| **Pg** | **Sec** | **Para** | **Line** | **Type** | **Comment/ Rationale** | **Reviewer (Name/Agency)** | **Suggested Disposition** | **Final Disposition**  **(Do Not Fill In)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1-1 | 1.1 | 1 | 4 | ed | Unnecessary word and punctuation | David Berry/NASA | From: "The data used, arising from..."  To: "The data arising from..." |  |
| 1-1 | 1.1 | 2, 3 | All | ge | I believe that these two paragraphs should really be in section 2 of the document, the Overview. | David Berry/NASA | Highly consider moving them. |  |
| 1-1 | 1.2 | 1 | 9 | ed | Word choice: from "might" to "could also" | David Berry/NASA | From: "...the standard might be applied..."  To: "...the standard could also be applied..." |  |
| 1-2 | 1.3 | 1 | 2-3 | te | Expand applicability of document... the current statement says what the document does not address. Add what it DOES address. | David Berry/NASA | Add phrase " ; it only applies to 'decommutated' data extracted from the telemetry stream" (or something like that") to sentence number 2. |  |
| 1-3 | 1.5 | Annex A | 1 | ed | Annex A content should be described on a separate line. | David Berry/NASA | Add new bullet for Annex A. |  |
| 1-3 | 1.5 | Annex B | 1 | ed | Shows as "Annex BA" | David Berry/NASA | Change to "Annex A" |  |
| 1-3 | 1.5 | Annex D | 1 | ed | Since Annex D is not "complete", I think "allowed" should not be used. | David Berry/NASA | From: "allowed values"  To: "example values" |  |
| 1-3 | 1.5 | Annex G | 1 | ed | Minor grammar. Incorrect indefinite article with acronym starting with vowel sound. | David Berry/NASA | From: "a NHM"  To: "an NHM"  NOTE: There are several instances of this same error in the document. I recommend an MS Word search through the document, with changes as applicable. |  |
| 1-3 | 1.5 | Annex J | 1 | ed | Minor typo. | David Berry/NASA | From: "Jcontains"  To: "J contains" |  |
| 1-3 | 1.5 | Annex K | 1 | ed | This paragraph can be removed based on the discussions/decisions at London Meetings. | David Berry/NASA | Remove paragraph devoted to Annex K. |  |
| 1-3 | 1.6 | 1 | 2 | ed | Reference "[H2]" is "not found". | David Berry/NASA | Give correct locating information for [H2] |  |
| 1-3 | 1.6.1 | KVN | 1-2 | te | I think the definition should be rewritten a bit. | David Berry/NASA | From: "...associates a Measurement or group of Measurements with a keyword."  To: "... associates a value with a keyword." |  |
| 1-4 | 1.6.1 | KVN | 1 | te | I think the definition should be rewritten a bit. | David Berry/NASA | From: "...and the Measurement(s) represent(s) a measurement or descriptive state..."  To: "... and the value represents a measurement, a group of measurements, or a descriptive state..." |  |
| 1-4 | 1.6.1 | KVN | 2 | ed | Minor typo. The sentence ends with a ".." | David Berry/NASA | Remove second period. |  |
| 1-5 | 1.7 | [8] | all | te | I would remove the Spacewarn Bulletin at this point and replace it with the UN Registry. | David Berry/NASA | Replace Spacewarn Bulletin [8] with the United Nations Online Registry of Objects Launched into Outer Space http://www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/osoindex.html |  |
| 2-1 | 2.2.2 | 1 | 6 | ed | Since this is a long sentence, it is a bit awkward. Essentially you are saying that the architecture provides both flexibility and consistency, but the intervening words obscure the "provides consistency" attribute. | David Berry/NASA | From: "...contents and consistency..."  To: "...contents and provides consistency..." |  |
