

#	Commentor Last Name	Paragraph/Section	Line Table / Figure	Comment Level (NC, H, M, L, E)	Comment	Suggested resolution	RTCA/EUROCAE Disposition	Action
1	Walker	Doc-(ALL)		M	Remove all references to ICAO	Remove all references to ICAO	WG-3/SG-1 and Don Walker agree that the objective is that ICAO references should be reduced or eliminated in future versions of these MOPS, along with a revision to Appendix A, which originally served as a mini-SARPs with the publication of DO-260 in September 2000.	Action Gary - create/update a listing of "open" issues to carry forward into the next versions of DO-260B/C
2	Honeywell Wilson	Doc-(General)		H	Since AC 20-165 requires NIC limiting in certain circumstances, this should be spelled out in the appropriate DO-260B sections (§2.2.3.2.3.1.1, §2.2.3.2.4.1.1)	Add the following note to sections §2.2.3.2.3.1.1 and §2.2.3.2.4.1.1: <i>"If the position source does not account for all errors or accomplish the appropriate HPL limiting, you must ensure the ADS-B equipment limits NIC to less than or equal to 8. If a SBAS position source provides a mode indication, it is acceptable to only limit the NIC ≤ 8 when in the non-augmented mode."</i>	WG-3/SG-1 agreed with the basic need for clarification and the following revised Note is proposed: <i>"Although the above requirements do not require HPL limiting, it is expected that some regulators will only accept installations that limit HPL. This may be standardized accordingly in future versions of these MOPS."</i>	Implemented: Corr-DO-260B(4), Corr-ED-102A(4), Corr-DO-282B(1), draft DO-260B+(4), draft ED-102A+(4), draft DO-282B+(1), Doc 9861, Doc 9871
3	Honeywell Wilson	Doc-(General)		H	Since AC 20-165 requires ground track to be invalidated when GNSS ground speed is below 7 knots, this should be spelled out in DO-260B, §2.2.3.2.4.3.	In the Note below Table 2-17, change the parenthetical to say: <i>"(The ADS-B equipment should invalidate the ground track when the GNSS ground speed falls below 7 knots.)"</i>	WG-3/SG-1 agreed with the basic need for clarification, but suggested that the current parenthetical be retained and that the following be added onto the end of the note, inside the parenthetical: <i>"Some regulators have already established such limits. These limits may be standardized accordingly in future versions of these MOPS."</i>	Implemented: Corr-DO-260B(3), Corr-ED-102A(3), draft DO-260B+(3), draft ED-102A+(3), Doc 9871
4	Saffell	Doc-(General)		H	US DOT FAA AC 20-165, section 3-3.b.(4) indicates that the ADS-B equipment may make automatic selection of the Position source. The AC goes on to state "If multiple sources are interfaced to the ADS-B, there must be a means for the flight crew to readily determine which source is selected". This latter statement works fine where selection is performed by the Flight Crew via switches or other indication that are readily displayed to the Flight Crew. However, this latter statement is deficient when the selection is performed automatically by the ADS-B equipment. There are no provisions in RTCA/DO-260B to require the ADS-B Out equipment to annunciate the source selection to external systems. Consequently, there were no such provisions added to ARINC 718-4 which was recently approved. Of interest is that RTCA/DO-302, STP MOPS, did provision for various source selections as well as for annunciation of such source selections. Problem is that for all practical purposes, RTCA/DO-302 has been effectively rendered obsolete or Not Applicable by the current ADS-B Out Mandate rules.	Appropriate source selection and annunciation requirements and test procedures need to be added to RTCA/DO-260B. However, to add such requirements, test procedures, etc., is a significant increase in scope beyond the intent of the Corrigenda. Alternately, automatic source selection will have to be disallowed if it cannot be appropriately annunciated to the flight crew.	WG-3/SG-1 agrees that this is not an issue of the MOPS, and FAA AIR-130 indicates that this should not have been in the AC and is being taken out of revision "A", which will possibly be available for draft review in the Spring of 2012.	Action Walker: Update AC 20-165

