

#	Commentor Last Name	Paragraph/Section	Line Table / Figure	Comment Level (NC, H, M, L, E)	Comment	Suggested Resolution	Working Group Disposition	Action
1	Strain	General		E	Standardize throughout on: 1) either GPS or GNSS 2) Upper case ADS-B Message and ADS-B Report		WG6 agrees to use "GNSS" and upper case where appropriate. Cannot change GPS Antenna Offset to GNSS.	Done
2	Miller	General		E	The terms Conflict Detection, Airborne Conflict Management, Flight Path Deconfliction Planning, Cooperative Separation and Station Keeping are obsolete.	Delete Conflict Detection and ACM. Replace Flight Path Deconfliction Planning with Delegated Separation / Self Separation. Replace Station Keeping with Spacing. Cooperative Separation should be replaced with "Delegated Separation"	WG6 agreed	Action Gary to go through and implement
3	Duke	title		E	I am fine with ASA, but it seems to miss the mark when describing the system of broadcast, receive, process and user I/O.	MASPS for Ground and Airborne Surveillance Applications (GASA) MASPS for ADS-B Traffic Surveillance Applications (ATSA) [it's been used before, but it is inclusive of what the MASPS is] MASPS for ADS-B Traffic Surveillance Systems (ATSS) [gets to more than just applications] MASPS for ADS-B Traffic Surveillance Systems and Applications (ATSSA) MASPS for Geo Referenced Air Traffic Surveillance (GRATS). MASPS for Geo Reference Aircraft Surveillance Informed Application Systems (GRASIAS) :-)	At the beginning of the meeting, WG6 expressed a preference for GRATS or ATSS. However, the ultimate winner was ATSSA.	And the winner is ATSSA
4	Strain	1.1		E	In paragraphs for chapters 2, 3 & 4, either refer to this document consistently as either "performance standards" or "performance requirements"		WG6 agrees that when referring to the entire document then it is "performance standards" and under that structure it is a "performance requirements"	Done
5	Duke	1.1	1	E	sub-system is used here and subsystem is used for most of the rest of the document.	look for all "sub-system" and change to subsystem	WG6 agrees to use subsystem	Done
6	Strain	1.2.2		L	1) I don't believe assumption C is valid, especially based on ALPA's statement in this regard in the ADS-B In ARC; 2) Assumptions C and F are contradictory	1) Change assumption C to say spacing instead of separation; 2) Assumption F remains valid with the change above	WG6 agreed to switch "C" and "F" and put qualifiers.	Done
7	Duke	1.2.3	4	M	"These reports are available for use by applications external to the ADS B[sic] system." implies that ASSAP is outside of the ADS-B system.	These reports are available for use by applications hosted within the ASSAP and to systems external to the ASA system.	WG6 agrees to change the last sentence under Figure 1-1 as "These reports are available for use by the ASSAP and CDTI subsystems."	Done
8	Duke	1.2.3	4	M	seems awfully early to introduce classes of systems. Is this necessary for the reader to have a grasps of these details to understand the system at this high level?	remove this paragraph	WG6 agreed to move this section and give it a separate heading as 1.2.3.4	Done
9	Duke	1.2.3.2	5	M	the title seems to be for the entire ASA Receive Participant Subsystem (D-->G, and A3-->G), but the text only describes the inputs D and, confusingly, A3 which is drawn inside of the subsystem.	make this language into an "inputs" paragraph and add language that describes all of the ASA Receive Participant subsystems at the highest level.	WG6 agreed to create a new intro sentence as "This section will describe the subsystem from Interface "D" and "A3" to Interface "G" in Figure 1-1."	Done

#	Commentor Last Name	Paragraph/Section	Line Table / Figure	Comment Level (NC, H, M, L, E)	Comment	Suggested Resolution	Working Group Disposition	Action
10	Strain	1.2.3.2.1		L	This section title and corresponding figure label should be simplified to simply the "ADS-B Receive Subsystem" to align with 3.4.3. Furthermore, this subsystem also receives (FIS-B messages containing TIS-B Service Status).	1) Replace this paragraph with the proposed first paragraph for section 3.4.3.7 in Working Paper, WG6-WP25-04R3-ADS-R_TIS-B_MASPS_Rqmts.doc. 2) modify figure 1-1 to match or state in this section that the subsystem will be referred to as simply the ADS-B Receive Subsystem.	WG6 agreed and replaced the paragraph and edited it.	Done
