

Tom Foster's report on his briefing to plenary:

Attached is the report of the ADS-B MASPS D0-242A AdHoc Working Group to the SC-186 Plenary on 8 February 2000. The feedback received from the Plenary is as follows:

1) They accepted the revised criteria for selection of MASPS change items to be considered for Revision A. Specifically, they accepted the criteria to limit new requirements to items needed to support surveillance for traffic separation assurance. We are not being advised to broaden the ADS-B MASPS requirements to include the wider "surveillance" definition that includes weather, FIS, etc. Therefore, we will not be addressing MET reporting, a/c data for wake vortex modeling, etc. in Revision A. The Plenary still needs to determine how non-ADS-B link requirements are to be managed. At the MOPS level, other requirements sources besides the ADS-B MASPS requirements need to be considered. It was suggested that other link services would require separate MOPS documents, however, coordination issues remain for shared messages and data. The related issue that we need to address in the ADS-B MASPS is to define requirements that assure that the ADS-B data delivery requirements are maintained, i.e. not compromised, when other link services are being supported.

2) They supported the proposal to change the MASPS integrity definition to NIC/NAC, however, this brought up the need to address the general issue of backward compatibility when changes can affect future interoperability with fielded systems.

3) They understood our proposals to expand and clarify the MASPS intent definitions and requirements. They accepted that additional detailed operational concepts and procedure definitions are needed to allow us to address the TCP requirements. This is also an area needing harmonization with European operational concepts. Since TCPs are not part of the near term application requirements, they accepted that we may defer the TCP updating to a future revision. We indicated that we would include caution notes to alert early implementors as to the maturity of the TCP requirements in Revision A.

4) Regarding ADS-B security, we were told to not address spoofing at this time. Spoofing is a high level policy issue that needs to be addressed and the Plenary does not want the WGs to address spoofing until there is specific direction provided. However, the security issue of anonymity is to be addressed.

5) Regarding our schedule for having a complete draft of Revision A to the ADS-B MASPS, the suggestion to align our schedule with the other MASPS/MOPS that are targeting for 12/2000 was accepted. We were told to not relax our work schedule due to this schedule change, as our scope of effort is still viewed to be large.

If others who attended the Plenary meeting have other comments, please bring them up at our meeting on 26-28 February.

Tom

(See attached file: 242A-WP-3-01 Plenary Brief.ppt)