International Journal of Scientific Research in Engineering and Management (IJSREM)
Volume: 10 Issue: 04 | April - 2026 SJIF Rating: 8.659 ISSN: 2582-3930

IMPACT OF FDTL NORMS IN AIRLINE FLEET SCHEDULING AND CREW ROSTERING: A CASE STUDY ON INDIGO'S 2025 INCIDENT

Dr. S. Ramasubramanian[1] Dr. Kalyani[2] Ahamed Suvaileen[3] Harish S.[3] Reenalie Josephine[3] Sahana Padmanabhan[3]

Associate Professor, Department of Aviation, Vels Institute of Science, Technology & Advanced Studies, Chennai 600117, Tamil Nadu, India[1] Assistant Professor, MH Cockpit Private Limited – 600117, Tamil Nadu, India[2]

BBA – Aviation Management, Vels Institute of Science Technology and Advanced Studies (VISTAS), Chennai, India[3]

***Abstract*—**The 2025 revisions to India's Flight Duty Time Limitation (FDTL) norms—enacted by the Directorate General of Civil Aviation (DGCA) and aligned with ICAO standards—imposed a structural shock on lean airline operations. Key provisions capped night Flight Duty Periods (FDPs) at 10 hours, extended weekly rest to 48 hours at the home base, reduced consecutive night landings from six to two, and mandated quarterly Fatigue Risk Management System (FRMS) reporting. IndiGo, operating 1,862 daily flights with near-zero crew buffers, was acutely exposed: Phase 2 enforcement triggered over 2,000 cancellations in December 2025, a collapse in on-time performance from 90.2% to 8.5%, and losses exceeding ₹5 billion. This paper analyses the cascading failure through the lenses of crew scheduling optimisation, comparative regulatory frameworks (DGCA, FAA, EASA), pilot mental health and fatigue science, and evidence-based scenario modelling. Resilient FDTL compliance requires a triad of investments: AI-enabled crew management, robust reserve pools, and a just safety culture that normalises fatigue reporting.

Keywords*—FDTL; crew rostering; pilot fatigue; IndiGo 2025; FRMS; flight scheduling; aviation safety; DGCA*

I. INTRODUCTION

Aviation safety depends critically on the cognitive fitness of flight crew. Pilot fatigue—defined as a physiological state of reduced mental or physical performance resulting from sleep loss, extended wakefulness, or circadian disruption—has been implicated in 15–20% of major aviation incidents worldwide [1]. In response, India's DGCA issued substantially revised FDTL norms effective in phases from July 2025, representing the most consequential update to Indian aviation duty-time regulation in over a decade.

India's domestic aviation market had doubled in traffic volume to 150 million passengers by 2025, with IndiGo holding approximately 60% market share through an ultra-lean, high-frequency short-haul model. The FDTL revisions—extending weekly rest to 48 hours, halving permissible consecutive night landings, and mandating FRMS reporting—exposed the fragility of this model when applied without structural crew buffers or adaptive scheduling technology.

Existing literature on FDTL norms is predominantly pre-2024 in orientation, focused on Western regulatory frameworks, and lacks empirical analysis of post-implementation operational impacts in high-growth emerging-market carriers. This study addresses these gaps through a mixed-methods analysis of IndiGo's 2025 crisis, comparative regulatory benchmarking across DGCA, FAA, and EASA frameworks, and scenario modelling of evidence-based FDTL reforms.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW AND RESEARCH GAP

A. Existing Scholarship

Barnhart et al. [2] established the computational foundations of crew scheduling optimisation, demonstrating that column generation and Lagrangian decomposition can reduce crew costs by 5–10% while satisfying FDTL constraints. Wen et al. [3] extended this to stochastic settings, showing that robust Benders-decomposition models reduce delay propagation by 15–20%. Efthymiou et al. [4] surveyed 500+ pilots, finding pre-duty sleep the strongest fatigue predictor (R^2=0.45) and a 12% fatigue rise in night-extended duties. The 2023 EASA effectiveness study of Flight Time Limitations confirmed that sector count and nighttime operations are more powerful fatigue drivers than raw duty length [5].

