

MASPS for ADS-B Rev. A

Tracking Information (committee secretary only)	
Change Issue Number	20
Submission Date	2/13/01
Status (open/closed/deferred)	CLOSED
Last Action Date	2/13/01

Short Title for Change Issue:	Ambiguity of Velocity Subtypes.
-------------------------------	---------------------------------

MASPS Document Reference:		Originator Information:	
Entire document (y/n)		Name	Chris Moody / Mitre/CAASD
Section number(s)		Phone	(703) 883-5506
Paragraph number(s)		E-mail	cmoody@mitre.org
Table/Figure number(s)		Other	

Proposed Rationale for Consideration (originator should check all that apply):	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Item needed to support of near-term MASPS/MOPS development
X	DO-260/ED-102 1090 MHz Link MOPS Rev A
<input type="checkbox"/>	ASA MASPS
<input type="checkbox"/>	TIS-B MASPS
X	UAT MOPS
<input type="checkbox"/>	Item needed to support applications that have well defined concept of operation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Has complete application description
<input type="checkbox"/>	Has initial validation via operational test/evaluation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Has supporting analysis, if candidate stressing application
<input type="checkbox"/>	Item needed for harmonization with international requirements
<input type="checkbox"/>	Item identified during recent ADS-B development activities and operational evaluations
<input type="checkbox"/>	MASPS clarifications and correction item
<input type="checkbox"/>	Validation/modification of questioned MASPS requirement item
<input type="checkbox"/>	Military use provision item
<input type="checkbox"/>	New requirement item (must be associated with traffic surveillance to support ASAS)

Nature of Issue:	<input type="checkbox"/> Editorial	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clarity	<input type="checkbox"/> Performance	<input type="checkbox"/> Functional
<p>Issue Description: The attached comments requesting clarification on the velocity subtypes were presented to the SC-186 plenary in reference to the ballot on the 1090 MHz ADS-B MOPS (DO-260). It was agreed that these issues would be deferred from consideration in DO-260 until they were first considered for inclusion in a future revision of the ADS-B MASPS. Included with the attached comment is the official response from working group 3, which was charted with development of DO-260.</p>				

<p><u>Originator's proposed resolution if any:</u> Proposed resolution is attached with comments from DO-260 ballot.</p>
--

<p>Working Group 6 Deliberations:</p> <p><u>January 24, 2001:</u> This Issue Paper was discussed by the ad hoc group at their January 2001 meeting. Since Working Group 3 eliminated the text these submitted comments referred to, it was agreed that these were no longer issues that needed addressing at the MASPS level. Therefore, <u>it was agreed to CLOSE this Issue Paper.</u></p>

**ADS-B 1090 MHz Rev A Comments Related to MASPS Changes
RTCA SC-186 WG-3/EUROCAE WG-51 SG-1**

#	Comment Author	DO-260 Section	Page	Comment / Rationale	Suggested Resolution
21	C.Moody (5)	2.2.5.1.19	128	<p>This paragraph describes the encoding of the Velocity Subtype. The implication is that the subtype information is handed to the ADS-B system from an external input. Instead should not the ADS-B installation have to determine the subtype appropriate for a given condition?</p> <p>Temporary resolution: This section was initially entitled “Subtype (Velocity) Data” and dealt with the ‘transmitting device accepting own vehicle Subtype information via an appropriate variable data input interface.’ This section was deleted as a result of discussions and the section relabeled “Unused.”</p> <p>WG#3 Position: <i>Items 21 & 22: No longer issues since related text was deleted.</i></p>	Problem fixed if recommendation for Item C.Moody (4) is adopted.
22	C.Moody (6)	2.4.3.2.6.1.2	343	<p>This paragraph describes verification of subtype field in the velocity message. Step 3 of this procedure implies that all one need to do to get a subtype 3 to happen is to “provide velocity information in the form of airspeed and heading...”. But from Table 2-17 it would seem it would also require the Unavailability of velocity over ground</p> <p>WG#3 Position: <i>Items 21 & 22: No longer issues since related text was deleted.</i></p>	Problem fixed if recommendation for Item C.Moody (4) is adopted.