

Summary of SC-186 Leadership Teleconference November 2, 2010

Participants:

Rocky Stone	Dean Miller
Jonathan Hammer	Diana Castaldo
George Ligler	Rob Strain
Jim Duke	Brian Townsend
Peter Moertl	Bob Semar
Gary Furr	Don Walker
Tom Pagano	Sethu Rathinam

The Teleconference and WebEx Session got under way shortly after 3:30pm EDT on Tuesday, 2 November 2010. Diana Castaldo indicated that she was waiting for Vinny Capezzuto to return from another meeting, but was not sure whether, or when, he would join the Teleconference. Gary Furr indicated that Stuart Searight had previously indicated that he would not be able to join the Teleconference until approximately 4:00pm because of another meeting. Gary agreed to perform the duties of Secretary for this Teleconference until Stuart came onto the call. After a brief roll call, Gary Furr indicated that there were two items for the Leadership to discuss: **(1)** Changes in SC-186 Personnel, and **(2)** un-resolved issues from the presentation of Working Group 6 regarding the MASPS which was cut short during the 24 September 2010 SC-186/WG-51 Plenary because of the closing of the facility in Amsterdam. Rocky Stone then offered Jonathan Hammer the opportunity to address the Leadership.

1. Personnel Changes in SC-186 – Jonathan Hammer

Jonathan Hammer indicated that he has been assigned a new position within Mitre, the duties of which will require that he resign from the position of Secretary of SC-186. Jonathan indicates that with discussions between himself, Rocky and Vinny, that the position of Secretary has been offered to Stuart Searight and he has accepted. Rocky Stone indicated that the Secretary position was identified in the Special Committee Terms of Reference and asked if this was a change that would have to be approved by the RTCA Program Management Committee. George Ligler responded that it was not. George added that he did feel that the announcement of the resignation of Jonathan and the appointment of Stuart should be discussed during the 25 February 2011 Plenary and approved by the SC-186 Membership.

Jonathan also announced that because of his changes in work at Mitre, he would also step down as Co-Chair of Working Group 6. Jonathan has suggested that Rob Strain, also of Mitre, be approved to replace him, and Jonathan spoke of the many years of experience that Rob has with ADS-B in general. It was also later noted that Rob has unique experience with the Critical and Essential Ground Station Specifications currently being implemented by ITT and that he has detailed knowledge of the TIS-B functions as they are implemented in the NAS by ITT. The SC-186 Leadership approved of the appointment of Rob Strain as Co-Chair of WG-6.

2. Un-resolved Issues from the Working Group 6 Plenary Presentation – Dean Miller

The next order of business was for Dean Miller to begin discussions on the issues that Working Group 6 had originally put before the SC-186/WG-51 Plenary Session on 24 September 2010, which was split between Amsterdam and Washington. The presentation of WG-6 was cut short because of the time issues, and the fact that the membership in Amsterdam were being asked to leave their facility as it approached 6:00pm in Amsterdam.

With the original WG-6 Plenary presentation displayed via WebEx, Dean Miller began by saying that it was not the intention of WG-6 to take over any of the functions of other Working Groups as they specify requirements for ADS-B Applications. WG-6 wants to work closely with and coordinate with other Working Groups to help ADS-B meet the requirements of the future.

- 2A. The first questions put to the Plenary, and now to the SC-186 Leadership, was the issue of including in the combined MASPS references to the requirements of NRA, RAD, APT and/or GIM. George Ligler asked the group to clarify who would be maintaining the ICD for the TIS-B function which is under creation by ITT. Sethu responded that it was his understanding that the SBS Program Office would be the keeper of the ICD and would be responsible for its maintenance and revisions.

Dean indicated that this was a departure from the initial question related to NRA, RAD, APT and GIM, and the discussion returned to whether or not these Applications should be referenced in the combined MASPS.

After discussion, **the Leadership agreed** that the combined MASPS would include a table summary of key requirements for NRA, RAD and APT. It is not clear at this time whether any requirements will be clearly defined for GIM in sufficient time for them to be included in the combined MASPS. **The Leadership agreed** that there would be further discussion on whether to include GIM during future Plenary Sessions.

- 2B. As Dean continued through the discussion of the table of contents of the combined MASPS, the next question was whether a section should be included for Conflict Detection (CD). It was pointed out that the definition of Conflict Detection as it appears in DO-289 probably will not be matured further and that the SBS Program Office is sponsoring the definition of a different application. **The Leadership agreed** that the details of the Conflict Detection application would not appear in the combined MASPS, but after a short discussion, **it was agreed by the Leadership** that there would be a minor reference made to CD as it appears in DO-289.

- 2C. The next question to be discussed was the FAROA Application. Dean pointed out that FAROA only requires a runway database, whereas the ATSA SURF Application required a full airport map database. Peter Moertl indicated that during the final review and comment resolution period prior to ATSA SURF being approved for publication, it was agreed that provisions would be made for the application to have both a full airport and runway only database. **It was agreed by the Leadership** that WG-6 should look at these

applications and include the application description, perhaps as a combination of multiple applications.

- 2D.** Dean continued with a discussion on the question of whether to include the SURF-IA Application. Dean acknowledged that there are currently known problems that have been identified during the trials of SURF-IA. Don Walker indicated that he does not want the current SURF-IA requirements to be reflected in the combined MASPS. Don believes that the application definition needs to be refined before it should be considered. **It was agreed by the Leadership** that the current definition of SURF-IA would not be included in the combined MASPS, but that it would be retained for a possible future revision of the document.
- 2E.** The next question in the presentation related to the GIM Application. This had been briefly discussed earlier and **it was agreed by the Leadership** that there is currently not enough known on the GIM Application to say that it should or should not be included in the combined MASPS. Dean requested that Peter Moertl provide someone to give a briefing to Working Group 6 on the GIM Application and **it was agreed by the Leadership** that there would be further discussion on this at future Plenary Sessions.
- 2F.** The final question covered by Dean during the briefing dealt with the inclusion of TIS-B and ADS-R requirements in the combined MASPS. Dean indicated that during previous WG-6 meetings, it was agreed that the current TIS-B MASPS was seriously out of touch with the current reality of what is being implemented by ITT. Further, Dean indicated that there have never been any system level requirements defined for the ADS-R function, which was basically invented during the creation of the Critical and Essential Specifications.

Rocky Stone expressed his agreement that these TIS-B and ADS-R requirements should be incorporated into the combined MASPS.

Don Walker disagreed that TIS-B should be included and indicated that he thinks that TIS-B will never be anything different than what it is today in the ITT NAS implementation. Don further indicates that the ITT implementation is very complicated and that it would take a lot of work on the part of WG-6 to define and integrate these requirements for very little future benefit during the early equipage phase of ADS-B until full equipage in 2020.

George Ligler commented that the ARC has in fact suggested that integrity parameter be inserted into the TIS-B formats in support of applications being able to use TIS-B data.

It was finally agreed by the Leadership that TIS-B and ADS-R requirements should be included in the combined MASPS, as long as the scope is well defined and the task does not take the Working Group too long to implement.