| 3-1 | 3.1.6 | 1 | 1 | te | This "requirement" has bothered me forever (and not just in the NHM). Essentially this is a requirement on the NHM as a message type (i.e., on the standard itself), and as such it doesn't make sense here (or in any of our other documents). I think I've finally figured out how best to portray this important requirement and satisfy it as well. But the statement in 3.1.6 should be removed (though it will re-appear in Annex I, requirements). | David Berry/NASA | Remove 3.1.6. A later comment will discuss how to add this to Annex I. |  |
| 3-2 | 3.2.4 | Table 3-1 | COMMENT | ed | I like what Karen did in the SMM comment examples. Her sample comment was "COMMENT This is important". This is, I think, far better than the "COMMENT This is a comment" that I cooked up. | David Berry/NASA | From: "COMMENT This is a comment"  To: "COMMENT This is important" |  |
| 3-3 | 3.2.7 | 1 | 3 | te | I think the time stamp on the header would be the time that the header was created... it's conceivable that a header might be created at the time a stream was opened, in which case it might already exist when the first data point arrives. | David Berry/NASA | From: "...the first data point if in stream format..."  To: "...the time that the header is produced if in stream format...".  But this is subject to discussion... |  |
| 3-3 | 3.3.4.2 | 1 | 1 | ed | I think this is overly complex. | David Berry/NASA | From: existing text and Note.  To: "A Define Block may contain multiple comments. See 5.6, 6.5 for formatting." |  |
| 3-3 | 3.3.4.3  3.3.4.4 | All | All | te | Delete, per our discussions/decisions at London. | David Berry/NASA | Delete sections. |  |
| 3-4 | 3.3.6 | Table 3-2 | COMMENT | ed | See above comment regarding Karen Richon's invention. | David Berry/NASA | From: "COMMENT This is a comment"  To: "COMMENT This is important" |  |
| 3-4 | 3.3.6 | Table 3-2 | COMMENT | te | I recommend removing the discussion about "DEFINE BLOCK" | David Berry/NASA | From: Existing  To: "This is one of two places in an NHM Metadata Section where comments may appear." |  |
| 3-4 | 3.3.6 | Table 3-2 | OBJNAME | te | Consistent with replacing Spacewarn with the UN Registry, update the text | David Berry/NASA | From: "SPACEWARN Bulletin"  To: "UN Register of Space Objects" |  |
| 3-5 | 3.3.6 | Table 3-2 | OBJ ID | te | Consistent with replacing Spacewarn with the UN Registry, update the text | David Berry/NASA | From: "SPACEWARN Bulletin"  To: "UN Register of Space Objects" |  |
| 3-5 | 3.3.6 | Table 3-2 | OBJ ID | te | Minor typo, reference number | David Berry/NASA | From: "[3]"  To: "[8]" |  |
| 3-5 | 3.3.6 | Table 3-2 | START\_ TIME | ed | There's only one metadata section, by design | David Berry/NASA | From: "...following this Metadata Section."  To: "...following the Metadata Section." |  |
| 3-5 | 3.3.6 | Table 3-2 | STOP\_ TIME | ed | There's only one metadata section, by design | David Berry/NASA | From: "...following this Metadata Section."  To: "...following the Metadata Section." |  |
| 3-5 | 3.3.6 | Table 3-2 | DEFINE | te | As discussed at London, I think "MNEMONIC" here is better, your original intent I think. | David Berry/NASA | From: "DEFINE"  To: "MNEMONIC" |  |
| 3-5 | 3.3.6 | Table 3-2 | DEFINE | te | Qualify the obligatory column "Yes" on DEFINE | David Berry/NASA | From: "Yes"  To: "Yes (at least one)" |  |
| 3-5 | 3.3.6 | Table 3-2 | DEFINE | te | The two words "mnemonic" and "keyword" appear in this document with 3 of the 4 possible combinations of capitalization of the first letters "Mnemonic Keyword", "Mnemonic keyword", "mnemonic keyword" | David Berry/NASA | Recommend standardizing the capitalization, probably "Mnemonic Keyword" since that concept has special significance in the document. |  |
