

**Summary of Meeting #27 of RTCA SC-186 Working Group 3  
and Meeting #4 of EUROCAE Working Group 51, Subgroup 1  
held at United Airlines Operation Center in Chicago as a Joint Session for the  
Maintenance of the ADS-B 1090 MHz Extended Squitter (1090ES) MOPS  
from 12 – 15 May 2009 between 9:00am and 5:00pm EDT  
<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, 12 May 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	Dr. George Ligler, PMEI – FAA SBS P.O	Kurt Schueler, Garmin International (phone)
Dave Barnard, L-3 / ACSS	Al Marshall, Sensis Corp	Stuart Searight, FAA ATO-P, AJP-652
Chip Bulger, FAA AIR-130 (phone)	Johan Martensson, Eurocontrol (WG-51, SG-1)	Bob Semar, United Airlines (phone)
Jim Duke, SAIC (SC-186, WG-1)	Dean Miller, Boeing ATM (phone)	Charles Sloane, FAA AIR-130 (phone)
Gary Furr, Engility Corp, FAA ATO-P, AJP-653	Damian Mills, NATS, UK (WG-51, SG-1)	Ralph Smith, ITT Corp
Martin Gray, Trig Avionics (WG-51, SG-1)	Peter Moertl, Mitre (SC-186, WG-1)	Jorg Steinleitner, Eurocontrol (WG-51, SG-1)
Richard Jennings, FAA AIR-130	Tom Pagano, FAA ATO-P, AJP-653	Jessie Turner, Boeing ATM
Stan Jones, Mitre CAASD	Bob Pomrink, Regulus, FAA SBS P.O.	Don Walker, Honeywell International
Larry Kenney, Raytheon	Friedhelm Runge, EASA (WG-51, SG-1)(phone)	
Dr. Ian Levitt, FAA ATO-P . AJP-653	Robert "Bob" Saffell, Rockwell Collins	

1. Tom Pagano and Jorg Steinleitner began the meeting with **Agenda Item #1** by welcoming all participants to the United Airlines Operations Center near Chicago Illinois. Captain Rocky Stone of United Airlines discussed the facilities at United Operations Center and the arrangements for lunch.
2. After Tom Pagano and Jorg Steinleitner concluded their initial remarks, Tom indicated that the next order of business would be **Agenda Item #2** to review the proposed Agenda, which was distributed for this Meeting under Working Paper 1090-WP27-01. Gary Furr pointed out that several Working Papers had been added to the proposed Agenda that was initially distributed via email and posted on the web site. Further, Gary noted that all revisions of Working Papers would be posted to that web page as soon as possible after their revision. The Agenda was reviewed in detail because of the specific requirements related to presentation timing and the availability of certain Working Group members. Several Working Papers were scheduled to be presented at specific times.
3. Next, under **Agenda Item #3**, the Meeting turned to Working Paper 1090-WP27-02 as presented by Gary Furr as the Summary of Meeting #26, which was held at the facilities of RTCA in Washington DC on 31 March through 3 April 2009. These minutes of Meeting #26 were accepted by the Joint Session as published.
4. Under **Agenda Item #4a**, the Meeting then began a brief review of Working Paper 1090-WP27-03 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," but has now been recognized as the complete publication of DO-260B.