Psychophysiological research using the Psychomotor Vigilance Task (PVT) demonstrates that after 17–18 hours of wakefulness, cognitive impairment is equivalent to a blood-alcohol level of 0.05% [6]. A landmark Environmental Health study found 12.6% of 1,848 active pilots met clinical depression criteria and 4.1% reported suicidal ideation—rates substantially higher than general-population norms [7].

B. Identified Research Gaps

Three specific gaps justify the present study. First, no published research analyses the post-2024 DGCA FDTL framework's operational impacts on Indian LCCs. Second, studies of pilot mental health and FDTL compliance do not address the compounding effect of zero-buffer rostering on fatigue accumulation and psychological distress. Third, the temporal dynamics of regulatory shock—how quickly an airline can adapt CMS rule engines, rebuild reserve pools, and restore network integrity—remain unquantified in the Indian context.

III. METHODOLOGY

This study employs a mixed-methods design integrating qualitative regulatory analysis, quantitative secondary-data analysis, and quasi-experimental scenario modelling. Primary regulatory sources comprise the 2024 DGCA Civil Aviation Requirements (CAR) Section 7, ICAO Annex 6 and Doc 9966, FAA 14 CFR Part 117, and EASA Commission Regulation (EU) No 965/2012.

Quantitative data on IndiGo's cancellations, on-time performance, and crew metrics were extracted from DGCA enforcement communications, aviation analytics platforms, and verified news reporting. Fatigue-performance data are drawn from peer-reviewed PVT research. Scenario modelling follows a 'What If?' methodology, producing bounded estimates of efficiency and safety impact.

IV. COMPARATIVE REGULATORY ANALYSIS: DGCA, FAA, AND EASA

The three dominant FDTL frameworks reflect distinct regulatory philosophies. DGCA's 2025 norms are prescriptive: hard numerical caps apply uniformly regardless of sector profile, route structure, or airline-specific fatigue data. The FAA (14 CFR Part 117) adopts a performance-based, circadian-sensitive matrix that modulates maximum FDP by start time and sector count, and permits FRMS-approved alternative compliance envelopes. EASA combines explicit sector-and-time rules with approved FRMS flexibility, permitting 2–4 night sectors depending on duty structure.

A critical operational implication for Indian carriers is the absence of an FRMS-backed alternative-compliance pathway. European and American airlines can design custom roster envelopes validated by fatigue science, absorbing regulatory changes more fluidly. IndiGo's lean model—calibrated to DGCA's prior prescriptive limits—had no equivalent adaptive mechanism when the 2025 revisions took effect.

TABLE I. REGULATORY FRAMEWORK COMPARISON: DGCA vs. FAA vs. EASA

Parameter	DGCA (India)	FAA (USA)	EASA (Europe)
Max Night FDP	10 hrs (8 hrs flying)	Time-of-day & sector matrix	Context-dep. (10–11 hrs)
WOCL Definition	0200–0600	0100–0600	0200–0559
Weekly Rest	48 hrs cont., home base	30 hrs (flexible)	36 hrs standard
Max Night Landings	2 per duty cycle	No hard cap	2–4 based on start time
Cumulative (28 days)	100 flight hours	100 flight hours	100 flight hours
Annual Flight Hours	1,000 hrs	1,000 hrs	900 hrs
FRMS	Mandatory quarterly	Voluntary (alternative)	Approved option
Regulatory Style	Prescriptive (hard caps)	Performance-based	Mixed (prescriptive + science)

Source: DGCA CAR Section 7 (2024); FAA 14 CFR §117; EASA Commission Regulation (EU) No 965/2012.

V. CREW FATIGUE, STRESS, AND MENTAL WELL-BEING

A. Fatigue-Performance Relationship

PVT research establishes a dose-response relationship between wakefulness and cognitive degradation that is particularly steep during the Window of Circadian Low (WOCL, 0200–0600). After 18 hours of wakefulness, pilots experience a 40% increase in error rates and reaction-time slowing of 20–40%. Within the WOCL, working memory capacity drops by 15–20%, and the likelihood of automation complacency increases significantly.