| 3-5 | 3.3.6 | Table 3-2 | After DEFINE | te | Add a "COMMENT" cell here, with text similar to the previous COMMENT location after META\_START | David Berry/NASA | From: N/A (nothing currently)  To: "This is one of two places in an NHM Metadata Section where comments may appear." |  |
| 3-6 | 3.3.6 | Table 3-2 | FRAME | te | Delete, per our discussions/decisions at London. | David Berry/NASA | Delete sections. |  |
| 3-6 | 3.3.6 | Table 3-2 | CALCURVE | te | Delete, per our discussions/decisions at London. | David Berry/NASA | Delete sections. |  |
| 3-6 | 3.4.2 | 1 | 2 | ed | Minor typo. The sentence ends with a ".." | David Berry/NASA | Remove second period. |  |
| 3-7 | 3.4.4 | Table 3-3 | DATA\_START | ed, te | I don't think "DATA\_START" can be considered a "record". Functionally it is a delimiter. | David Berry/NASA | From: "First record in Data Section"  To: "Delimits beginning of Data Section" |  |
| 3-7 | 3.4.4 | Table 3-3 | DATA\_STOP | ed, te | I don't think "DATA\_STOP" can be considered a "record". Functionally it is a delimiter. | David Berry/NASA | From: "Last record in Data Section"  To: "Delimits end of Data Section" |  |
| 3-7 | 3.4.4 | Table 3-3 | COMMENT | ed | See above comment regarding Karen Richon's invention. | David Berry/NASA | From: "COMMENT This is a comment"  To: "COMMENT This is important" |  |
| 3-7 | 3.4.4 | Table 3-4 | keyword | ed | In "Description" section, minor grammar error (pluralization) | David Berry/NASA | From: "Keywords for all variable"  To: "Keywords for all variables" |  |
| 3-7 | 3.4.4 | Table 3-4 | N/A | ed, te | I think it is more straightforward to characterize the "<value>" as "<timetag>" plus "<measurement(s)>" | David Berry/NASA | From: "<timetag data element>"  To: "<timetag>" |  |
| 3-7 | 3.4.4 | Table 3-4 | N/A | ed, te | In the "Description", wording suggests a single measurement | David Berry/NASA | From: "Time associated with the hardware measurement"  To: "Time associated with the hardware measurement(s)" |  |
| 3-8 | 3.4.4 | Table 3-4 | N/A | ed, te | I think it is more straightforward to characterize the "<value>" as "<timetag>" plus "<measurement(s)>" | David Berry/NASA | From: "<measurement data elements>"  To: "<measurement(s)>" |  |
| 3-8 | 3.4.7 | 1 | 1 | ed, te | Word choice | David Berry/NASA | From: "... a keyword not specified..."  To: "... a keyword not defined ..." |  |
| 3-8 | 3.4.7 | NOTE | 2 | ed, te | Redundant: the "structure of the keywords" and "the fields that compose the keyword" are equivalent. | David Berry/NASA | From: "...used in the Data section and the fields that compose the keyword are specified..."  To: "...used in the Data Section is specified..." |  |
| 3-8 | 3.4.8 | 1 | 1, 2 | ed, te | Need for "data element" is not clear | David Berry/NASA | From: "timetag data element", "measurement data elements"  To: "timetag", "measurement(s)" |  |
| 3-8 | 3.4.8 | 1 | 2 | ed, te | Questionable possessive. | David Berry/NASA | From: "... the record's mnemonic keyword..."  To: "... the associated Mnemonic Keyword..." |  |
| 3-8 | 3.4.8.1 | 1 | 1 | ed, te | Need for "data element" is not clear | David Berry/NASA | From: "The data element(s) shall..."  To: "The timetag and measurement(s) shall..." |  |
| 3-8 | 3.4.8.2 | 1 | 1 | ed, te | Need for "data element" is not clear | David Berry/NASA | From: "The number of measurement data element(s) shall..."  To: "The number of measurements shall..." |  |