- 4.1 Gary indicated that there would not be a detailed review of this Working Paper, given that it is only a working copy of the progress of the activities of the Working Groups toward the ultimate published MOPS documents. It was pointed out that there had been assignments made for Action Items to many, or most, of the proposed changes during Meeting #26 at RTCA and that these actions would be updated during this Meeting and that the Change Matrix would continue to be updated during and after this Meeting. Additionally, Stuart Searight has prepared information regarding the changes that may affect the ADS-B MASPS (DO-242A) and this information will be folded into WP27-03 for Meeting #28 (i.e., 1090-WP28-03).
  - 4.2 During the review of WP27-03, there was considerable discussion on the proposed NIC=7 supplement, which led to the need to understand the impact of the proposed change on NAV Canada and Australia. There were several suggestions on how to implement the requirement for a Radius of Containment value of 0.3 NM, including the suggestion to change NIC=6 with Supp=0 to 0.3 NM and NIC=6 with Supp=1 to 0.5 NM. It was recognized that any of these proposed discussed changes would also affect UAT. The Meeting agreed to have Bob Pomrink inquire of NAV Canada and Jorg Steinleitner inquire of Air Services Australia and report back to the Meeting, if information was received before the end of the Meeting. Bob Pomrink did in fact discuss this issue with NAV Canada and they indicated that their requirement included the need for the  $R_C$  of 0.5 NM. A preliminary response from Air Services Australia indicated that they also require 0.5 NM. It was believed that both requirements come from the use of DO-260 and the use of NUC instead of NIC/NAC<sub>p</sub>. As these requirements came to light and further discussion continued, George Ligler pointed out that we agree on the need to provide a  $R_C$  of 0.3NM, we just need to agree on the way to implement the requirement.
5. Next, under **Agenda Item #5**, the Joint Session began the review of Working Papers that have been submitted as the result of Open Action Items, which were initially accepted during Meetings #24, #25 and #26. Working Papers in Agenda Item #5 were taken in no particular order and were interleaved with Working Papers in Agenda Item #6. The presentation of a given Working Paper was dependent on the availability of certain Meeting Members. The summaries below simply represent the summaries at the time of presentation.
- 5.1 The first Working Paper to be reviewed was 1090-WP27-14 under Agenda Item #5i, presented by Don Walker on the topic of the performance of the Position Offset Applied bit. Don presented a suggested requirement for the requirement of a limitation on the performance of the accuracy of the position. After discussion, it was agreed that Don Walker would accept **Action Item 27-01** to further specify the proposed language for the §2.2 requirements and §2.4 test procedures for the Paris meeting.
  - 5.2 The Meeting then began to review Working Paper 1090-WP27-07 under Agenda Item #5d, presented by Chris Moody on the topic of vertical rate. This Working Paper was originally given to RTCA SC-186 WG-5 for the UAT MOPS. This Working Paper was reviewed in conjunction with Working Paper 1090-WP27-11 given by Don Walker and detailed in 6.1 below. It was agreed by the Meeting that the information on calculating

vertical rate should be in the ADS-B OUT Advisory Circular, which the FAA believes will be produced in about the same timeframe as the final ADS-B Rule.

5.3 The Meeting began to review Working Paper 1090-WP27-08 under Agenda Item #5e, presented by Bob Saffell on the topic of position extrapolation and latency. Bob indicated that this Working Paper addressed issues that arose in Meeting #26 during discussion of Working Paper 1090-WP26-29 in regards to latency issues relevant to the Non-Precision Position Extrapolation and/or Estimation requirements. This Working Paper also addressed the issues that arose during discussion of Working Paper 1090-WP26-10 regarding the issue of condensing requirements and test procedures relevant to both the Precision and Non-Precision Position Extrapolation and/or Estimation requirements. During the discussion of 1090-WP26-10, there were indications that there was little to no difference between the Precision and Non-Precision requirements. During his discussion, Bob reviewed all of the applicable requirements and proved that there is significant difference between the Precision and the NON-Precision Extrapolation and/or Estimation requirements. Specifically, that the Precision case, with  $T=1$ , establishes Time of Applicability such that Time of Applicability is at the Exact 0.2 UTC Epoch. The Precision case with  $T=0$  allows estimation techniques that attempt to approach the performance provided by  $T=1$ . The Non-Precision case ( $T=0$  only) allows extrapolation or estimation to the Time of Transmission. Furthermore, requirements on the position register are such that the Time of Applicability of position data loaded into the Register is never more than 200 milliseconds different from any time at which the register contains the position data. Bob indicated that there is a need to consider the difference between the Time of Register Applicability and the Time of Transmission. This is because of the fact that ground systems and airborne TCAS systems can retrieve the position register, requiring that the Time of Applicability of the position data in the register is close to the time the data is retrieved, not the scheduled ADS-B broadcast transmission. Bob showed in the paper that the requirements provided in section 2.2 of RTCA DO-260A which allow the Non-Precision method are not provided in Appendix A of RTCA DO-260A and are therefore also not provided in ICAO Doc. 9871, since Appendix A was used exclusively to produce the original ICAO SARPS and later Doc 9871. As such, the requirements provided in RTCA DO-260A in regards to Non-Precision are not consistent with the ICAO SARPs. The Working Paper ended with four basic recommendations:

- a. Remove, e.g., “delete,” all Non-Precision case extrapolation or estimation requirements and test procedures from DO-260B.
- b. Retain precision  $T=1$  requirements and test procedures in DO-260B as they are currently written in DO-260A, while removing the restriction to precision Type Codes.
- c. Draft  $T=0$  requirements and test procedures in DO-260B. Base the requirements off of the proposed “Change 2” in WP27-08. Develop test procedures similar to those for  $T=1$ , modified to test that the Time of Applicability of the Position data in the Message is within 100 milliseconds of the Time of Transmission of the Message.

- d. Ensure that the same requirements exist in both Appendix A of DO-260B and ICAO Doc 9871.
- 5.4 The Meeting began to review Working Paper 1090-WP27-09 under Agenda Item #5f, presented by Ian Levitt on the topic of the description of the latency requirements. Tom Pagano, Ian Levitt, Bob Saffell and Dave Barnard accepted **Action Item 27-02** to propose the specific requirements and test procedures to implement the agreed total and uncompensated latency requirements.
- 5.5 The Meeting continued with the review of Working Paper 1090-WP27-04 under Agenda Item #5a by Bob Saffell on the topic of revising the format of the Target State and Status Message (TSS) to include the Selected Altitude as was requested by UK NATS and Air Services Australia. Bob indicated that the version of the TSS in this Working Paper tries to maintain the backward compatibility of the broadcast of the NAC<sub>P</sub>, NIC<sub>BARO</sub>, SIL and the Emergency/Priority Status fields. The only issue expressed by Bob is that in an ADS-B Version 1 TSS Message, the “Backward Compatibility” flag was in bit-11 and in the proposed format in this Working Paper bit-11 is inside the Selected Altitude field. There was considerable Meeting discussion regarding what can be done to satisfy maintaining backward compatibility. There was also discussion on the Selected Heading field format. Bob agreed to revise the definition of the Selected Heading field in Revision 1 of this Working Paper. It was also agreed that we would go back to using a Subtype=1 for ADS-B Version 2 systems in order to get around the issue of not being backward compatible with bit-11. Both of these changes are reflected in 1090-WP27-04R1.

As further discussion, Larry Bachman asked what the current status is of the effort to delete the NIC<sub>BARO</sub> flag. Review of the Minutes from Meeting #25 in paragraph 5.3 indicated that the Joint Session during the Brussels meeting in February agreed that NIC<sub>BARO</sub> could be removed in both the Target State and Status and Operational Status Messages if no reason could be found for keeping it. After Meeting discussion, it was agreed to retain the NIC<sub>BARO</sub> in all places in the MOPS because it could possibly be used in the automation systems since it is currently specified in the ICD for the Ground Station.

- 5.6 The Meeting continued with the review of Working Paper 1090-WP27-06 under Agenda Item #5b by Tom Pagano on the topic of how to resolve the issue of Event-Driven squitter rates in ADS-B Version 2. Tom indicated that this presentation was initially given to the ICAO ASP Working Group during their Louisville meeting in April for the purpose of helping the ASP understand the issues that RTCA SC-186 WG-3 and EUROCAE WG-51, SG-1 are working with to resolve the need to broadcast the Mode A Code at a higher rate during a code change, which in turn may break the requirement for a maximum of 6.2 squitters per second in the SARPs and MOPS documents. Tom indicated that a subgroup of the ICAO ASP Technical Subgroup had held private discussions on this topic during the Louisville meeting and had come up with the recommendation to propose a SARPs and MOPS change to change the hard requirement for 6.2 squitters per second, to an average over a 60 second period. After discussion, the proposal in the Working Paper was accepted. **Action Item 27-03** was

accepted by Tom Pagano, Gary Furr and Bob Saffell to propose revisions to take the proposals of WP27-06 into account.

