

## Field Review Comment Metric

<b>Originating Office:</b> AIR-130	<b>Document Description: TSO-C59b</b> Airborne Selective Calling (SELCAL) Equipment	<b>Project Lead/Reviewer</b> David W. Robinson	<b>Reviewing Office:</b> ANM-100S	<b>Date of Review:</b> 4/15/2016
---------------------------------------	--	---	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

	Commenter	Section # and Page #	Comment	Suggested Change and Rationale	Disposition
1.	Ray Mei ANM-130S	Section 3.b.(2), page 2	“(HF) communication is the primary service operation, with a second high frequency (HF) radio ...” No need for ( ) and high frequency.	Delete ( ) and high frequency. Use HF instead: “ <b>HF</b> communication is the primary service operation, with a second <b>HF</b> radio ...”	Concur, removed ( ) from (HF) as it is an acronym for High Frequency The first use of the acronym “HF” is spelled out in paragraph 3.a of the TSO,
2.	Ray Mei ANM-130S	Section 7.b, page 5	“...include one copy of the data in paragraphs <b>5.e. (1)</b> through <b>5.e.(4).</b> ” Needs to be clarified.	Add “ <b>as described.</b> ” “...include one copy of the data <b>as described</b> in paragraphs <b>5.e. (1)</b> through <b>5.e.(4).</b> ”	Nonconcur per template.
3.	Tom Phan ANM-100B	Requirements, page 1	Missing airborne electronic hardware (AEH) qualification.	Even though the failure condition classification is MINOR and AC 20-152 does not require the FAA to review life cycle data, the TSO manufacturer should follow AC 20-152 and declare their hardware design assurance process. Add subsection for Airborne Electronic Hardware Qualification.	Nonconcur per template. Furthermore, as pointed out by the commenter, AC 20-152 provides guidance on acceptable methods for applicants to use to perform AEH development assurance for Level D devices. No change needed.
4	Tony Pigott ANE-101	Section 3, Page 1	Rev B Functional Qualification evokes new standard RTCA/DO-93a section 2.4 only. What about Section 2.1.3, which	Consider adding compliance to section 2.1.3 to pick up FCC compliance.	Nonconcur. Paragraph 3, REQUIREMENTS, of the TSO states that the SELCAL

## Field Review Comment Metric

<b>Originating Office:</b> AIR-130	<b>Document Description: TSO-C59b</b> Airborne Selective Calling (SELCAL) Equipment	<b>Project Lead/Reviewer</b> David W. Robinson	<b>Reviewing Office:</b> ANM-100S	<b>Date of Review:</b> 4/15/2016
---------------------------------------	--	---	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

	Commenter	Section # and Page #	Comment	Suggested Change and Rationale	Disposition
			evokes FCC compliance (thought that this was a contentious issue?)		equipment must meet all of the MPS qualification and documentation requirements of RTCA/DO-93A. This includes section 2.1.3, which states, “Federal Communications Commission Rules All equipment shall comply with the applicable rules of the Federal Communications Commission.” The Functional Qualification paragraph the commenter refers to (3.c) specifies required testing to demonstrate the required functionality of the SELCAL equipment. Section 2.1.3 does not identify any specific compliance tests for showing compliance with the FCC rules. No change needed to this section.
5	ACE114 David Jenson	3.c, pg 2	<b>Functional Qualification.</b> Demonstrate the required functional performance under	<b>Functional Qualification.</b> Demonstrate the required	Concur, change made

## Field Review Comment Metric

<b>Originating Office:</b> AIR-130	<b>Document Description: TSO-C59b</b> Airborne Selective Calling (SELCAL) Equipment	<b>Project Lead/Reviewer</b> David W. Robinson	<b>Reviewing Office:</b> ANM-100S	<b>Date of Review:</b> 4/15/2016
---------------------------------------	--	---	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

	Commenter	Section # and Page #	Comment	Suggested Change and Rationale	Disposition
			the test conditions specified in RTCA/DO-93A , <i>Minimum Operational Performance Standards for Avionics Supporting Airborne Selective Calling (SELCAL) Equipment</i>	functional performance under the test conditions specified in RTCA/DO-93A , <i>Minimum Operational Performance Standards (MOPS) for Airborne Selective Calling (SELCAL) Equipment – Consistency with title of DO document.</i>	
6	ACE114 Ruth Hirt	Section 5.c Page 4	Recommend to add a separate paragraph to state Airborne Electronic Hardware related requirements after 5.c	Suggestion 5.d – <i>If article includes simple or complex custom airborne electronic hardware, a plan for hardware aspects of certification (PHAC), hardware verification plan, top-level drawing, and hardware accomplishment summary (or similar document, as applicable).</i> Rationale – Not to omit AEH related requirements.	Nonconcur per template. Also see response to #3 above.
7	ACE114 Ruth Hirt	Section 6.g Page 5	Recommend to add a separate paragraph to state AEH related requirements after 6.g	Suggestion 6.h – <i>If the article includes complex custom airborne electronic</i>	Nonconcur per template. Also see response to #3 above.

## Field Review Comment Metric

<b>Originating Office:</b> AIR-130	<b>Document Description:</b> TSO-C59b Airborne Selective Calling (SELCAL) Equipment	<b>Project Lead/Reviewer</b> David W. Robinson	<b>Reviewing Office:</b> ANM-100S	<b>Date of Review:</b> 4/15/2016
---------------------------------------	--	---	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

	Commenter	Section # and Page #	Comment	Suggested Change and Rationale	Disposition
				<p><i>hardware, the appropriate hardware life cycle data in combination with design assurance level, as defined in RTCA/DO-254, Appendix A, Table A-1. For simple custom airborne electronic hardware, the following data: test cases or procedures, test results, test coverage analysis, tool assessment and qualification data, and configuration management records, including problem reports.</i></p> <p>Rationale – Not to omit AEH related requirements.</p>	