

**Summary of Meeting #25 of RTCA SC-186 Working Group 3
and Meeting #2 of EUROCAE Working Group 51, Subgroup 1
held at Eurocontrol in Brussels as a Joint Session for the
Maintenance of the ADS-B 1090 MHz Extended Squitter (1090ES) MOPS
on 17 – 20 February 2009 between 9:00am and 5:00pm CET**
<http://adsb.tc.faa.gov/WG3.htm>

The meeting was called to order by Working Group 3 Co-Chair Thomas Pagano of the FAA ATO-P organization at about 9:00am, 17 February 2009. Mr. Pagano and EUROCAE WG-51, SG-1 Chair Jorg Steinleitner welcomed all attendees and asked that each attendee introduce themselves and their organization. The participants during part, or all, of the meeting included:

Dr. Larry Bachman, JHU-APL	Christophe Maily, Airbus (WG-51, SG-1)	Robert "Bob" Saffell, Rockwell Collins
Dave Barnard, L-3 / ACSS (phone)	Johan Martensson, Eurocontrol (WG-51, SG-1)	Kurt Schueler, Garmin International (phone)
Bob Darby, Eurocontrol (WG-51, SG-1)	Miguel Martinez, Indra (WG-51, SG-1)	Stuart Searight, FAA ATO-P
Gary Furr, Engility Corp, FAA ATO-P	Thomas Mayer, Becker Avionics	Charles Sloane, FAA AIR-130 (phone)
Alberto Fernandez-Sanchez, Indra (WG-51, SG-1)	Dean Miller, Boeing ATM	Joe Smith, SAIC – FAA SBS P.O. (phone)
Richard Jennings, FAA AIR-130	Damian Mills, NATS, UK (WG-51, SG-1)	Nicolas Soldevila, Thales (WG-51, SG-1)
Rudolf Kopecky, ERA (WG-51, SG-1)	Tom Pagano, FAA ATO-P	Jorg Steinleitner, Eurocontrol (WG-51, SG-1)
Dieter Kunze, Becker Avionics (WG-51, SG-1)	Christian Paquier, Dassault Aviation (WG-51, SG-1)	Jessie Turner, Boeing ATM
Dr. Ian Levitt, FAA ATO-P (phone)	Eric Potier, Eurocontrol (WG-51, SG-1)	Don Walker, Honeywell International (phone)
Dr. George Ligler, PMEI – FAA SBS P.O.		

1. Tom Pagano began the meeting with **Agenda Item #1** by welcoming all participants to the Eurocontrol Headquarters facility in Brussels Belgium. Jorg Steinleitner, EUROCAE WG-51, SG-1 Chair and host for this meeting, welcomed participants and discussed the facilities and the arrangements for coffee breaks and lunch.
2. After Tom Pagano and Jorg Steinleitner concluded their presentations, Tom indicated that the next order of business would be **Agenda Item #2** to review the Agenda, which was distributed under Working Paper 1090-WP25-01. Gary Furr pointed out that several Working Papers had been added to the Agenda that was initially distributed via email and that the latest version of the Agenda would be available for participants on the WG-3 web page for the meeting. Further, Gary noted that all revisions of Working Papers would be posted to that web page as soon as possible after their revision.
3. Next, under **Agenda Item #3**, the Meeting turned to Working Paper 1090-WP25-02 as presented by Gary Furr as the Summary of Meeting #24, which was held at the facility of Honeywell Aerospace in Phoenix Arizona on 13 – 15 January 2009. These minutes of Meeting #24 were accepted by the Joint Session as published.
4. Under **Agenda Item #4a**, the Meeting then began a review of Working Paper 1090-WP25-03 as Gary Furr reviewed of all of the currently proposed changes that could be included in what was originally referenced as "Change 3 to DO-260A."
 - 4.1 George Ligler had comments regarding the review of the requests for the broadcast of the Wake Vortex Avoidance information to the ADS-B Working Group. They agreed

that there was a need for this information to be broadcast and it was agreed that the FAA SBS Program Office would fund a business case. Bob Saffell pointed out the discussion was held during the ICAO ASP TSG meeting regarding the preferred way to broadcast the information was via a cross link on TCAS equipped aircraft.