| 3-8 | 3.4.8.2, 3.4.8.3 | N/A | N/A | te | Note that these two sections refer to constructs in the Hardware Data Record that have not yet been defined. | David Berry/NASA | Consider whether these two paragraphs should be deleted since the material is discussed (twice!) in section 5.3 |  |
| 3-8 | 3.4.8.4 | 1 | 2 | ed | Minor typo. The sentence ends with a ".." | David Berry/NASA | Remove second period. |  |
| 3-8 | 3.4.10 | 1 | 1 | ed | The essential content of this sentence is equivalent to that of 3.4.5, but the sentence construction is quite different. It also has a double period at the end. | David Berry/NASA | Use the same sentence structure as was used in 3.4.5. Also, remove second period. |  |
| 4-1 | 4.1 | 1 | 1 | ed | Suggest using same structure as was used in Section 3.1, Note 1 | David Berry/NASA | Consider |  |
| 4-1 | 4.1 | 2 | 1 | ed | Suggest spelling out the anti-acronym of "SANA" at this first (actually 2nd... also occurs on page 1-3) usage. | David Berry/NASA | Consider |  |
| 4-1 | 4.1 | 3 | 1 | te | It is irrelevant to the standard that the schema is ASCII only. | David Berry/NASA | Delete sentence |  |
| 4-1 | 4.1 | 5 | 2 | te | The capitalization in the schema location, as written, renders a "not found" http error in at least 3 different browsers | David Berry/NASA | Make URL all lower case. |  |
| 4-1 | 4.2.2 | 1 | 1 | ed | Be consistent with structural text. | David Berry/NASA | From: "single segment construct"  To: "single <segment> construct" |  |
| 4-2 | 4.3.2 | 1 | 2 | ed | space between word and comma | David Berry/NASA | From: "implementations ,"  To: "implementations," |  |
| 4-2 | 4.4.3.1 | 1 | 1 | te | XML tags are case sensitive; these are upper case but should be lower case | David Berry/NASA | From: <NHM></NHM>  To: <nhm></nhm> |  |
| 4-3 | 4.4.3.4 | 1 | 1 | te | XML tags are case sensitive; the tag here is upper case but should be lower case | David Berry/NASA | From: <NHM>  To: <nhm> |  |
| 4-3 | 4.4.3.5 | NOTE | 4 | te | XML tags are case sensitive; the tag in the NOTE is upper case but should be lower case | David Berry/NASA | From: <NHM  To: <nhm |  |
| 4-4 | 4.4.6.1 | 1 | 1 | ed | Repeated word. | David Berry/NASA | From: "Metadata Section Section"  To: "Metadata Section" |  |
| 4-4 | 4.4.6.2 | 1 | 2 | ed | Refers to Table 3-3 but should refer to Table 3-2 | David Berry/NASA | From: "table 3-3"  To: "table 3-2" |  |
| 4-4 | 4.4.6.2 | 1 | N/A | te | Should mention exclusion of "META\_START" and "META\_STOP" keywords in the XML format. | David Berry/NASA | Add phrase to the effect of "... with the exception of the META\_START and META\_STOP keywords." |  |
| 4-4 | 4.4.6.4 | 1 | 3 | ed | Extra punctuation. | David Berry/NASA | From: "...as follows:)."  To: "...as follows:" |  |
| 4-4 | 4.4.6.4 | 1 | 4-9 | te | I think a better XML coding for the <defineSet> would be as shown at right=>. This would allow a tighter tie between the metadata and data, and also address the "units" problem. | David Berry/NASA | <defineSet>  <define>Primary IRU Rates</define>  <MNEMONIC>...</MNEMONIC>  <UNITS>...</UNITS>  </defineSet> |  |
| 4-4 | 4.4.7 | 2 | 1 | te | Erroneous pointer | David Berry/NASA | From: "... those specified in table 3-3"  To: "...the MNEMONICs defined in the metadata section" |  |
| 4-5 | 4.4.7 | 1 | 3 | ed, te | Word choice | David Berry/NASA | From: "described"  To: "defined" |  |
| 4-5 | 4.4.7 | 1 | 3 | ed | Extra punctuation | David Berry/NASA | Remove extra period after "in the Metadata Section". |  |