#	Commentor Last Name	Paragraph/Section	Line Table / Figure	Comment Level (NC, H, M, L, E)	Comment	Suggested resolution	RTCA/EUROCAE Disposition	Action
5	Furr	Doc-(1.1)		E	It has been agreed that in an effort to make using DO-260B easier with these Corrigendum items integrated, that DO-260B will be edited to include each Corrigendum Item and the actual "Corrigendum-1" document will be added to the PDF file as a separate new Appendix "W".	In §1.1 add a new paragraph to describe Appendix "W" as the Corrigendum-1 for DO-260B/ED-102A including errata and clarifications.	<u>Appendix W</u> includes the content of "Corrigendum-1 for DO-260B/ED-102A" which serves to itemize errata that were discovered in the document after the publication of RTCA DO-260B in December 2009. The Appendix also includes the addition of notes in some areas in an effort to clarify issues that have been points of discussion during the implementation of ADS-B Version 2 transmitting subsystems, as defined by RTCA DO-260B and EUROCAE ED-102A.	Implemented: Corr-DO-260B(1), Corr-ED-102A(1), draft DO-260B+(1), draft ED-102A+(1)
6	Saffell	Doc-(2.2.3.2.3.3)	2 nd. Paragraph	H (almost NC)	RTCA/DO-260B section 2.2.3.2.3.3 requires that NIC Supplement-B be changed if an update has not been received in 2 seconds. Problem is that HIL data coming from an ARINC 743A GPS may not be updated for up to 1.2 seconds. This forces a change based on a sample of one. In order to allow appropriate debounce, the time should be changed to 2.6 seconds to be consistent with similar data change requirements in the SARPs and DOC. 9871.	Recommend that the minimum time to reflect a change in NIC Supplement-B be changed to 2.6 seconds. It should be noted that 14CFR §91.227 and AC 20-165 allow 12 seconds for changes in NIC.	WG-3/SG-1 agrees that this change cannot be considered in this Corrigendum, as it has requirements change implications. This issue will be retained for discussion during any potential future revision of these MOPS, the transponder MOPS and ICAO Doc 9871.	Action Gary - create/update a listing of "open" issues to carry forward into the next versions of DO-260B/C
7	Saffell	Doc-(2.2.3.2.7.1.3.8)	2 nd. Paragraph	H (almost NC)	RTCA/DO-260B section 2.2.3.2.7.1.3.8 requires that NAC_P be changed if an update has not been received in 2 seconds. Problem is that HFOM data coming from an ARINC 743A GPS may not be updated for up to 1.2 seconds. This forces a change based on a sample of one. In order to allow appropriate debounce, the time should be changed to 2.6 seconds to be consistent with similar data change requirements in the SARPs and DOC. 9871.	Recommend that the minimum time to reflect a change in NAC_P be changed to 2.6 seconds.	WG-3/SG-1 agrees that this change cannot be considered in this Corrigendum, as it has requirements change implications. This issue will be retained for discussion during any future revision of these MOPS, including the transponder MOPS and ICAO Doc 9871.	Action Gary - create/update a listing of "open" issues to carry forward into the next versions of DO-260B/C
8	Saffell	Doc-(2.2.3.2.7.2.3.10)	2 nd. Paragraph	H (almost NC)	RTCA/DO-260B section 2.2.3.2.7.2.3.10 requires that NIC Supplement-C be changed if an update has not been received in 2 seconds. Problem is that HIL data coming from an ARINC 743A GPS may not be updated for up to 1.2 seconds. This forces a change based on a sample of one. In order to allow appropriate debounce, the time should be changed to 2.6 seconds to be consistent with similar data change requirements in the SARPs and DOC. 9871.	Recommend that the minimum time to reflect a change in NIC Supplement-C be changed to 2.6 seconds. It should be noted that 14CFR §91.227 and AC 20-165 allow 12 seconds for changes in NIC.	WG-3/SG-1 agrees that this change cannot be considered in this Corrigendum, as it has requirements change implications. This issue will be retained for discussion during any future revision of these MOPS, including the transponder MOPS and ICAO Doc 9871.	Action Gary - create/update a listing of "open" issues to carry forward into the next versions of DO-260B/C
