

ASSAP MOPS Group Telecon Minutes #5

The attendees included the following:

| Last Name | First Name | Organization |
|-----------|-------------|------------------|
| Chamlou | Roxaneh | MITRE/CAASD |
| Conway | Sheila | NASA |
| Eich | Tom | ACSS |
| Manning | Robert | Pentagon/L-3 |
| Plummer | Steve | |
| Ramdeen | Steve | |
| Sleight | Randy | FAA/JHU APL |
| Swider | Christopher | FAA/AIR-130 |
| Thomas | Dave | FAA/L-3 TITAN |
| Wang | Ganghuai | MITRE/CAASD |
| Wichgers | Joel | Rockwell Collins |

The ASSAP MOPS group telecon, on 20 December 2006, started at 1 pm (Eastern Time). Roxaneh, chairman, started the meeting with reviewing the proposed agenda.

1. The proposed agenda was accepted with no changes (Reference ASSAP-WP09-01). The last group meeting minutes were accepted as is (Reference ASSAP-WP09-02).
2. The review of the ASSAP MOPS schedule and status was led by Roxaneh (Reference ASSAP-WP08-06, ASSAP-WP09-09):
 - a. The 1st draft of the ASSAP MOPS is scheduled to be completed by October 12, 2007.
3. The review of the ASSAP MOPS outline was led by Roxaneh (Reference ASSAP-WP09-08):
 - a. Roxaneh identified potential topics in each section of the outline.
 - b. The assumptions section should contain a write-up regarding which applications are met with DO-260 equipage (Reference Issue S6 – What are the risk/issues for requiring Do-260A vs. DO-260?). Don Walker is currently assigned to this issue and needs help to write this section.
 - c. The assumptions section should also address the implications of ADS-R being restricted to DO-260A re-broadcast according to the Critical Spec Draft.
 - d. The assumptions section should address implications of with multiple 1090ES traffic having the same ICAO address (Reference Issue SP1 – Is the ICAO address received via 1090 MHz unique?). Currently, no one has volunteered to investigate the safety risks regarding this issue and write this section in the MOPS.
 - e. The assumptions section should address database inputs such as surface maps lying outside ASSAP MOPS scope (Reference Issue S5 – Should database inputs such as surface maps be defined in ASSAP?). - Don
 - f. The assumptions section should address general deviations from the ASA MASPS.

1. Joel will write a section regarding NIC/NAC/SIL threshold values for the initial 5 ASA applications (Reference Issue AP5 – Provide some preliminary NIC/NAC/SIL threshold values for the initial 5 ASA applications based on Joel's proposed alternative 3 of issue AP3).
2. Don will write a section regarding velocity limitations for surface traffic (Reference Issues AP6 and AP7).
3. The assumptions section should address or clarify that NAC does not have to be extrapolated.
 - g. Volunteers are still needed to write portions of the assumptions section.
 - h. Randy (APL) provided some status on the performance requirements section. He plans to have a section regarding ASSAP latency requirements. Randy is also investigating filtering requirements for tracking up to 170 targets based on their closure rates. Randy will provide an updated presentation at the next meeting regarding these issues.
 - i. Roxaneh asked Randy and Larry from APL to investigate the need for a probability metric to bound ADS-B track to TIS-B track correlation mismatch. Tom Eich mentioned that Ken Carpenter has a paper that was reviewed during meeting #1 that may contain some of this information.
 - j. Tom Eich (ACSS) will investigate any interface issues for supporting Sethu's presentations (Reference ASSAP-WP09-04, ASSAP-WP09-05).
 - k. ACSS will write the I/O section which includes traffic quality and degradation information to the CDTI.
 - l. Track selection requirements for applications may better belong in each of the specific application sections.
 - m. Action Item #63 response from ACSS:
 1. ACSS will write the following requirements in the Applications Processing section: a) Traffic Priority b) Minimum number of traffic sent to the CDTI.
 - n. ASA MASPS has a requirement for the determination of the Track Relative Horizontal Position (R3.190). The question was raised regarding the need for a similar requirement for the relative vertical position. Joel provided the following justification for no such requirement: the intent of R3.190 was to provide for traffic display that is based on horizontal range rather than slant range.
4. Telecon ended at 2:30PM.