TABLE II. PILOT FATIGUE: PVT LAPSES AND COGNITIVE IMPAIRMENT BY WAKEFULNESS DURATION

Hours Awake	PVT Lapses/10 min	Cognitive BAC Equiv.	Error Rate Increase
12 hours	1–2	0.00%	Baseline
16 hours	3–5	0.03%	+20%
18 hours	6–9	0.05%	+40%
20 hours	10–14	0.08%	+65%
22 hours	15+	≥0.10%	+100%+

Source: Adapted from Williamson & Feyer (2000); Dawson & Reid (1997); Harrison & Horne (2000).

B. Pilot Mental Health and Stigma

Mental-health research in aviation reveals a paradox: the high-responsibility environment that demands peak cognitive performance also generates the stress that degrades it. A 2016 Environmental Health study found that 12.6% of 1,848 actively flying pilots met clinical depression criteria and 4.1% reported suicidal ideation [7]. The traditional aviation culture discourages open discussion of mental difficulties, as pilots fear that admitting burnout, anxiety, or depression could jeopardise their medical certificate or career.

Research among short- and long-haul pilot cohorts found that roster unpredictability—frequent re-rosters, short-notice changes, and compressed rest—is independently associated with elevated anxiety and reduced job satisfaction, beyond the direct physiological effects of sleep loss. When FDTL tightening reduces crew buffers to near-zero, as at IndiGo pre-crisis, these stressors compound: pilots experience not only more irregular schedules but also social pressure not to declare fatigue when doing so would cancel flights and strand passengers.

C. Short-Haul vs. Long-Haul Comparative Findings

Short-haul pilots accumulate more take-off and landing cycles, experience more frequent WOCL encroachments through early-morning departures, and have less recovery sleep between duties due to compressed turnaround targets. IndiGo's network—average block time 3.99 hours with 1,862 daily flights—falls squarely in the high-frequency short-haul category most vulnerable to FDTL-driven crew shortages and fatigue accumulation. Where Ryanair maintains approximately 7.8 crew sets per aircraft and a formalised FRMS, IndiGo's pre-crisis 7.1 ratio with zero standby pool represents a structurally more fragile configuration.

VI. AIRLINE FLEET SCHEDULING AND CREW ROSTERING

A. Aircraft Rotation Planning

Aircraft rotation planning assigns individual tail numbers to sequences of flights, minimising ferry costs and ground time while ensuring aircraft availability. Under FDTL norms, rotation planning must account for crew rest requirements: if a rotation requires crew to operate a night flight followed by an early morning departure, the rest gap must be at least 12 hours under DGCA's revised norms, forcing longer aircraft ground time or crew swaps. Key planning constraints include continuity, maintenance windows, slot constraints, and crew availability.

B. Crew Pairing and Rostering Optimisation

Crew rostering is a two-stage process: (1) pairing construction, which builds legal sequences of flights complying with all FDTL constraints; and (2) rostering, which assigns pairings to individual crew members over a planning period. Modern crew management systems use a combination of column generation, branch-and-price algorithms, and heuristic repair procedures. Under DGCA's 2025 FDTL norms, pairing construction must satisfy additional constraints: no pairing may include more than two night landings, each pairing must embed a 48-hour rest anchor within any 168-hour window, and WOCL-encroaching pairings must be flagged for FRMS review before publication.

C. Reserve Crew Management

Reserve crew are pilots held on standby to cover sick calls, FDTL overruns, and operational disruptions. International best practices recommend reserve crew levels of 12–18% of the active roster for LCC operations, rising to 20–25% during peak seasons. A structured reserve management framework includes short-call reserves (available within 2 hours), long-call reserves (available within 12 hours), and airport standby (physically present at the airport). Effective reserve management requires real-time visibility of FDTL status for all active and reserve crew, mandating an integrated CMS with live crew tracking.

D. AI-Enabled Crew Management Systems

Legacy CMS platforms—built in the 1990s and 2000s—rely on rule engines that check feasibility sequentially, flagging violations after a roster is constructed and requiring 30–90 days to reconfigure for revised rules. Modern AI-enabled platforms use constraint programming, machine learning, and Monte Carlo simulation to generate FDTL-compliant rosters proactively, predict disruption risks, and suggest real-time recovery actions. Post-crisis, IndiGo invested in upgrading its CMS rule engine to align with revised DGCA caps, reducing the adaptation lag that contributed to the December 2025 cancellations.

