

Notes from WG4 Salem Oregon meeting – March 10-12, 2003

### Section 2.1

Steve had not made any changes yet to section 2.1. He does plan to incorporate my comments.

May need to import Jim's drawings as GIF files to prevent problems with spacing in Visio text (like in 2.1 drawing 2.7)

### Section 2.2

Add PO-ASAS category names to Chapter 2.

Refer to PO-ASAS application names, too?

### Section 2.3

Application Category will need to reflect downgrades due to flight crew training (or lack thereof) or equipment failure. Also needs to notify crew of own plane of downgrade to equipment due to failure.

**Tom Foster suggested asking WG1 to confirm these two suggestions. Gene Wong added that ATC should be consulted.**

Note that various factors were considered when creating categories, such as class of user, requirements groupings, etc.

Remove question about application category version number. Should be broadcast to indicate which version of the MASPS or MOPS that the equipment supports. **Need a requirement that a version number be broadcast so receiving aircraft can tell which version number of the MASPS/MOPS that this supports. This action needs to be taken by Stu in section 3.2.**

Add sentence to 2.3.2.2 (basic applications) indicating that ONLY the basic category has any optional applications. All applications are required in other applications.

March 13, 2003

Continue review of section 2.4.

2.4.5 requirements for crew interface. Jonathan asked for more help with this section. Sheila asked if there should be a requirement that the CDTI be in the primary field of view. Tom Foster felt that it could still be useful even if not in the primary field for some applications. He suggested that if it is integrated, it should be compatible with other uses of the display. Sheila suggested using language as in advisory circular AC 25-11. The group decided that visual alerts *should* be located in the primary field of view. CDTI display location *should* be consistent with requirements of DO-257a, DO-259, AC 25-11, AC... etc.

Bill Kalvardos took an action to look through AC 25-11 for requirements that may be applicable.

Bill will also provide a reference or definition of primary field of view.

After more discussion, the group agreed that the necessity of placement depends on the applications used, and a table was generated by application category. CDTI must be located in the primary field of view for the intermediate and advance application categories, as well as CD in basic. It is desired for other basic applications.

Sheila and Bill agreed to write up some general “motherhood” requirements for this section based on the references.

2.4.6 external systems assumptions. Jonathan also asked for help with this section. Jonathan will work on introductory text. Jim Maynard is tasked to write section 3.4, which this section refers to.

Chapter 4, if included, my just repeat all the requirements and include something about how you might test them.

2.4.7 data quality requirements. Jonathan will move table 2-4 before the definitions of the terms used in that table.

In discussing the definitions, Bill suggested that there are standard FAA definitions for some of these terms, and they should be used if possible. It was noted that the “definitions” used in 2.4.7.1 are more descriptions than definitions.

There was some discussion about adding a more general definition for terms prior to the more specific definitions of terms used in the table. This was followed by hours of discussion about the individual definitions. The results of these discussions are contained in the revised draft text.

2.4.8 ASA System/subsystem integrity, continuity, availability requirements. Jonathan plans to move this section elsewhere in the document. Nevertheless, the group reviewed the contents of the section.

May meeting – Full week before Memorial Day in Seattle (at FAA office).