9	Furr	Doc-(2.2.3.2.7.2.4.6)		E	During review of the references and bibliography for the new combined MASPS, I noted that there has been an update to an Advisory Circular referenced in the definition of the System Design Assurance (SDA) parameter. The correct version is AC 23.1309-1D. I also noted that this reference has already been updated in both current drafts of ICAO Doc 9861 (UAT) and Doc 9871 (1090ES).	Update three places in 2.2.3.2.7.2.4.6 with the reference to AC-23.1309-1D	WG-3/SG-1/WG-5 agrees	Implemented: Corr-DO-260B(1), Corr-ED-102A(1), Corr-DO-282B(1), draft DO-260B+(8), draft ED-102A+(8), draft DO-282B+(5)
10	Saffell	Doc-(2.2.3.2.7.2.6)	2 nd. Paragraph	H (almost NC)	RTCA/DO-260B section 2.2.3.2.7.2.6 requires that NIC Supplement-A be changed if an update has not been received in 2 seconds. Problem is that HIL data coming from an ARINC 743A GPS may not be updated for up to 1.2 seconds. This forces a change based on a sample of one. In order to allow appropriate debounce, the time should be changed to 2.6 seconds to be consistent with similar data change requirements in the SARPs and DOC. 9871.	Recommend that the minimum time to reflect a change in NIC Supplement-A be changed to 2.6 seconds. It should be noted that 14CFR §91.227 and AC 20-165 allow 12 seconds for changes in NIC.	WG-3/SG-1 agrees that this change cannot be considered in this Corrigendum, as it has requirements change implications. This issue will be retained for discussion during any future revision of these MOPS, including the transponder MOPS and ICAO Doc 9871.	Action Gary - create/update a listing of "open" issues to carry forward into the next versions of DO-260B/C

#	Commentor Last Name	Paragraph/Section	Line Table / Figure	Comment Level (NC, H, M, L, E)	Comment	Suggested resolution	RTCA/EUROCAE Disposition	Action
11	Saffell	Doc- (2.2.3.2.7.2.7)	2 nd. Paragraph	H (almost NC)	RTCA/DO-260B section 2.2.3.2.7.1.3.8 requires that NAC_P be changed if an update has not been received in 2 seconds. Problem is that HFOM data coming from an ARINC 743A GPS may not be updated for up to 1.2 seconds. This forces a change based on a sample of one. In order to allow appropriate debounce, the time should be changed to 2.6 seconds to be consistent with similar data change requirements in the SARPs and DOC. 9871.	Recommend that the minimum time to reflect a change in NAC_P be changed to 2.6 seconds.	WG-3/SG-1 agrees that this change cannot be considered in this Corrigendum, as it has requirements change implications. This issue will be retained for discussion during any future revision of these MOPS, including the transponder MOPS and ICAO Doc 9871.	Action Gary - create/update a listing of "open" issues to carry forward into the next versions of DO-260B/C
12	Saffell	Doc- 2.2.3.3.2.1.2.a 2.2.3.3.2.2.2.a and DO-181E 2.2.23.1.3.a		NC	The MOPS paragraphs referenced at left all indicate that the ADS-B Transmitting Subsystem (e.g., transponder) shall initialize on Power Up in a state in which no extended squitters are being transmitted. Each extended squitter message, and particularly the Aircraft Identification and Category Message, are started once appropriate data has been received to load at least one variable field of the message. For the Aircraft Identification and Category Message, this means that Flight ID, or Aircraft Registration Data must be received. These requirements have very purposely been harmonized into RTCA DO-260B, RTCA DO-181E, Eurocae ED-102A, Eurocae ED-73E, ICAO Annex 10, and ICAO DOC. 9871. The MOPS and SARPs have been established in a manner such that if the aircraft installation cannot provide valid flight identification or aircraft registry data, then the Aircraft Identification and Category Message shall not be transmitted. AC 20-165 clearly infers a different operation. As such, either AC 20-165 must be fixed or appropriate changes must be made in the MOPS and SARPs documents. AC 20-165 is contradictory to the existing MOPS in that it requires the Aircraft Identification and Category message to be started immediately with the possibility of old and stale data. Such would be the condition if the transponder has been removed from one aircraft and installed into another. The primary problem is that the MOPS and SARPs require that the message not be transmitted at all if there is no valid variable data. The AC forces startup with OLD data which is contradictory to the MOPS and SARPs.		