- 4.2 With regard to Change #3 for Total and Uncompensated Latency, Tom Pagano asked the question as to why it was classified as a Class #2 change. George Ligler offered an explanation as to why he believed that this Change had originally been classified as a Class #2. After discussion the Joint Session agreed that the Class of change would be revised to a #1.
- 4.3 Next under **Agenda Item #4b**, the Joint Session began a review of Working Paper 1090-WP25-06 as Gary Furr presented at a very high level view of the changes that have been integrated into the initial DO-260A from sources such as “Change 1 to DO-260A,” plus “Change 2 to DO-260A,” plus Working Papers 1090-WP23-03R1 and 1090-WP23-05. Gary pointed out that there are also some changes that have been identified in Working Paper 1090-WP25-03 that have already been integrated into the draft.
- 4.4 During discussion on the draft of DO-260A++, there were several issues that came up. The first issue was dealing with referencing of TSO’s in the MOPS. There was discussion regarding the fear of a circular reference since the TSO points to the MOPS and if we have a TSO reference with a “shall,” then we complete the circle. Regarding this issue, it was agreed that Gary would go through the document and place references to TSOs in Notes. There was additional discussion regarding how to reference the latest versions of MOPS documents. It was agreed that Gary would make modifications to those references to include phrases such as “DO-181D or later version.”
5. Next, under **Agenda Item #5**, the Joint Session began the review of Working Papers that have been submitted as the result of Action Items accepted during Meeting #24 in Phoenix.
 - 5.1 The first Working Paper to be reviewed was 1090-WP25-05 under Agenda Item 5b as presented by George Ligler. This Working Paper is in response to Action Item 24-02. George reports that he has contacted the FAA SBS Program Office and that they confirmed that Business Case activity involving the ARC Recommendations concerning non-diversity ADS-B equipage with “medium” power has been deemed unnecessary. This conclusion was reached because the FAA was able to decide the degree to which such equipage might be used within the airspace defined in the NPRM on the basis of operational analysis of airspace requirements. For users who would only operate in portions of the NPRM airspace where such equipage would be permitted, there is a clear cost reduction. The final recommendation from this Working Paper was that we develop a non-diversity A1*, to ensure that all other requirements intended by the NPRM specifying class A1 as the minimum equipage class are met. It was agreed that Action Item 24-02 would be closed and a new **Action Item 25-01** would be opened for Rich Jennings and Chip Bulger to check on the compatibility of this proposed new requirement with existing text in ICAO Annex 10, Vol. IV, §2.1.5.3.

