

RTCA Special Committee 186, Working Group 3

ADS-B 1090 MOPS, Revision A

Meeting #14

**Summary of WG-3 Teleconference
Held 1pm EDT, 12 September 2002**

Presented by Gary Furr

SUMMARY

On Thursday, 12 September 2002 members of WG-3 held a two hour teleconference with the objective of discussing and resolving items that were significant problems relating to continuing the writing of Test Procedures by personnel at the FAA Technical Center.

On Thursday, 12 September 2002 WG-3 held a two hour teleconference with the objective of discussing and resolving the following 12 numbered items. The resolution and or action items resulting from the discussions are noted below in ***bold italics*** in brackets [].

1. As currently specified, DO-260A determines the TYPE Code using the NIC parameter as defined in Table 2-11. The position extrapolation/estimation requirements for position transmission were based on the TYPE code (NUCp) in DO-260. The requirements were based on whether the transmission was precision or non-precision. For DO-260A, if we use the TYPE code for precision/non-precision processing selection, as currently specified, the requirements would be based on NIC alone. **Question:** For DO-260A, is it not more correct to select the precision/non-precision transmission requirements using either the NIC or the NACp? This affects numerous sections of 2.2.
[It was agreed that only the NIC parameter would be used for determination of precision/non-precision and that there would be no required changes to existing text in order to accommodate this decision.]
2. The following Sections have TBDs that must be cleared: §2.2.3.2.7.2.4.2, §2.2.3.2.7.2.4.3, §2.2.3.2.7.2.4.4, §2.2.10.5, §2.2.10.6, §2.2.10.6.2, §2.2.10.6.3.
[It was agreed that the Note in §2.2.3.2.7.2.4.2 “TCAS/ACAS” would be deleted altogether. The TBD in the Note for §2.2.3.2.7.2.4.3 “IDENT” will be referenced to §2.2.5.1.31. The TBD in the Note for §2.2.3.2.7.2.4.4 “Receiving ATC Services” will be referenced to §2.2.5.1.32. It was agreed that the TBDs in Table 2-76 in §2.2.10.5 relating to the number of Participant Track Files would be removed and the numbers for A2 and A3 Participants would remain at 400 each. After discussion on the topic of Participant Track File Maintenance in §2.2.10.6, it was agreed to delete the entire section and subparagraphs.]
3. The following Sections are incomplete or have missing requirements: §2.2.3.2.7.2.12, §2.2.17.1, §2.2.17.3.5.8, and §2.2.17.3.6.
[Regarding the incomplete requirement of §2.2.3.2.7.2.12, it was agreed that the requirement would be expanded by Gary in the next Draft and that the encoding state 0 = Track Angle and 1 = Heading to be consistent with what would have been the state in DO-260 while on-the-ground. Tom Pagano agreed to write a TIS-B Introduction paragraph to place in §2.2.17.1. The TBDs in §2.2.17.3.5.8 will be referenced to Appendix A.1.7 and referenced to the 12-bit CPR Encoding. It was agreed to totally delete §2.2.17.3.6 since there is currently no TIS-B Management Message defined.]
4. All of §2.2.5.1 needs to be reviewed for completeness, but as it sits in the current Draft #2, there are specifically missing requirements in §2.2.5.1.22 through §2.2.5.1.32.
[For review in Brussels, Gary will cut and paste a generic statement similar to what was written for these inputs in the UAT MOPS for paragraphs §2.2.5.1.22 through §2.2.5.1.32.]

5. All of Section 2.2.5.2 needs to be reviewed for completeness, but as it sits in the current Draft #2, is it correct to base the Latency on the NIC or NAC_P parameters as specified in §2.2.5.2.1 and §2.2.5.2.2?
[After review of the NIC and NAC_P parameters as they relate to Latency, it was agreed to base the formula for “X” in §2.2.5.2.1 and §2.2.5.2.2 only on NAC_P. Further, it was noted that the NUC_P parameter was still present in the text of these paragraphs and needs to be revised.]
6. It is believed here at the FAATC that §2.2.17.4 is not complete and we should have a discussion on it.
[Following group discussion, Bill Harman agreed to address a revision of parts of §2.2.17.4 and submit revisions to Gary for integration into the draft for Brussels.]
7. Do we have duplicate requirements in §2.2.3.3.1.4.4 and §2.2.3.3.2.7?
[No. Leave AS-IS.]
8. Do we have duplicate requirements in §2.2.3.3.1.4.5 and §2.2.3.3.2.8?
[No. Leave AS-IS.]
9. With the update of §2.2.3.2.2 at the last meeting, several of the paragraphs had text inserted relating to the ADS-B/TIS-B Receiving Subsystems. **Question:** Shouldn't this text be moved to the ADS-B Receiver Section?
[This issue was deferred for discussion in Brussels.]
10. Regarding the reception of Version 0 and Version 1 Messages and producing Reports: This is a significant test procedure effort so these requirements need to be polished.
[This issue was deferred for discussion in Brussels.]
11. There are duplicated fields in the Target State and Status Message, and the Operational Status Message (specifically the NAC and SIL parameters).
[It is correct to have these parameters in both messages because if there is a change in one of the parameters, it needs to be broadcast at the highest rate to ensure reception of the changed information ASAP. Leave AS-IS.]
12. In §2.2.3.2.7.1 there is an expansive amount of Notes. Are all of these Notes still necessary?
[This issue was deferred for discussion in Brussels.]
13. During review of §2.2.5.1.1 at the FAA Technical Center in an attempt to write Test procedures, it was decided that there should be separate requirements as follows:
 §2.2.5.1.1 was renamed “Participant Address” and split into three subparagraphs as:
 §2.2.5.1.1.1 ICAO 24-Bit Discrete Address
 §2.2.5.1.1.2 Anonymous Address
 §2.2.5.1.1.3 Address Qualifier for Non-Transponder Devices
[This topic was inadvertently left off of the original teleconference list and therefore was not discussed during the teleconference, but must be reviewed in Brussels.]