WG-3/SG-1/WG-5 agrees this is not a issue with the MOPS documents, but rather that the AC could possibly be interpreted to be inconsistent with the SARPs and MOPS. FAA AIR-130 agrees to review the AC 20-165 paragraphs and make revisions in AC 20-165A, such that nowhere is it implied that the transponder needs to store old data and use it at start-up.	Action Walker: Update AC 20-165
13	Saffell	Doc- 2.4.4.4.2.2	Table 2-163	E	In Table 2-153, in the line for Pulse #2, the "delta pulse width column contains a value of "-3.5." This is incorrect and it should be a value of "+3.5" as appears also in Table 2-165 for Pulse #1.	Change the value from "-3.5" to "+3.5"	WG-3/SG-1 agrees that this is a typo and should be corrected	Implemented: Corr-DO-260B(1), Corr-ED-102A(1), draft DO-260B+(1), draft ED-102A+(1)
14	Honeywell Wilson	Corr-(1.7)		H	Since AC 20-165 now requires HAE to be used, section §2.2.3.2.6.1.15 needs to emphatically state that HAE is required by AC 20-165. A manufacturer should not be able to obtain TSO Authorization only to be denied an STC.	Add the following note to §2.2.3.2.6.1.15: "2. HAE will be required for some state mandates and the manufacturer must ensure that when converting from HAG (e.g., MSL) to HAE, the same model used by the position source is used".	WG-3/SG-1/WG-5 agree that this is a good clarification and can be added to the currently proposed note.	Implemented: Corr-DO-260B(2), Corr-ED-102A(2), draft DO-260B+(2), draft ED-102A+(2), Doc 9871(1)
15	Honeywell Wilson	Corr-(1.8)		L	In the first line of the proposed note, change the phrase "flag bit" to "source bit"	Change the phrase "flag bit" to "source bit"	WG-3/SG-1/WG-5 agreed to switch to "source bit"	Implemented: Corr-DO-260B(2), Corr-ED-102A(2), draft DO-260B+(2), draft ED-102A+(2), Doc 9871(1)

#	Commentor Last Name	Paragraph/Section	Line Table / Figure	Comment Level (NC, H, M, L, E)	Comment	Suggested resolution	RTCA/EUROCAE Disposition	Action
16	Potier	Corr-(1.29)		M	When reviewing Corrigendum Item 1.29 I have noticed that section §2.2.13.6.1 "Transmitting Diversity" requires each type of ADS-B message to be alternately transmitted from the top and bottom antennas. This is not exact. By default, on the ground, the surface ADS-B messages must be transmitted on the top antenna when installation has antenna diversity. This section is therefore misleading and is in conflict with DO181/ED73 paragraph §2.2.12.5.2 requirement and should be corrected. Note that the test procedure in §2.3.2.7.1 is only verifying transmission of airborne type message.	Add the following note just after the existing note in section §2.2.13.6.1: <i>Note 2: On systems implementing transmitting diversity, the use of the top antenna only is the default condition for broadcasting the surface type messages. The broadcast of the surface type messages is under control of the SAS command On Mode S transponder-based systems with antenna diversity .</i>	WG-3/SG-1/WG-5 agrees to implement the following: Add the following note just after the existing note in section §2.2.13.6.1: <i>Note 2: On systems implementing transmitting diversity, the use of the top antenna only is the default condition for broadcasting the surface type messages. The selection of the antenna when transmitting surface type messages may be under the control of other systems (see RTCA DO-181E / EUROCAE ED-73E).</i> Additionally, it was agreed that the sentence after the Note will be revised to be: "The Single Antenna Flag (SAF) is set as described in 2.2.3.2.7.2.4.5."	Implemented: Corr-DO-260B(1), Corr-ED-102A(1), draft DO-260B+(1), draft ED-102A+(1)