- 5.2 George Ligler volunteered to discuss his and Rich Jennings response to Action Item 24-01. George is the Co-Chair of RTCA SC-159, the GPS Special Committee. George discussed what vertical quality indicators are actually put out on the bus. He found that it varies by manufacturer. George indicates that the current GBAS MOPS does not require the output of a VPL parameter. The result of this investigation is that he recommends that WG-3/SG-1 modify the 1090ES MOPS by removing the vertical parameters from NIC, NAC_P and SIL, and place this issue in a Change Class 3 for possible review of a future MOPS change.
- 5.3 The discussion related to vertical quality indicators led to a further discussion on the NIC_{BARO} parameter. Bob Saffell indicates that the industry has been trying to get rid of Gilham altitude reporting for years, and that this bit was used to report whether or not the barometric pressure altitude being reported in the Airborne Position Message has been cross-checked against another source of pressure altitude. The usefulness of this bit in the ADS-B world was brought into question and discussion revolved around whether or not to discontinue the ADS-B broadcast of this bit. Getting rid of Gilham for transport class aircraft was confirmed in ICAO Annex 6, Part 1, §6.19. The Meeting agreed that the FAA should require the removal of Gilham. The Meeting further agreed that the strategy would be to totally delete the NIC_{BARO} from both the Target State and Status Message, and the Operational Status Message. If however, in the next few months we find that there is a need for the NIC_{BARO} flag, then it would be left in the Operational Status Message. There was an additional conversation regarding the usefulness of the “Receiving ATC Services” flag while Chip Bulger was joining the conversation. The Meeting agreed that whether the Mode A code was broadcast or not, that ATC has no need for the “Receiving ATC Services” flag and that we will recommend that it be removed from DO-260B in conjunction with Change #13 on Working Paper 1090-WP25-03. Additionally, the Meeting agreed that the “IFR Compatibility Flag” in the Airborne Velocity Message would be deleted, as per the discussion held originally in Phoenix during the discussion on Working Paper 1090-WP24-06R1.
- 5.4 The Meeting began to review Working Paper 1090-WP25-14 as presented by Kurt Schueler of Garmin in response to Action Item 24-14. Kurt has gone through the basic DO-260A document and has proposed in the range of 40 places that would have to have changes proposed in order to add an equipment class for an A1 with non-diversity. One of the decisions that will have to be made is how to designate the actual requirement. The Meeting agreed on the designation of “A1S” for single antenna, and to continue to use “A1” for diversity (two antenna). Kurt agreed to accept **Action Item 25-02** to use this Working Paper as a basis for identifying all of the specific changes to DO-260A. Larry Bachman agreed to accept **Action Item 25-03** to review Appendix P and make the necessary changes.
- 5.5 The Meeting started off Wednesday morning with a review of Working Paper 1090-WP25-08 by Bob Saffell of Rockwell Collins, in response to Action Item 24-06 regarding the broadcast of the selected altitude. This issue initiated with a request by Air Services Australia and later by NATS UK for the addition of an ADS-B Message to specifically broadcast Selected Altitude information that is contained in Register 40₁₆.

This topic was discussed most recently during the ICAO ASP TSG meeting in Fort Lauderdale where Damian Mills of NATS UK had presented a proposal to revise the content of the Target State and Status Message. Bob Saffell has taken the Working Paper that was presented by Damian Mills to the TSG and revised it in his proposals in WP25-08. There was some Meeting discussion on the various proposed changes concerning target altitude. The Meeting agreed that we were not ready to finalize all of the fields of the Target State and Status Message. Several potential edits were made to the Working Paper to produce 1090-WP25-08R1. It was agreed that an Issue Paper would be written by Damian Mills, in conjunction with consultation with Air Services Australia, to write up an operational need for the broadcast of the Barometric Pressure setting for presentation to RTCA SC-186 and EUROCAE WG-51 to review for the purpose of having a Plenary agreement for the need for broadcasting this data. Additionally, the Issue Paper will contain a justification for removing the Mode bits.

- 5.6 The Meeting continued with the review of Working Paper 1090-WP25-10 by Dean Miller of Boeing, in response to Action Item 24-13 regarding the potential for duplicate addresses on the 1090 MHz Extended Squitter data link. Currently as combined with Change 1 and Change 2 using the reasonableness tests, the 1090ES receiver will drop a target that might be identified as a duplicate address. The ICAO ASP TSG has created a Note in ICAO Doc 9871, which allows a manufacturer to send a flag to the application that says that he has a possible duplicate address. Working Paper WP25-10 dealt more closely with the way that the ASAS MOPS treats potential duplicate addresses and dealt with UAT as well as 1090ES. After discussion, the Meeting agreed that a requirement would be created for the 1090ES receiver section similar to the requirements in both the FAA and EUROCAE Ground System specifications for identifying and passing a flag to applications indicating a possible duplicate address. Dean Miller accepted **Action Item 25-04** to draft the requirements for DO-260B for dealing with potential duplicate addresses.
- 5.7 The Meeting continued with the review of Working Paper 1090-WP25-07 by Chip Bulger, which was a response to Action Item 24-18 regarding whether RTCA SC-186 Working Group 1 expects that the information for Position Offset will be required in the Surface Alerting application, and whether or not it matters if the position reference point is the “center of the Length/Width box” OR the nose of the aircraft. Chip reports that the response that he has received from WG-1 is that the impact of this has not yet been determined primarily because their Operational Performance Assessment will not be available until possibly July, but that it is expected that the Position Offset will be needed. After discussion, the Meeting agreed that based on the information that we have available, we would not alter the requirements in DO-260A for the POA (Position Offset Applied) Flag. Further, the change proposal would be flagged as a Class 3 change in the Change Matrix.
- 5.8 The Meeting continued with the review of Working Paper 1090-WP25-16 by Eric Potier, which was a response to Action Item 24-19 regarding the potential differences in the air/ground determination language in the existing DO-260A++ and the recently revised DO-181D transponder MOPS. Eric compares the specific sections of both documents related to the validation of air/ground determination and makes recommendations to bring DO-260B into compliance with the language in DO-181D.