11	Duke	1.2.3.2.2	5	H	"ASSAP is the processing subsystem that accepts surveillance reports, performs any necessary correlation and/or tracking, and performs application-specific separation assurance processing." ASSAP only does this? Are there any situational awareness application processing? My concern is that it looks like "separation assurance processing" is the only kind of processing ASSAP does.	make this higher level, such as "...performs application specific processing."	WG6 agreed	Done
12	Duke	1.2.3.2.2	5	M	"Surveillance reports, tracks, and any application-specific alerts or guidance are output by ASSAP to the CDTI function." is CDTI a subsystem, or a function? We need to be consistent with our terms. I think it is a sub-system, but I am sure that there are other ways to think of it.	change "function" to "subsystem"	WG6 agreed to consistently use the word "subsystem"	Done
13	Duke	1.2.3.2.3	5	M	"Display" is not the only function of the CDTI subsystem. The first sentence of the first paragraph jumps right out and narrows the reader's thought to "display."	remove the first sentence of the paragraph.	WG6 agreed	Done
14	Duke	1.2.3.3.1	6	L	Multilat in asde-x isn't "recently developed" anymore.	remove the "recently developed" adjective	WG6 agreed	Done
15	Duke	1.2.3.3.1	6	M	multilateration can (and will) provide TIS-B position and velocity information.	work a reference into the section for WAM and other multilat (ASDE-X in terminal) sources for TIS-B	WG6 agreed and restructured the sentence	Done
16	Duke	1.2.3.3.2	6	M	ADS-R services are not unique to 1090 and UAT. They could also be used for VDL4 and another link (presumably 1090). (see MOPS 1.5.1.9 and appendix G)	uplevel ADS-R and make the UAT/1090 an example implementation	WG6 believes that there would not be any usage of VDL4 and ADS-R function.	Done
17	Duke	1.2.3.3.3	6	M	is this the correct term for the ADS-B Radio Stations? Is it a "sensor?" it seems more like a receiver.	change "Surveillance Sensor" to "Radio Station" or "Ground Radio Station"	WG6 agreed and restructured the sentence	Done
18	Duke	1.2.4	6	E	there is no "-" in Traffic Alert and Collision Avoidance System.	remove the errant "-"	WG6 agreed	Done
19	Duke	1.3	8	H	delegated spacing and delegated separation seem to be comingled. See paragraph 1 and paragraph 4 of this section.	The term de jure for this step beyond spacing (FIM-S) seems to be "defined interval." this step is very small, and really is only the different "airborne separation" NOT the transfer of separation to the flight crew for the designated pairing. The group needs to discuss if we are bound by the ARC recommended direction, or if delegated separation is still the long-term end state. In any case, FIM-spacing is "delegated spacing" in that the interval is specified by the controller--"given spacing."	WG6 discovered that the term "delegated spacing at the end of the first paragraph should have been "delegated separation."	Done
20	Duke	1.3.1	9	M	EVAcq and AIRB don't seem to fit the "enhanced situational awareness" category defined in 1.3. (no cueing as a minimum).	The AIRB application	WG6 agreed	Done

#	Commentor Last Name	Paragraph/Section	Line Table / Figure	Comment Level (NC, H, M, L, E)	Comment	Suggested Resolution	Working Group Disposition	Action
21	Duke	1.3	9	E	Enhanced Situational Awareness should be a new paragraph. There is a period missing before "Enhanced."	edit	WG6 agreed	Done
22	Miller	1.4	2nd para	E	The sentence starting with "It should be noted ..." is a duplicate of the same sentence in the first paragraph.	Delete the sentence in the second paragraph.	WG6 agreed	Done
23	Strain	2.1.1.2		L	What is meant by "translated?" Do we mean from messages to a report?	Clarify wording	WG6 agreed and restructured the sentence	Done
