = \int_{v_c-\Delta v}^{v_c+\Delta v}\int_{u_{cf}-\Delta u}^{u_{cs}+\Delta u} N_2(0,I)dudv$$
$$= \int_{v_c-\Delta v}^{v_c+\Delta v} N(0,1)dv \int_{u_{cf}-\Delta u}^{u_{cs}+\Delta u} N(0,1)du$$
$$= \left(\Phi(v_c+\Delta v)-\Phi(v_c-\Delta v)\right)\left(\Phi(u_{cs}+\Delta u)-\Phi(u_{cf}-\Delta u)\right)$$

where $u_{cs}$ is the first element of vector $T\left(-\Delta P^{AB}(T_s)\right)$; $u_{cf}$ is the first element of vector $T\left(-\Delta P^{AB}(T_f)\right)$ and $\Delta u = \rho_0\sqrt{\dfrac{c}{ac-b^2}}$.

Compare $cp$ and $cp_{approx}$, it is obvious that $cp$ is more accurate for describing the complexity during time period $[T_s, T_f]$ in the sense that $cp$ takes the information of start and end positions of aircraft into consideration.

### *B. A Pair of Piecewise Linear Trajectories*

Consider aircraft A flying according to its flight plan with waypoints $\{P_i^A\}_{i=0,\cdots,n^A}$, the sequence of velocities $\{V_i^A\}_{i=1,\cdots,n^A}$, and the end time of each segment $\{T_i^A\}_{i=1,\cdots,n^A}$. Similarly, aircraft B is flying according to its flight plan with waypoints $\{P_j^B\}_{j=0,\cdots,n^B}$, the sequence of velocities $\{V_j^B\}_{j=1,\cdots,n^A}$, and the end time of each segment $\{T_j^B\}_{j=1,\cdots,n^B}$. Suppose $T_0^A = T_0^B = 0$ and $T_{n^A}^A = T_{n^B}^B$, in view that the relative velocity changes whenever aircraft A or aircraft B changes its velocity, we need first to combine the two piecewise linear trajectories to a relative piecewise linear trajectory.

Let $\{T_k^{AB}\}_{k=1,\cdots,n^{AB}}$ be the union of $\{T_i^A\}_{i=1,\cdots,n^A}$ and $\{T_j^B\}_{j=1,\cdots,n^B}$ with its elements in ascending order regarding to $k$. Thus, the waypoints of the relative piecewise linear trajectory are $\{\Delta P_k^{AB} = \bar{P}^A(T_k^{AB}) - \bar{P}^B(T_k^{AB})\}_{k=0,\cdots,n^{AB}}$; the sequence of relative velocities are $\{\Delta V_k^{AB} = V^A(T_{k-1}^{AB}) - V^B(T_{k-1}^{AB})\}_{k=1,\cdots,n^{AB}}$.

Thus, given the relative piecewise linear trajectory, we can apply the algorithm demonstrated in Section III.A, to calculate the complexity indicator $cp(k)$ in terms of each trajectory segment over time period $[T_{k-1}^{AB}, T_k^{AB}], k = 1,\cdots,n^{AB}$. To obtain an aggregate complexity for the whole piecewise trajectory, three methods are proposed here:

$$cpsum = \sum_{k=1}^{n^{AB}} cp(k)$$

$$cpweight = \sum_{k=1}^{n^{AB}} \frac{T_k^{AB} - T_{k-1}^{AB}}{T_{n^{AB}}^{AB}} cp(k)$$

$$cpinvpie = 1 - \prod_{k=1}^{n^{AB}} (1 - cp(k))$$

*cpsum* is the sum of complexity indicators of all segments; *cpweight* is a weighted sum of segments using the normalized duration length of each segment as the weight coefficient; *cpinvpie* is in the sense of the overall conflict probability of the two entire piecewise linear trajectories as if each segment was independent of each other. It should be emphasized that, although from the perspective of conflict probability, *cpinvpie* seems most plausible, our purpose is to develop a complexity indicator which could be implemented in future 4D trajectory planning. The complexity indicator is based on conflict probability but not constrained to be a conflict probability. All these three complexity indicators have the potential to serve as meaningful metrics. Their application in 4D trajectory planning will be presented in the future publication.

### C. Multiple Pairs of Piecewise Linear Trajectories

Consider a set of 4D trajectories in the airspace of interest. Based on the method discussed in Section III.C, the complexity indicator of any pair of two 4D trajectories can be calculated. Based on this, an aggregate complexity indicator over all pairs of trajectories can be developed by taking maximum, summation, weighted summation or inverse product (in the sense of reliability), of all pairwise complexity indicators. The key idea will be demonstrated in the following numerical example.