The Meeting agreed with the recommended changes but suggested that Note 4 from DO-181D be added to the recommended changes.

- 5.9 The Meeting continued with the review of Working Paper 1090-WP25-09 by Eric Potier, which was a response to Action Item 24-09 regarding the possibility of adding any type of switch to turn ADS-B ON or OFF. This Working Paper was reviewed and approved by the ICAO ASP TSG during their meeting in Fort Lauderdale, 2 – 6 February 2009 as a proposal to change the ICAO SARPs to clarify the human interface and to suggest that there is no SARPs requirement for an ON/OFF switch. Meeting participants were encouraged to send any additional ideas to Eric Potier to improve the Working Paper for presentation to the ICAO ASP Working Group at their meeting in April 2009 in Louisville Kentucky.
- 5.10 The Meeting continued the discussion with the review of Working Paper 1090-WP25-13 by Bob Saffell, which was a response to Action Item 24-12 regarding a technical evaluation of the aspects of requiring an ADS-B Fail/Warn indication/declaration as it may or may not be associated with any attempt to provide an ADS-B ON/OFF switch. In this Working Paper, Bob reviews the technical aspects of providing a Fail/Warn declaration and/or an ADS-B OUT ON/OFF switch.
- 5.11 The Meeting continued with the review of Working Paper 1090-WP25-15 by Jessie Turner of Boeing, which was a response to Action Item 24-10 regarding the discussion of possible Fail/Warn declaration(s) and/or ADS-B ON/OFF switch with the Boeing customers. The Working Paper asks the question of what types of ADS-B OUT parameters need to be annunciated to the flight crew. Jessie presented a table of ADS-B parameters and suggested that Boeing had looked at each of these parameters and suggested whether or not they felt that a Fail/Warn should be annunciated. The Meeting discussed at length whether the regulators felt that the current Fail/Warn was sufficient. Requirements in DO-260A++ §2.2.11.2.1 and §2.2.11.2.2 were reviewed as being the same as those in DO-181D.
- 5.12 The Meeting continued with the review of Working Paper 1090-WP25-11 by Ian Levitt of the FAA, which was a response to Action Item 24-08 regarding updating of Working Paper 1090-WP24-09R1 that was presented during the Phoenix Meeting #24, to include information about the case where T=1. During the review of the changes, Boeing representatives expressed concern that there might be some small tolerance needed for the T=1 case. The Meeting agreed that an **Action Item 25-07** would be accepted by Garmin and ACSS to review their implementations and advise during the next meeting at RTCA on the value of some small delta “X” for the requirement expressed in Working Paper 1090-WP25-11R1, §1.2.3, bullet “c” for –100-X to +100+X for uncompensated latency. Dean Miller and Jessie Turner also accepted **Action Item 25-08** to produce a Working Paper on GPIRU regarding uncompensated latency. Tom Pagano and Ian Levitt accepted **Action Item 25-09** to revise Working Paper WP25-11 and add a small tolerance for the T=1 case as was discussed during the review of the Working Paper. The Meeting agreed that the Working Paper bullet “b” in §1.2.3 would be expressed as a note in the MOPS.