24	Miller	2.2.1	Table 2-5	L	Table 2-5 does not include the interaction or relationship between ownship and target aircraft for the ADS-B In applications. The choices are: Receive data only (SA Apps) / Selected (eg AIRB) / Designated (eg VSA) / Coupled (eg FIM-S or FIM-DS).	Add row at bottom of Table 2-5 titled "Ownship Interaction with Target Aircraft"	WG6 agreed	Done
25	Miller	2.2.1	Table 2-7	L	The SIL value for TIS-B service has been updated	Add "and SIL" to Note 4.	WG6 agreed	Done
26	Miller	2.2.1	Table 2-7	L	The SIL value for TIS-B service has been updated	Change SIL value from 0 to 2 and add reference to Note 4.	WG6 agreed	Done
27	Strain	2.2.1.1		L	References to FAA program documents (i.e., AIWP and ITP Policy Memo) are inappropriate. Furthermore, the term delegated separation has been changed to defined interval.	Remove references to FAA program documents and update terminology.	WG6 agreed to move the general reference to AIWP to section 1. and delete the reference to ITP Policy Memo	Done
28	Strain	2.2.1.1.1		L	The operational description (or lack thereof) in this section isn't parallel in structure to the other peer sections.	Rewrite in a use-case/scenario form similar to 2.2.1.1.3		Action to Jim Duke and Dean Miller to review 2.2.1.1.1 and decide to add to this section, or delete from others
29	Strain	2.2.1.2		E	Section titles inconsistent, not aligned with FAA application and too long	Change section and subsection titles to be consistent with one another and the FAA ATS application "Separation Services."	WG6 agreed	Done
30	Miller	2.2.1.2	1sr para	M	Need to resolve issue with content in Section 3.1.4.1 vs content in this Section.	Resolve the noted issue	No change	Done
31	Pagano	3.1.1.1.1		L	Sentence describing On-condition reports uses TC reports as example but these are no longer intended to be supported	Delete sentence "Types of OC reports may include Trajectory Change+0 ..." and move next sentence into this subsection.	WG6 agreed	Done
32	Pagano	3.1.1.1.2	Figure 3-3	E	Change bubble "Modular and Transmitter" to "Modulator and Transmitter"	Change bubble "Modular and Transmitter" to "Modulator and Transmitter"	WG6 agreed	Done
33	Pagano	3.1.1.3.1		M	Application example is not appropriate for A2 eqt class	Change sentence "Class A2: Supports all class A1 functionality and additionally provides extended range to 40 NM and information processing to support longer range applications, e.g. oceanic climb to co-altitude." to "Class A2: Supports all class A1 functionality and additionally provides additional range to 40 NM and information processing to support longer range applications, e.g. Delegated Separation FIM-DS."	WG6 agreed	Done

#	Commentor Last Name	Paragraph/Section	Line Table / Figure	Comment Level (NC, H, M, L, E)	Comment	Suggested Resolution	Working Group Disposition	Action
34	Pagano	3.1.1.3.1		M	Application example is not appropriate for A3 eqt class	Change sentence "Class A3: Supports all class A2 functionality and has additional range capability out to 90 NM, supporting, e.g., long range airborne applications." to "Class A3: Supports all class A2 functionality and has additional range capability out to 90 NM, to support extended range applications, e.g., Delegated Separation in Oceanic/ Low Density EnRoute."	WG6 agreed	Done
35	Elliott	3.1.2.1	Figure 3-7	E	This figure is derived from Figure 2-1 in 317A, same content but our document but cleaned up a bit.	Just a question, are going to share our figures with WG-4?	WG6 agreed to leave Figure 3-7 as is because the latest draft of DO-317A is not standardized.	Done
36	Pagano	3.1.4.3		H	This section on TIS-B and ADS-R has too much detail for a MASPS	Edit material to include high level requirements only. The link specific message structures should not be included in the MASPS	During the meeting, Tom reviewed 3.1.4.2 and 3.1.4.3 and produced a cut-down version of both, which was accepted by WG6.	Action Gary to implement revised 3.1.4.2 and 3.1.4.3.