VII. CASE STUDY: INDIGO'S DECEMBER 2025 CRISIS

A. Pre-Crisis Operational Profile

IndiGo entered the FDTL implementation period operating 1,862 daily flights across 344 aircraft with a crew-sets-per-aircraft ratio of 7.1—below the 8–9:1 required for full FDTL compliance—and a standby pool of effectively 0%. Its CMS required 30–90 days to reconfigure rule engines for the revised caps. The airline had simultaneously approved a 6% winter schedule increase to 15,014 weekly departures, compounding the mismatch between crew availability and operational demand.

B. Crisis Timeline and Operational Metrics

TABLE III. INDIGO DECEMBER 2025 CRISIS — CANCELLATIONS AND ON-TIME PERFORMANCE

Period	Event / Impact	Cancellations	OTP
Oct 2025	Baseline; Phase 1 absorbed without major disruption	Minimal	90.2%
Nov 2025	Full FDTL enforcement; roster gaps emerge	1,232	67.7%
Dec 4, 2025	Crisis peak; crew shortages at multiple hubs	550+	8.5%
Dec 5, 2025	DGCA grants temporary exemptions; 1M+ pax stranded	~1,600	<10%
Jan 2026	Roster restructuring; accelerated pilot hiring	Declining	>60%
Feb 11, 2026	Full compliance restored; FRMS reforms in place	Minimal	>85%

Source: DGCA enforcement records; BBC (2025); Business Standard (2026); Moneycontrol (2025).

C. Financial and Regulatory Consequences

The financial toll was severe and multi-layered. Direct cancellation compensation to passengers exceeded ₹24 crore; total refunds were estimated at up to ₹5 billion. IndiGo's stock lost approximately ₹400 billion (15%) in market capitalisation between December 2–9, 2025. DGCA levied India's largest-ever civil aviation penalty: ₹22.2 crore in fines plus a ₹50 crore bank guarantee tied to a 15-month reform programme.

Over one million passengers were directly stranded, prompting the government to deploy emergency rail capacity and impose airfare caps through March 2026. Post-crisis corrective actions—raising standby to 15%, increasing crew-sets-per-aircraft to 7.2, and accelerating pilot hiring from 9,500 toward 11,000 by end-2026—restored operations but at a sustained 10% schedule reduction.

D. Direct Impacts on Crew Rostering and Fleet Scheduling

New FDTL norms invalidated IndiGo's rosters, as expanded rest windows and night limits created crew shortages during the peak wedding season (November–December). Rostering systems required 30–90 days to adapt their rule engines to the revised caps, leading to cascading unavailability. Fleet efficiency dropped measurably: FDTL constraints grounded over half of IndiGo's fleet temporarily, as insufficient rested crews prevented scheduled aircraft rotations from completing. High-utilisation models faltered, with schedules cut 10% post-crisis sustained through February 2026.

Disruptions rippled nationwide, prompting the government to add emergency rail capacity and impose airfare caps until March 2026. The crisis forced IndiGo to abandon its approved 6% winter schedule increase, effectively losing the revenue premium associated with peak-season capacity. The airline's Net Promoter Score fell 22 points between October and December 2025, with 'reliability' and 'schedule integrity' cited as the primary consumer concerns.

VIII. RESULTS

A. Quantified Operational Impacts

The FDTL revisions reduced effective crew availability by 20–25%, necessitating an increase in pilot-to-aircraft ratios from 7:1 to at least 8–9:1. The 48-hour weekly rest requirement, combined with the WOCL-adjusted FDP cap, reduced night-sector capacity by approximately 30% for a typical IndiGo hub rotation. Aircraft utilisation fell from 14.2 block-hours per day to an estimated 12.8 hours during the December disruption—a 10% reduction—with long-term schedule cuts sustained at that level through February 2026.

The OTP degradation from 90.2% (October 2025) to 8.5% (December 4, 2025) represents a 91% decline in schedule reliability. This is not merely an operational inconvenience but a systemic safety signal: when OTP collapses to single digits, crews are routinely operating under pressure, near FDP limits, with reduced buffers for in-flight incidents requiring extended duty.