## IV. Numerical Examples

### A. Two-aircraft Two-segment Trajectories

In this session, three flight plans are designed to test the effectiveness of the proposed complexity indicator as shown in Figure 5. Velocity magnitudes of the two aircraft are the same. One aircraft assumes larger variance than the other. Parameters are set for demonstration purpose not necessarily complying with real case (worse than real case). More tests will be carried out with data from real flight plans.



(a) (b) (c)

Figure 5. Numerical example flght plans: (a) Flight Plan 1; (b) Flight Plan 2; (c) Flight Plan 3




Figure 6. Compleixty indicators of Flight Plan 1, 2 and 3

Complexity indicators for the three flight plans are shown in Figure 6. Intuitively, the complexity of Flight Plan 1 is higher than Flight Plan 2, and Flight Plan 2 higher than Flight Plan 3. From the result it can be concluded that the indicator is able to reflect the complexity between 4D trajectories and is in consistent with intuitions from air traffic controllers' perspective.

### B. Three-aircraft One-Segment Trajectories

In this session, two three-aircraft one-segment trajectories scenarios are tested. The flight plans of the three aircraft are shown in Figure 7. Velocity magnitudes of three aircraft are the same. Complexity between aircraft and the aggregate complexity is shown in Figure 8. The computation results are in consistent with the intuition that the complexity of Flight Plan 4 is higher than Flight Plan 5.




(a) (b)

Figure 7. Numerical example flght plans: (a) Flight Plan 4; (b) Flight Plan 5




(a)




(b)

Figure 8. Compleixty indicators (a) between aircraft (b) aggregate

## V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, a complexity indicator is proposed to evaluate the complexity among a set of 4D trajectories based on conflict probability. Numerical examples are carried out to verify the effectiveness of the proposed complexity. Key advantages of this complexity indicator are:

(1) It is trajectory based, rather than sector-based.

(2) It is a complexity over the whole period of trajectories, rather than an instantaneous complexity for a given time.

(3) Analytical form of the complexity indicator is readily available. No tuning of parameters is needed.

(4) It is consistent with the perceptions of air traffic controllers regarding to air traffic complexity.

(5) It is compatible with the current ATM system structure and can be applied to future ATM system as well.

For future work, the application of including the complexity indicator into 4D trajectory planning is ongoing. The extension to 3D case in airspace is also under consideration.

## REFERENCES


[1] http://www.amadeus.com/web/amadeus/en_US-US/Amadeus-Home/News-and-events/News/041713-300-world-super-routes/1259071352352-Page-AMAD_DetailPpal?assetid=1319526535668&assettype=Press Release_C

[2] http://www.bridgingskies.com/advancing-air-traffic-management-in-asia-pacific/#sthash.TcM13C4Q.dpuf

[3] http://www.jpdo.gov/

[4] http://www.eurocontrol.int/sesar/

[5] http://www.caas.gov.sg/

[6] S. Loft, P. Sanderson, A. Neal, and M. Mooij, "Modeling and predicting mental workload in en route air traffic control: Critical review and broader implications," *Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society*, vol. 49, pp. 376-399, 2007.

[7] W. S. Pawlak, C. R. Brinton, K. Crouch, and K. M. Lancaster, "A framework for the evaluation of air traffic control complexity," in *Proceedings of the AIAA Guidance Navigation and Control Conference, San Diego, CA*, 1996.

[8] M. Prandini, L. Piroddi, S. Puechmorel, and S. L. Brazdilova, "Toward Air Traffic Complexity Assessment in New Generation Air Traffic Management Systems," *Intelligent Transportation Systems, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 12, pp. 809-818, 2011.

[9] D. Delahaye and S. Puechmorel, "Air traffic complexity: towards intrinsic metrics," in *Proceedings of the third USA/Europe Air Traffic Management R & D Seminar*, 2000.

[10] D. Delahaye and S. Puechmorel, "Air traffic complexity based on dynamical systems," in *2010 49th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2010, pp. 2069-2074.

[11] R. A. Paielli and H. Erzberger, "Conflict probability for free flight," *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics*, vol. 20, pp. 588-596, 1997.

[12] I. Hwang and C. E. Seah, "Intent-based probabilistic conflict detection for the next generation air transportation system," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 96, pp. 2040-2059, 2008.

[13] M. Prandini and J. Hu, "A probabilistic approach to air traffic complexity evaluation," in *Decision and Control, 2009 held jointly with the 2009 28th Chinese Control Conference. CDC/CCC 2009. Proceedings of the 48th IEEE Conference on*, 2009, pp. 5207-5212.