37	Miller	3.1.4.3.1.2.6		M	The latency requirements for TIS-B in this section are also captured in Section 3.3.1.5	If the latency requirements for TIS-B are to remain in both Sections, then add "from interface A2 to interface D" so that both sections have the same basis of measurement.		Action Dean and Gary to move the latency into section 3.3.1.5
38	Pagano	3.1.4.3.2.2.2		H	Sentences providing nominal message transmission rates do not seem consistent with subsequent sections update interval requirements	Delete these sentences - 2 sentences beginning with "The nominal transmission rate..."		Action Tom to review 3.1.4.3 and suggest what should be retained in this section
39	Miller	3.1.4.3.2.2.6		M	The latency requirements for ADS-R in this section are not included in Section 3.3.1. "Latency"	If the latency requirements for ADS-R are to stay in this section, then add "from interface A2 to interface D" so that all sections that refer to the ground segment have the same basis of measurement.		Action Dean and Gary to move the latency into section 3.3.1.6
40	Pagano	3.2.2.3		E	Incorrect section references	In first sentence, change "(§3.5.4 and §3.5.4.5" to "(§3.5.1.4 and §3.5.1.4.5"	WG6 agreed	Done
41	Pagano	3.2.3		E	Incorrect section references	In first sentence, change "(§3.5.4 and §3.5.4.6" to "(§3.5.1.4 and §3.5.1.4.6"	WG6 agreed	Done
42	Pagano	3.2.4.1		M	Position reference point text needs to be updated to reflect change in reporting.		WG6 agreed. Action Gary to take the supplement file and integrate the changes.	Done
43	Pagano	3.2.9.5		L	SDA is included under the OM section but it is not OM data, even though 1090ES transmits it in the OM field in Operational Status Messages.	Take SDA section 3.2.9.5 and elevate it one section under Mode Status		Action Gary to look at this and try to move the SDA section
44	Pagano	3.2.10 & 3.2.11		M	Recommend addition of a Note for Table 3.2.10a and a similar Note 5 in section 3.2.11 to indicate that previous versions of ADS-B included vertical accuracy and integrity in higher	Add Note indicating that versions 1 and 2 included vertical limits as well as horizontal for values and refer to previous ADS-B MASPS versions.		Action Tom and Gary to craft a note for each of these sections
45	Miller	3.3.1	General	M	The coverage of latency requirements of each type in this section is almost complete but is not 100%. Refer to attached revision to Figure 1-1.	Working Group 6 to decide whether the current coverage of latency requirements is adequate or whether the missing types need to be added.	WG6 determined that the set of requirements were complete	Done

#	Commentor Last Name	Paragraph/Section	Line Table / Figure	Comment Level (NC, H, M, L, E)	Comment	Suggested Resolution	Working Group Disposition	Action
46	Pagano	3.3.1.1		H	The sentences "Total Latency is the sum of Compensated Latency and Latency Compensation Error and is expressed as a single upper value. The related position error is the product of Total Latency and acceleration uncertainty valid for the duration of the Total Latency." doesn't seem correct.	Change sentences to "Total Latency is the sum of Compensated Latency and Latency Compensation Error and is expressed as a single upper value. Position error attributed to latency is due to the latency compensation error as defined below. "	WG6 agreed that there was a problem with the definition and a change was made. This change will be relayed to WG 4 as the definition in DO-317A is also wrong.	Done
47	Miller	3.3.1.3		M	A reference is made to Appendix L of DO-242A	Delete reference to Appendix L of DO-242A and add reference to Appendix F of DO-3xx which contains the updated information..	WG6 agreed	Done
48	Miller	3.3.1.5	Title	E	The title should reflect which type of latency requirement is being applied to be consistent with other 3.3.1 sections.	Change title to "TIS-B Subsystem Total Latency Allocation"	WG6 agreed	Done
49	Miller	3.3.1.6	General	H	In this section the LCE requirements are stated on 95% basis. In DO-317A they are stated on NTE basis.	Change all LCE requirements in this section to NTE basis to be consistent with DO-317A.	WG6 agreed to remove the references to 95% probability	Done
50	Miller	3.3.1.6	6th para	M	The requirement in this section is stated as a LCE requirement whereas in DO-317A Table 2-2 it is stated as a total latency requirement.	Resolve the inconsistency	WG6 agreed to take the LCE and move it to the total latency section	Done
51	Pagano	3.3.1.6		M	The rqt for ADS-R latency as stated in section as "The latency compensation error of retransmitted geometric position data by the ADS-R ground subsystem (interfaces B2 to D in Figure 1-1) shall (R3.xxx) be no greater than 0.1 seconds (at 95% probability)." does not correctly state the rqt.	Change sentence to "The additional contribution to latency compensation error for retransmitted geometric position data by the ADS-R ground subsystem (interfaces B2 to D in Figure 1-1) shall (R3.xxx) be no greater than 0.1 seconds (at 95% probability)."	WG6 requested a review of the SBS Critical Services Spec and agreed to implement the suggested change as a result.	Done