17	Runge	Corr-(1.32)	Table 2-112 Test #9	H	The Explosion Testing should be performed only if required. Sorry I missed that one earlier	Add "When Required," no tests to the remark column	WG-3/SG-1/WG-5 Agree. Modify Corrigendum item #1.32 to replace "NO TESTS" with "When Required"	Implemented: Corr-DO-260B(1), Corr-ED-102A(1), Corr-DO-282B(1), draft DO-260B+(1), draft ED-102A+(1), draft DO-282B+(1)
18	Runge	Corr-(1.32)	Table 2-112 Test #25	L	Electrostatic Discharge test a group should be assigned as well. Aim is to verify proper functionality after having passed the test which is done in general using group 2	Identify Group 2 for ESD testing	WG-3/SG-1/WG-5 agrees. Modify Corrigendum item #1.32 to specify Group #2 and in the remarks column, indicate "No Test during, 2 after"	Implemented: Corr-DO-260B(1), Corr-ED-102A(1), Corr-DO-282B(1), draft DO-260B+(1), draft ED-102A+(1), draft DO-282B+(1)
19	Runge	Corr-(1.32)	Table 2-112 Test #26	H	The Fire Test has been put into Group 2 with the comment 2 after but the test is linked only to the material used and no test case is linked to that section.	Test should be put to group 5 with the comment No Tests	WG-3/SG-1/WG-5 and Friedhelm all agree to leave the Remarks column as is in the Corrigendum which is the same as in DO-181E/ED-73E.	No Changes
20	Honeywell Wilson	Corr-(1.37)		E	In the existing Item "h." in the second line, it should state "f." (not "f.,")	In the Corrigendum, additionally strike through the comma after "f.,"	WG-3/SG-1/WG-5 agrees	Implemented: Corr-DO-260B(1), Corr-ED-102A(1), draft DO-260B+(1), draft ED-102A+(1)
21	Honeywell Wilson	Corr-(1.48)	Table 2-153	H	The Binary value in Item #2 in the table is still incorrect and should be coded to "0 1001 1011" (decimal 123.2)	see comment	WG-3/SG-1 agree with this and will change to "0 1001 1011"	Implemented: Corr-DO-260B(1), Corr-ED-102A(1), draft DO-260B+(1), draft ED-102A+(1)
22	Honeywell Wilson	Corr-(1.78)		H	Since AC 20-165 now requires HAE to be used, §A.1.4.5.6 needs to emphatically state that HAE is required by AC 20-165. A manufacturer should not be able to obtain TSO Authorization only to be denied an STC.	Add the following note to §A.1.4.5.6: "2. HAE will be required for some state mandates and the manufacturer must ensure that when converting from HAG (e.g., MSL) to HAE, the same model used by the position source is used".	WG-3/SG-1/WG-5 agree that this is a good clarification and can be added to the currently proposed note.	Implemented: Corr-DO-260B(2), Corr-ED-102A(2), draft DO-260B+(2), draft ED-102A+(2), Doc 9871(1)
23	Honeywell Wilson	Corr-(1.83)		L	In the first line of the proposed note, change the phrase "flag bit" to "source bit"	Change the phrase "flag bit" to "source bit"	WG-3/SG-1/WG-5 agrees	Implemented: Corr-DO-260B(2), Corr-ED-102A(2), draft DO-260B+(2), draft ED-102A+(2), Doc 9871(1)

#	Commentor Last Name	Paragraph/Section	Line Table / Figure	Comment Level (NC, H, M, L, E)	Comment	Suggested resolution	RTCA/EUROCAE Disposition	Action
24	Honeywell Wilson	Corr-(1.85)	Note	H	Shouldn't the assumption for GVA=3 be "invalid" rather than "45 meters" if the ADS-B Version is 2?	Change the note to indicate GVA =3 is an invalid entry for a Version 2 transmitter, and must be treated as "unknown", since GVA=2 already indicates < 45 meters.	WG-3/SG-1/WG-5 agree to modify the proposed response to replace the last sentence of the Note with: <i>"It is expected that ADS-B transmitting subsystems with ADS-B Version Numbers greater than 2 will define the GVA encoding of "3" as a value less than 45 meters at some point in the future. Therefore, ADS-B Version 2 receiving subsystems should treat the GVA encoding of "3" as < 45 meters for data received from ADS-B Version Numbers 2 or greater."</i> The also affects 2.2.3.2.7.2.8.	Implemented: Corr-DO-260B(2), Corr-ED-102A(2), Corr-DO-282B(1), draft DO-260B+(2), draft ED-102A+(2), draft DO-282B+(1), Doc 9861(1), Doc 9871(1)