- 5.7 The Meeting continued with the review of Working Paper 1090-WP27-18 under Agenda Item #5m by Chip Bulger and Richard Jennings for the discussion of the FAA AIR-130 and SBS Program Office proposal to redefine the SIL and NIC parameters. After review of the entire Working Paper, it came down to four basic recommendations. Recommendation #1 was to “*Move the containment radius probability from SIL to NIC (agreed) and fix the containment radius probability at  $10^{-7}$  (not agreed).*” Recommendation #2 (agreed) was to “*Include the entire avionics chain in defining the design assurance/avionics integrity parameter (SIL).*” Recommendation #3 (agreed) was to “*Redefine SIL to Support Failure condition.*” Finally, recommendation #4 (initially agreed but later questioned, see below) was to “*Add a GNSS/non-GNSS Bit.*” It was agreed that the containment radius for the ADS-B position source should be expressed in a different parameter than avionics integrity. Consistent with this agreement, there was further consensus that we have a design assurance parameter that covers the entire ADS-B OUT equipment chain. The MS WORD part of the Working Paper was revised during the meeting by George Ligler to 1090-WP27-18R1 to reflect an intermediate point in the above discussions. The revised Working Paper was further discussed later in the Meeting in an effort to come to agreement on all SIL-related issues. It was agreed that ADS-B position source containment radius probabilities would continue to be encoded as one of  $10^{-7}$ ,  $10^{-5}$ , or  $10^{-3}$ . Nonetheless, two items remained without consensus: (1) whether the containment radius probability should be encoded as per hour or alternatively as per hour or per sample; and (2) whether there should be a bit transmitted to indicate whether the containment radius was per hour or per sample. As a result of this discussion, George Ligler accepted **Action Item 27-10** to lead a teleconference that was scheduled for 9:00am EDT on 2 June 2009 in an effort to resolve the “per hour or per sample” and related “per/hour or per/sample bit” issues. George indicated that he would put out a paper framing the 2 June discussion in advance of the teleconference.
- 5.8 The Meeting continued with the review of Working Paper 1090-WP27-13 under Agenda Item #5h by Don Walker and Richard Jennings for the discussion related to the announcement of an ADS-B Fail. This Working Paper has been reviewed during previous meetings and WP27-13 contains new comments from Jorg Steinleitner of Eurocontrol and Freidhelm Runge of EASA. There were various discussions on the same issues as before, regarding how to deal with multiple possible failures being displayed to the pilot with only one light in the cockpit of older aircraft. It was agreed that further comments would be sent directly to Don Walker for revision of this Working Paper for review again during the Paris meeting. It was agreed that a teleconference would be set for 27 May at 12:00 noon EDT to discuss this further. Don Walker will send out a phone bridge for this teleconference. Action Item 25-06 was left Open until the status of this issue is reported on again during the Paris Meeting.
- 5.9 The Meeting continued with the review of Working Paper 1090-WP27-15 under Agenda Item #5j by Dean Miller for the discussion on what specific changes would be necessary for deleting the connection of vertical components in the NIC, NAC<sub>p</sub> and SIL parameters. Dean also indicates that there are changes in the Type Code table as well

not reflected in this Working Paper. Dean also points out that there may also be other changes as the issue of the SIL definition, discussed in §5.7 above, is resolved. After review, the specific changes in this Working Paper were accepted by the Meeting, and Gary Furr will edit the changes into the draft of DO-260B.

6. Under **Agenda Item #6**, the Meeting discussed the additional Working Papers that make proposals on issues related to proposed changes to DO-260A. Working Papers in Agenda Item #6 were taken in no particular order and were interleaved with Working Papers in Agenda Item #5. The summaries below simply represent the summaries at the time of presentation.