B. Mental Health and Fatigue Indicators

Survey-based evidence adapted from Efthymiou et al. [4] and ERAM Scholarly Commons [8] indicates that pilots in high-frequency LCC operations with unpredictable rosters report fatigue symptom rates 18–22% higher than long-haul counterparts. During the IndiGo crisis, pilot union communications documented widespread reports of duty extensions, rest violations, and psychological distress, with the union publicly characterising the situation as 'running on fumes.' The absence of a confidential fatigue-reporting channel meant that these conditions went underreported to the regulator until the crisis was already acute.

C. Scenario Modelling Outcomes

Risk-based FDTL envelopes (analogous to FAA/EASA FRMS pathways) could improve crew utilisation by 10–15% and reduce reactive cancellations by 8–12% during demand peaks. Flexible weekly rest accumulation over 14 days (minimum 36 hours, total 48) could improve schedule density by 5–8% during peak seasons with rigorous FRMS monitoring. Mandatory digital fatigue reporting is projected to increase declared fatigue events by 15–20%, enabling earlier systemic risk identification before cascades develop.

IX. DISCUSSION

A. Regulatory Design and Operational Resilience

The IndiGo crisis confirms a well-established principle in safety-critical systems: prescriptive rules without adaptive implementation mechanisms generate perverse outcomes. DGCA's 2025 FDTL revisions are scientifically justified—the fatigue-performance evidence reviewed in Section V unambiguously supports stricter night-duty limits. The failure was not regulatory in intent but architectural in execution: a framework that provides no FRMS-based flexibility pathway forces lean operators to absorb the full shock of rule changes simultaneously across their entire network.

The solution is not to weaken DGCA's hard caps but to introduce a parallel FRMS approval track that allows airlines meeting defined data-quality and oversight standards to seek route-specific alternative compliance—analogous to the pathways available to FAA and EASA operators.

B. Pilot Mental Health as a Safety Metric

A critical insight from the data is that pilot mental health is not a welfare add-on to aviation safety policy—it is a core safety metric. The 12.6% clinical depression prevalence and the documented stigma around fatigue reporting mean that regulatory frameworks that do not actively counter these barriers are operating with systematically incomplete information about crew fitness. Airlines that invest in just safety cultures—with anonymous reporting, no-punitive-action policies for fatigue declarations, and transparent roster feedback mechanisms—generate materially better safety information.

C. Structural Implications for Indian Aviation

India's pilot pool shortfall—approximately 1,500–2,500 certified commercial pilots below the FDTL-compliant requirement for current fleet sizes—is not amenable to short-term solutions. The 18–24 month timeline for training and licensing new commercial pilots means that the sector will face FDTL-induced capacity constraints at least through 2027. DGCA's current approach of granting ad-hoc waivers under crisis conditions should be replaced with a structured waiver framework tied to verifiable corrective-action milestones.

Comparative analysis of DGCA, FAA, and EASA frameworks illustrates that prescriptive limits and science-based flexibility are not mutually exclusive. India's challenge is to preserve the clarity and enforceability of its prescriptive caps while creating structured pathways—such as FRMS-approved alternative compliance and split-duty provisions—that give airlines the operational adaptability needed to serve a high-growth, high-density aviation market.

X. EVIDENCE-BASED RECOMMENDATIONS

TABLE IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AIRLINES, DGCA, AND REGULATORS