- 5.13 The Meeting continued with the review of Working Paper 1090-WP25-04 by Christophe Maily of Airbus, which is a response to Action Item 24-16 regarding proposed switching the “Single Antenna Flag” in the Airborne Position Message with the NIC Supplement in the Operational Status Message. Christophe reviews the connections between the requirements of airborne and surface applications and makes the recommendation that the NIC Supplement will be placed in the Airborne Position Message and that the “Single Antenna Flag” will be moved to a spare bit location in the Operational Status Message. Dave Barnard of ACSS discussed the fact that this change could impact there 1090ES receiver and that they would like the opportunity to go back and review their code before totally accepting the suggestion for this change.
- 5.14 The Meeting continued with the review of Working Paper 1090-WP25-17 by Eric Potier of Eurocontrol, which is in response to Action Item 24-20 regarding the need to clarify the starting and ending of squittering. The Working Paper pointed out an inconsistency on the timeout of the Velocity Register 09₁₆. The update rate in Doc 9871 was changed to 1.3 seconds, which would mean that the timeout would be set at 2.6 seconds. However, the DO-181D update was left at zeroing out the register after two seconds. The Working Paper also investigated the termination of Airborne Position squitter when there is no more position data available. The Meeting agreed that the Airborne Position squitter will continue to be transmitted after 60 seconds when altitude remains present. It was noted that the associated test is not consistent with the requirement and should be corrected. The meeting was of the opinion that the transmission of Airborne Position squitter will stop if the altitude disappears for more than 60 seconds. Eric indicated that the Meeting should not consider his proposals since he has changed his position on the proposals during the meeting and because further research needs to be performed on the Velocity update. A revision to this Working Paper will be offered during the next meeting at RTCA.
- 5.15 The Meeting continued with the review of Working Paper 1090-WP25-12 by Tom Pagano, which is in response to Action Item 24-15 regarding the GPS alarm and NIC determination. George Ligler accepted *Action Item 25-13* to consult with RTCA SC-159 to answer the question as to whether HFOM is valid when the Non-Isolated Satellite Failure is set.
- 5.16 The Meeting continued with the review of the matrix of proposed change candidates to ensure that all changes had appropriate actions assigned against them.

6. Under **Agenda Item #6**, the Meeting discussed the dates, times and length of the future meetings of the joint sessions of RTCA SC-186 WG-3 and EUROCAE WG-51, SG-1. The Meeting agreed that the currently planned future meetings in order to meet our schedule would be the following:

Meeting	Dates/Time	Meeting Location
WG-3 #26 SG-1 #3	31 March – 3 April 2009 9:00am – 5:00pm EDT	RTCA, Washington DC (ending at noon on Friday, 3 April 2009)
WG-3 #27 SG-1 #4	12 – 15 May 2009 9:00am – 5:00pm CDT	United Airlines Headquarters, Chicago IL (ending at about noon on Friday, 15 May 2009)
WG-3 #28 SG-1 #5	16 – 19 June 2009 9:00am – 5:00pm, Paris	EUROCAE at Malakoff in Paris France

7. Under **Agenda Item #7**, the Meeting opened the floor for discussion of additional issues related to a potential changes to DO-260A:

- 7.1 The first issue raised was by Dean Miller of Boeing regarding the potential use of Register 09₁₆ Airborne Velocity Messages, Subtypes 3 and 4 for air-to-air applications using airspeed and heading. Dean indicates that it is possible that future applications may need the airspeed and heading instead of velocity over ground provided in the standard Airborne Velocity Message for Subtypes 1 and 2. Bob Saffell explains that Velocity Subtypes 3 and 4 were included for broadcast only if you lost velocity over ground, basically as a backup. But the basic requirement was always to broadcast a basic State Vector, and Subtypes 3 and 4 were always a secondary measure. Christophe Maily indicates that Airbus cannot support the broadcast of Subtypes 3 and 4 instead of 1 and 2 at this time because they have already implemented an ITP application based on N/S & E/W Velocity. Dean references the NPRM where he believes that the FAA requests “(d) *An indication of the Aircraft’s velocity. This message element is also derived from the aircraft’s navigation position sensor and would provide ATC with the aircraft’s airspeed with a clearly stated direction and describes the rate at which an aircraft changes its position.*” After discussion, it was indicated that it is believed that the NPRM has misstated the request and should have been requesting “velocity over ground” instead of “airspeed.” The Meeting agreed to capture this issue in the potential change list and Dean Miller accepted **Action Item 25-II** to create a Working Paper for the next meeting to discuss this further.
- 7.2 The second issue raised was by Dean Miller of Boeing regarding the use of the report formats that are specified in DO-260A for State Vector, Mode Status, Target State, etc. Dean indicates concerns about the expression of resolutions, accuracies and the required rates of producing these reports.
- 7.3 The third issue raised was by Jorg Steinleitner of Eurocontrol regarding his view of the requirements for broadcasting additional NIC values for surface applications. Jorg presented Working Paper 1090-WP25-18, where he presents his justification for making the changes to the NIC values consistent with the more detailed proposal of the original ICAO ASP Working Paper TSG WP05-23 on this topic. The Meeting discussed the need to take this proposal back to the ICAO ASP TSG for their approval and Jorg Steinleitner agreed to develop a corresponding Working Paper for presentation

at the next ICAO ASP TSG meeting in Paris in June 2009, which will include further feedback from the RFG ATSA-SURF and ADS-B-APT work.

8. The following is a summary of all of the Open Action Items from Meeting #24, and those accepted during Meeting #25.

Action Number	Action Description	Assigned to	Status
24-03	Address with his AIR-130 colleagues the proposed revision of the SIL parameter. SIL Parameter definition was changed by AIR-130 during Change 1 to DO-260A and then the vertical component was again added by AIR-130 during Change 2 to DO-260A.	Rich Jennings Chip Bulger	Due < 31 March
24-05	With respect to the proposed changes to the Zero TYPE Code Message identified in Working Paper 1090-WP24-16, Don and Eric will additionally identify any proposed changes to the Test Procedures in §2.4 as required.	Don Walker Eric Potier	Due < 31 March
24-07	Review the body of DO-260A, Appendix A and Appendix J for any proposed changes that would relate to the decoupling of setting the NAC _V parameter using HFOM and propose changes to requirements and test procedures.	George Ligler Rich Jennings	See WP26-08
24-09	Contact EASA and review AMC 20-24, §8.9.4.2 and see if this paragraph could be removed or revised to indicate that a switch for the flight crew to turn ADS-B ON/OFF is not required.	Eric Potier Jorg Steinleitner	See WP25-09 Due < 31 March
24-11	During the discussion of 1090-WP24-18 regarding the possibility of the ADS-B ON/OFF switch, there was also discussed the possibility of a new Fail/Warn declaration for ADS-B. Christophe accepted the action to discuss these proposed changes with Airbus customers and report back to the Joint Session.	Christophe Maily	Due < 31 March
24-18	Review the issues related to 1090-WP24-07R2, Change Item #27, “Clarify ADS-B Position Reference Point,” and check with SC-186 WG-1 as they work on Surface Alerting, and report to the Joint Session concerning their proposed usage of the Position Reference Point.	Chip Bulger	See WP25-07 and WP26-04
25-01	Check with the consistency of the proposed new requirement for a “non-diversity A1” class of 1090ES equipment when viewed against the existing ICAO Annex 10, Vol. IV, §2.1.5.3 requirement.	Rich Jennings Chip Bulger	Due < 31 March
25-02	Using Working Paper 1090-WP25-14 as a start, specify all changes to DO-260A++ to implement the A1 non-diversity equipment class.	Kurt Schueler	Due < 31 March
25-03	Update Appendix P to include A1S equipment class. This will include the results of the USA East Coast model for 2020 and 2035.	Larry Bachman	First draft due < 16 June
25-04	Draft requirements for the 1090ES MOPS for potential duplicate address processing in the receiver section along the lines of that in both the FAA SBS and EUROCAE Ground Station Specifications.	Dean Miller Charles Sloane	Due < 31 March
25-05	Propose wording to §2.2.11.2.1 and §2.2.11.5.1 regarding the clarification of the monitoring function and the setting of a Fail/Warn declaration.	Jessie Turner	Due < 31 March

