

Open 1090 MOPS Issues as maintained by Gary Furr since the June Plenary.

I started collecting these issues during the discussions of the “Post-Plenary Ad Hoc CPR Committee.” The list below has been maintained in the order in which issues came up, and not necessarily in any particular order that we should consider them during the up coming meeting. Presentation and discussion order of the issues will be determined before and/or during the meeting on November 28 – 30, 2000.

1.	Tables 2-119 and 2-120 (pages 486/487) have the same title. Tables 2-144, 2-145 and 2-146 (pages 531/532) have the same titles. New titles to be suggested by Gary Furr.
2.	Issues raised by EUROCAE WG-51 as presented by Bev Nichols. These issues are supported by the attached file named EUROCAE-Comments-on-ED-102.pdf with response comments added by Gary Furr. (Open item also reported in #11 below)
3.	Issues raised by EUROCAE WG-51 on Section 2.3 from Enrico Pupillo and commented on during the October DERA SC-186 Plenary by Bob Saffell. These issues are supported by the attached file named wg-51cmt.pdf
4.	Consider Steve Ashley’s concern over ARINC 429 labels. Should we alter references to ARINC 429 Labels? This issue is supported by the attached file named ARINC429.pdf
5.	Ian Levitt points out that the last entry in Table 2-90 is incorrect because everybody was interpreting the NL Table incorrectly. This issue needs to be reviewed and agreed upon by the same people that reviewed the CPR issue after the Plenary.
6.	For the Airborne and Surface Encoding values in Table 2-89 and 2-91, Jim Maynard wants to add columns for Hex Latitude/Longitude. We should also consider the same issue for the NL Table Verification in Table 2-90. We should additionally decide the “format” of the test files that are to be placed on the ADS-B web site.
7.	Tom Pagano’s disagreement with the reference to DO-181B in Step 3 of 2.4.3.2.1.1.2.1 and the need to add references to “FS” and “VS” in other steps. This issue is supported by the attached file named Pagano1.pdf
8.	David Glessner’s simpler method for CPR encoding. Reference Section A.7.3. This issue is supported by the attached file named A-7-3-Rev-A.pdf
9.	Expand the Test Procedure for “Receiver Duty Factor” section 2.4.4.3.5, page 443.
10.	Consider Question/Issue raised by Jean-Michel Bonnet regarding number of TCPs, replacing TCP on the ground with “ground destination messages, etc. This issue is supported by the attached file named Bonnet.pdf
11.	For En Route Operational Capabilities Encoding defined in Tables 2-54 and A-13, we need to discuss the “Meanings” and whether it is even appropriate to have the definitions here or elsewhere. (this issue is also noted in the comments submitted by Bev Nichols which was item #2 above)