52	Elliott	3.4.1.1		E	Change Target Status for TCAS to Alert Status		WG6 agreed to make the change to TCAS Alert Status	Done
53	Elliott	3.4.1.3	Table 3.4.1.3	H	Missing input interfaces for integrity for surf	Add SIL for traffic and integrity region & level for ownship	WG6 agreed	Done
54	Elliott	3.4.1.3	Table 3.4.1.3	E	Change Target Status for TCAS to Alert Status	See comment	WG6 agreed to make the change to TCAS Alert Status	Done
55	Elliott	3.4.1.3	Table 3.4.1.3	M	Combine 2 rows, Altitude Rate "OR" Vertical Sense	See comment	WG6 agreed	Done
56	Elliott	3.4.1.3	Table 3.4.1.3	E	Remove True/Magenta Heading Reference from the ID/Status information for ADS-B / ADS-R / TIS-B sources.	Not a requirement in 317a	WG6 disagreed with removing this as a requirement and declared that this is an issue with DO-317A	Done
57	Elliott	3.4.1.3		L	Text is unclear, says "ASSAP shall (R3.xxx) provide input interface method for validation status information (e.g., validity bit, or value of zero) for each required information element input to the ASSAP from the ADS-B / ADS-R / TIS-B receiver."	Change to "ASSAP shall (R3.xxx) provide a method for validation of input interface information (e.g., validity bit, or value of zero) for each required information element input to the ASSAP from the ADS-B / ADS-R / TIS-B receiver."	WG6 agreed that the paragraph should be removed from 3.4.1.3 and moved to an ADS-B receive subsystem requirement in 3.4.3.7.	Done
58	Pagano	3.4.3.2	Table 3.4.3.2a	E	Note 7 has incorrect section references	Change Note 7 last sentence from "See §3.5.4.1, §3.5.8.5, and §3.5.8.6 for details.)" to "See §3.5.1.4.1 for details)."	WG6 agreed	Done
59	Pagano	3.5.1.4.10		E	Incorrect section reference	Change "3.3.9.6" to "3.2.9.6"	WG6 agreed	Done
60	Strain	3.5.2.1		M	This section has some dated information and redundant information with earlier sections that introduce TIS-B and thus, should be reworked and made to be parallel to the following section on ADS- messages and reports.	1) Collapse section headings 3.5.2.1 and 3.5.2.2 into 3.5.2 2) 1st par 3.5.2.1, replace this paragraph with the first paragraph in 3.5.3 and replace ADS-R with TIS-B in the sentence 3) 2nd-4th par 3.5.2.1, delete these paragraphs (this infor is provided earlier in doc or no longer correct) 4) 3rd par 3.5.2.2, delete entire paragraph (not a desired action)	WG6 agreed and made extensive modifications to 3.5.2 and 3.5.3.	Done

#	Commentor Last Name	Paragraph/Section	Line Table / Figure	Comment Level (NC, H, M, L, E)	Comment	Suggested Resolution	Working Group Disposition	Action
61	Strain	3.5.3		M	This section has some dated information and redundant information with earlier sections that introduct TIS-B and thus, should be reworked and made to be parallel to the following section on ADS- messages and reports.	1) 2nd par 3.5.3, delete entire paragraph (More descriptive of the ADS-R service than the processing of messages and reports) 2) 3rd Par 3.5.3, delete entire paragraph (redundant with first paragraph) 3) Add sentence, ADS-R messages are received and processed into reports in the same manner as ADS-B messages.	WG6 agreed and made extensive modifications to 3.5.2 and 3.5.3.	Done
62	Elliott		Table 3.6.4	E	TCAS Traffic Status is call Alert Status in 317A		WG6 agreed to make the change to TCAS Alert Status	Done
63	Elliott		Table 3.6.4	M	The ASSAP requirements section has an input interface of Altitude Rate or Vertical Sense	Make same?	WG6 agreed to add "or Vertical Sense"	Done
64	Elliott		Table 3.6.4	M	The ASSAP requirements section does not require TCAS Report Time	Add to ASSAP section?	WG6 agreed to add a new Note and point to it for TCAS Report Time	Done
65	Elliott	Appendix A		E	Many terms such as A/S, CAZ, CDZ, AGC, AIC are defined but never used in the document	Remove unused terms		
66	Elliott	3.4.1.4.1		E	Table reference is wrong. The ASSAP tracking function shall (289R3.178) terminate a track when the maximum coast interval or data age (see FRAC draft DO-317A, Table 2-2) has been exceeded for all of the applications for which the track is potentially being used.	Change to table 2-4	WG6 agreed	Done
67	Strain	3.4.3.1	3.4.3.1a	M	The notes to this table should not contain requirements	Create separate requirements statemens for each item in the notes.	WG6 agreed and revised the Notes into requirements	Done
68	Strain	3.4.3.3.1.1		E	Indirect reference to "the table" in requirement 242AR3.12. I assume this is referencing table 3.4.3.3.1.1a, but it is not clear	Be explicit about which table.	WG6 agreed	Done
69	Strain	3.4.3.3.1.1	3.4.3.3.1.1a	M	1) The notes to this table 1) define error terms, though there are none in the table; 2) there are 9 notes, though the table only references notes 4, 5 and 11; 3) Note 1 references "lower" and "higher" numbers, though the table doesn't reference this note and it is not apparent which numbers are being referenced.	Clean up the notes to only those germane to the table.	WG6 agreed	Done