Action Number	Action Description	Assigned to	Status
25-06	Verify with EASA their position on the Fail/Warn annunciation for ADS-B.	Rich Jennings Jorg Steinleitner	Due < 31 March
25-07	Review latency numbers as identified in 1090-WP25-11 §1.2.3.c and make a recommendation for "X".	Kurt Schueler Dave Barnard	Due < 31 March
25-08	Produce a Working Paper on GPIRU regarding uncompensated latency.	Dean Miller Jessie Turner	Due < 31 March
25-09	Make revisions to 1090-WP25-11R1 for tolerances on the T=1 case.	Ian Levitt Tom Pagano	Due < 31 March
25-10	Review their software for the 1090ES receiver to assess the potential impact of the proposed switching of the NIC Supplement into the Airborne Position Message to replace the Single Antenna Flag.	Dave Barnard	Due < 31 March
25-11	Create a Working Paper to discuss the issue of broadcasting the Airborne Velocity Message Subtypes 3 and 4 for airspeed and heading, instead of Subtypes 1 and 2 with velocity over ground.	Dean Miller	Due < 31 March
25-12	Recommend changes to DO-260B related to the termination of transmission of broadcasting position messages after loss of data. Propose corrections to test procedures.	Eric Potier Don Walker	Due < 31 March
25-13	Consult with RTCA SC-159 to answer the question as to whether HFOM is valid when Non-Isolated Satellite Failure is set.	George Ligler	Due < 31 March
25-14	There are numerous sections of DO-260B which will change because of the insertion of the Mode A and TCAS RA into the Emergency/Priority Status, and the change of the Target State and Status. Hence, the issue of the broadcast rates of the Event-Driven Squitters must be reviewed and suggestions made for changes.	Bob Saffell Dean Miller	Due < 31 March
25-16	Write a recommendation and create a presentation to justify the added NIC values on the surface based on proposed future applications for presentation at June ICAO ASP TSG meeting in Paris.	Jorg Steinleitner Eric Potier	Due < 31 March
25-17	Review the proposal for T=1 from Bill Harman WP24-02 and make suggestions or recommendations for whether or not to accept the Harman suggestions for removal of requirements and test procedures, and whether other sections may be affected.	Bob Saffell Tom Pagano	Due < 31 March
25-18	Make specific DO-260B paragraph suggestions on changes necessary to implement the removal of the vertical components for NIC, NAC, SIL.	Dean Miller	Due < 31 March
25-19	Report to SC-186 Plenary on 27 February 2009 all of the issues related to changing the 1090ES MOPS which affect the ADS-B MASPS. (Change Items: #10, #11, #13, #27)	Tom Pagano George Ligler Rich Jennings	Closed
25-20	Further develop the requirements for the revised Target State and Status for presentation at next meeting.	Bob Saffell	Due < 31 March
25-21	White Paper on the operational advantages of having the barometric altitude correction parameters broadcast in the Target State and Status Message. Coordinate with Air Services Australia.	Damian Mills	See WP26-06
25-22	Start review of DO-260A++ for identifying all changes that will be required for changing to Version 2.	Gary Furr	Due < 31 March

Action Number	Action Description	Assigned to	Status
25-23	Open Action for Gary Furr to implement agreed upon changes into the current draft of DO-260B for review during the next meeting.	Gary Furr	Due < 31 March

9. The **Working Papers** for all WG-3 Meetings, as well as the Meeting Agendas, Meeting Minutes, and Meeting Schedules are posted on the ADS-B 1090 MHz web site maintained at the FAA William J Hughes Technical Center, located at: <http://adsb.tc.faa.gov/WG3.htm>