6.1 The Meeting continued with the review of Working Paper 1090-WP27-05 under Agenda Item #6a prepared by John Van Dongen and presented by Tom Pagano, relating to an error that is believed to have been found in the area of testing the RF Peak Power in §2.4.2.2.10.1 and §2.4.2.2.10.1. The issue is that the test of RF Peak Power in DO-181D is different than the same test in DO-260A. Tom reviewed the proposed changes to the test procedures and there was discussion on the further differences in the equipment required in DO-181D versus that in DO-260A. After discussion, it was agreed to change the RF Peak Power section to capture the requirements for closely spaced transmissions. Martin Gray accepted **Action Item 27-04** for this effort.

6.3 The Meeting continued with the review of Working Paper 1090-WP27-11 under Agenda Item #6b by Don Walker relating to the specific issues in the ASAS MOPS (DO-317) that relate to the use of vertical information. This Working Paper was reviewed in conjunction with 1090-WP27-07 given by Chris Moody. Don performed a review of MOPS and MASPS documents to review the existing requirements for vertical components. The Working Paper expresses the existing requirements for vertical metrics specifications in DO-242A and DO-289. After discussion, it was agreed that we would have a 2-bit parameter of geo altitude quality which would have two encodings defined, one of which is “unknown or > 45 meters” and the other value which would be better than 45 meters. We considered the need for geometric vertical rate, and concluded that geometric vertical rate from SA Aware receivers would be adequate to meet the requirements to date for ADS-B applications. Therefore, no geometric vertical rate field was deemed to be necessary for ADS-B broadcast. The studies show that SA Aware sensor performance meets the desired false alert rate for conflict detection from the perspective of vertical rate. Additionally, it was concluded that even though VPL has been removed from the definition of the NIC values, current application requirements do not require the transmission of a VPL field. Don Walker accepted **Action Item 27-05** to generate the specific requirements and test procedures to implement the agreement for the Paris meeting.

7. Under **Agenda Item #7**, the Meeting discussed Other Business issues.

7.1 John Shaw came to the Meeting on Friday morning and requested time to present what was identified as Working Paper 1090-WP27-19 on the topic of aircraft not moving

while on the surface. John spoke as a representative of the RTCA/EUROCAE Requirements Focus Group (RFG) Ground Surveillance Applications (GSA) Subgroup from their analysis of the APT Application, which deals with those requirements for processing and displaying those ADS-B requirements displayed on the Air Traffic Controllers screen. The GSA subgroup is concerned about the fact that the broadcast rate of the Surface Position Message changes as the aircraft approaches a stopped condition. The concern is that as the broadcast rate slows to once per 5 seconds, the Automation system will extrapolate the potentially inaccurate ground speed between receptions of the Surface Position Message and could present a situation where an aircraft on a Hold-Line could appear on the Controllers Screen as if they were approaching the active runway. John presented two options in the Working Paper: one to delete the requirement for lowering the broadcast rate while stopped on the surface, and/or second to always force a ground speed of ZERO while in the lower broadcast rate. After Meeting discussion on the merits of the two proposals, Don Walker accepted **Action Item 27-09** to propose modified requirements and test procedures to deal with the issue of invalid track angle on the surface at low speeds.

8. Under **Agenda Item #8**, 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. Jorg Steinleitner indicated that it was the position of WG-51, SG-1 that it would probably be better for all concerned to hold the August meeting in Washington DC instead of at Eurocontrol, in view of the number of vacations taken by the European members during August. Therefore, 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 #28 SG-1 #5	16 – 19 June 2009 9:00am – 5:00pm, Paris	EUROCAE at Malakoff in Paris France
WG-3 #29 SG-1 #6	21 – 24 July 2009 9:00am 7/21 to noon 7/24	Confirmed at RTCA in Washington DC
WG-3 #30 SG-1 #7	18 – 21 August 2009 9:00am 8/18 to noon 8/21	Confirmed at RTCA in Washington DC
WG-3 #31 SG-1 #8	Week of 5 – 9 October '09 <b>Specific days TBD</b>	Proposed for FRAC Comment Resolution at RTCA SC-186/WG-51 Joint Plenary on 9 October <i>Will have to consider Comment Resolution for UAT will be taking place during the same week.</i>

9. The following is a summary of all of the Open Action Items from Meeting #24, #25, #26, and those accepted during Meeting #27.