Actor	Recommendation	Expected Outcome
Airlines	Deploy AI-enabled CMS with real-time FDTL constraint solver and FRMS integration	Reduces adaptation lag from 30–90 days to 3–7 days; enables proactive disruption recovery
Airlines	Increase crew-to-aircraft ratio to ≥8.5:1 (LCC); maintain ≥15% standby pool	Directly addresses the structural buffer deficit exposed by IndiGo's December 2025 collapse
Airlines	Mandate anonymous digital fatigue reporting; no punitive action for declarations	15–20% increase in report filing; earlier detection of systemic roster risks
Airlines	Run Monte Carlo simulations (1,000+ scenarios) ≥90 days before regulatory changes	Prevents the sudden operational shock that triggered the December 2025 crisis
DGCA	Consult airlines, pilot unions, and CMS vendors ≥12 months before new FDTL rules; 6-month parallel run	Prevents sudden operational shock; ensures software and staffing readiness
DGCA	Develop FRMS alternative-compliance pathway (analogous to EASA)	Allows data-driven roster flexibility while maintaining safety; reduces ad-hoc waivers
DGCA	Tie schedule-expansion approvals to verified crew-strength-to-fleet-size benchmarks	Prevents airlines from growing capacity faster than compliant crew pool can sustain
Regulators	Publish transparent waiver criteria; require corrective action plans with milestones	The December 2025 waiver without public criteria undermined FDTL credibility

Source: Authors' analysis based on DGCA (2024), EASA (2023), Efthymiou et al. (2021), and IndiGo crisis data.

XI. CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that FDTL norms—when scientifically grounded and rigorously enforced—are essential for pilot safety and long-term aviation sustainability. The IndiGo 2025 crisis reveals that prescriptive limits without structural preparation generate crises that undermine the very objectives they pursue. A carrier operating at zero reserve buffer, with a CMS requiring 60 days to adapt to revised rules, and no confidential fatigue-reporting channel, is not FDTL-compliant in substance even if nominally within legal limits.

Effective implementation requires three mutually reinforcing components. First, regulatory design must combine clear prescriptive hard caps with FRMS-backed flexibility pathways for data-validated alternatives. Second, operational investment in AI-enabled crew management, robust reserve pools (minimum 15%), and pilot training pipelines calibrated to fleet growth is non-negotiable. Third, safety culture must actively counteract fatigue-reporting stigma through just-culture principles and transparent roster feedback.

Future research priorities include longitudinal FDTL outcome tracking across Indian carriers, development of India-specific biomathematical fatigue models, econometric analysis of compliance costs in emerging-market LCC contexts, and exploration of real-time wearable fatigue-monitoring technology as a frontier for continuous objective crew-fitness management.

REFERENCES

[1] ICAO, Manual for the Oversight of Fatigue Management Approaches (Doc 9966, 2nd ed.), International Civil Aviation Organization, Montreal, 2016.

[2] C. Barnhart, A. M. Cohn, E. L. Johnson, D. Klabjan, G. L. Nemhauser, and P. H. Vance, "Flight crew scheduling," in Operations Research in the Airline Industry, G. Yu, Ed. Kluwer, 1998, pp. 384–413.

[3] X. Wen, S. Sun, Y. Zhang, and Y. Liu, "Robust airline crew scheduling," Transportation Research Part E, vol. 136, p. 101899, 2020.

[4] M. Efthymiou, A. Psychogios, and J. Vaz, "Flight crew evaluation of FTL regulation," Journal of Air Transport Management, vol. 92, p. 102038, 2021.

[5] EASA, Effectiveness of Flight Time Limitation (FTL 2.0) Study, European Union Aviation Safety Agency, 2023.

[6] A. M. Williamson and A. M. Feyer, "Sleep deprivation and performance impairment," Occupational and Environmental Medicine, vol. 57, no. 10, pp. 649–655, 2000.

[7] Environmental Health (2016), cited in A. M. Williamson and A. M. Feyer, adapted fatigue data, Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 2000.

[8] ERAM Scholarly Commons, "Airline pilot perception of stress and self-reported fatigue," Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, 2022.

[9] DGCA India, Civil Aviation Requirements (CAR) Section 7 — Flight Duty Time Limitations, New Delhi, 2024.

[10] FAA, 14 CFR Part 117 — Flight and Duty Limitations and Rest Requirements: Flightcrew Members, 2012.

[11] B. Xu, Z. Tan, and Y. Ling, "Airline scheduling optimization," IEEE Trans. Intelligent Transportation Systems, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 3120–3135, 2024.

[12] D. Dawson and K. Reid, "Fatigue, alcohol and performance impairment," Nature, vol. 388, no. 6639, p. 235, 1997.

[13] Y. Harrison and J. A. Horne, "Impact of sleep deprivation on decision making," Journal of Sleep Research, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 45–54, 2000.