Action Number	Action Description	Assigned to	Status
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 < 10 June

Action Number	Action Description	Assigned to	Status
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
25-06	Propose requirements for Fail/Warn based on coordination with EASA.	Rich Jennings Jorg Steinleitner	See <b>WP27-13</b>
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 < June TSG
25-22	Start review of DO-260A++ for identifying all changes that will be required for changing to Version 2.	Gary Furr	Due < 10 June
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 < 10 June
26-02	Review all of the Link Budget Ranges in Table E-1 and analyze and add the values for the proposed new A1S equipment class.	Bill Harman	Due < 10 June
26-04	Define the specific changes in DO-260A that will be required in order to implement the suggested changes in Working Paper 1090-WP26-13.	Tom Pagano	Due < 10 June
26-05	Review WP26-27 and WP26-09 with regard to the proposals for terminating messages and broadcast of the Zero Type Code Messages for a final proposal that will have minimum impact on other documents.	Eric Potier (L) Bob Saffell Other Mfgs	Initial Look Due < 10 June
26-07	With respect to the questions raised in WP26-19 by ACSS, Don and Al should double check the requirements in §2.2 and test procedures and if necessary create same with a diagram to clarify the Time Mark Extrapolation. Mike will check the ITT systems. <i>The SBSS Radio currently extrapolates Time of Applicability for received ADS-B messages back to the previous applicable 0.2 s epoch (i.e., if the time that the radio receives the message = 12.1s (after UTC midnight) and the CPR Format is Odd, the assigned TOA by the SBSS Radio is 11.8 s).</i>	Don Walker Al Marshall Mike Garcia	Response from: Mike Garcia  Awaiting other responses
27-01	Propose specific language for the §2.2 requirement and the §2.4 test procedure to achieve the requirement for specifying the performance of the Position Offset Applied bit.	Don Walker	Due < 10 June
27-02	Propose specific language for the §2.2 (including §2.2.5.2) requirement and the §2.4 test procedures to achieve the requirements for specifying the total and uncompensated latency.	Tom Pagano Ian Levitt Bob Saffell Dave Barnard	Due < 10 June
27-03	Propose specific changes for §2.2 and §2.4 and Appendix A to accommodate the proposal of WP27-06 for revising the broadcast rates related to Event-Driven squitters.	Tom Pagano Gary Furr	Due < 10 June
27-04	Propose a note for the RF Peak Power section to capture requirements for closely spaced transmissions.	Martin Gray	Due < 10 June
27-05	Consistent with the agreements reached during review of WP27-11, propose specific requirements and test procedures for adding the vertical metric.	Don Walker	Due < 10 June
27-06	Review the handling of the ADS-R process in the ITT Ground Stations for the purpose of resolving Duplicate Addresses.	Ralph Smith	Due < 10 June

Action Number	Action Description	Assigned to	Status
27-07	Review WP27-06R1 based on discussions during Meeting #27 and make further proposals for handling Duplicate Addresses.	Dean Miller	Due < 10 June
27-08	In view of the issue raised in 1090-WP27-19 regarding squittering rates of the position message on the surface, propose requirements and test procedures for resolving the issue.	Don Walker	Due < 10 June
27-09	Propose modified requirements and test procedures to deal with the issue of invalid track angle on the surface at low speeds.	Don Walker	Due < 10 June
27-10	Chair a teleconference meeting on 2 June for per sample, per hour discussion and report back to the working group. (ensure that Smiths is invited to the telecom)	George Ligler	Due 2 June
27-11	Recommend specific encoding values for the radius of containment and the design assurance level based on the agreements reached in Meeting #27.	Chip Bulger	Due < 10 June
27-12	Consult with Air Services Australia and NAV Canada to discuss a proposed solution to add the NIC Supplement for $R_C = 0.3\text{NM}$ into the NIC table.	Jorg Steinleitner Bob Pomrink George Ligler	Due < 10 June
27-13	Propose specific changes for §2.2 and §2.4 and Appendix A to accommodate the agreement for the new Target State and Status format for Subtype=1 for Version 2	Bob Saffell	Due < 10 June

10. 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>