| 4-7 | 4.4.8 | 1 | 1 | ed | Superfluous words | David Berry/NASA | From: "Special tags in the NHM shall be used..."  To: "Special tags shall be used..." |  |
| 4-7 | 4.5 | 1 | 1 | te | Add clarifying information | David Berry/NASA | From: "... the schema set may be downloaded..."  To: "... the NDM/XML schema set (which includes the NHM schema) may be downloaded..." |  |
| 4-7 | 4.5.1 | 1 | 1 | te | Add reference to NDM/XML document. | David Berry/NASA | Add "See reference [7]." |  |
| 4-7 | 4.5.2 | 1 | 2 | te | XML parameter misspelled | David Berry/NASA | From: xsi:nonamespaceschemalocation  To: xsi:noNamespaceSchemaLocation |  |
| 4-7 | 4.5.2 | 1 | 2 | ed | lower case acronym | David Berry/NASA | From: "url"  To: "URL" |  |
| 5-9 | 5.2.9.3 | 1 | 1 | te | missing word | David Berry/NASA | From: "NHM KVN Data Records"  To: "NHM KVN Hardware Data Records" |  |
| 5-9 | 5.2.9.4 | 1 | 1 | te | missing word | David Berry/NASA | From: "Mnemonic Keywords in Data Records"  To: " Mnemonic Keywords in Hardware Data Records" |  |
| 5-9 | 5.2.9.5 | 1 | 1 | te | missing word | David Berry/NASA | From: "Mnemonic Keyword in Data Records"  To: " Mnemonic Keyword in Hardware Data Records" |  |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | ge | There are several places in the document (see previous 3 items) where "Data Record" is used synonymously with "Hardware Data Record". Should be consistent. | David Berry/NASA | Recommend doing a search for all instances of "Data Record" that are not preceded by the word "Hardware" and correct as applicable. |  |
| 5-9 | 5.2.9.5.2 | 1 | 1-2 | ed | Verb subject agreement... "Elements ... shall consist of one or more measurements..." is incorrect. It allows a single element to consist of two or more measurements. | David Berry/NASA | From: "Elements after the timetag shall consist of one or more measurements or calculated values associated with that timetag."  To: "Each element after the timetag shall consist of a single measurement or calculated value associated with that timetag." |  |
| 5-9 | 5.2.9.7 | N/A | N/A | ed | There is no text here ? | David Berry/NASA | Delete 5.2.9.7 |  |
| 5-9 | 5.2.10 | All | All | ed, te | I think this section is misplaced. | David Berry/NASA | Suggest moving immediately following 5.2.6. |  |
| 5-10 | 5.3 |  |  | ge | I think that all the Mnemonic Keyword syntax rules should be specified in this section. There are some aspects of the syntax that only appear in table 5-1. | David Berry/NASA | In general I think that all the syntax rules in Table 5-1 should be contained somewhere in requirements in section 5.3, and the Table primarily used to show examples. As it is, some syntax rules are only found in the numbered requirements, some are only found in the Table, and some are found in both places and thus redundant. |  |
| 5-10 ff | 5.3.1.3 ff | All | All | ed | I don't see a need to go to 5 or 6 levels of numbering in this section. I think it makes the document unnecessarily complex. | David Berry/NASA | Suggest changing 5.3.1.3 to 5.3.2, and renumbering susequent sections accordingly. This will remove one level of numbering hierarchy. |  |
| 5-10 | 5.3.1.3.2 | 1 | 1 | ed, te | This paragraph is redundant. 5.3.1.2 already states that "The Mnemonic Keyword shall be an alphanumeric string...". | David Berry/NASA | Delete 5.3.1.3.2 |  |
| 5-10 | 5.3.1.3.3 | 1 | 1 | ed | Phrase is constructed redundantly. | David Berry/NASA | From: "The string contained in the System Field shall be one of the strings..."  To: "The System Field shall be one of the strings..." |  |
| 5-10 | 5.3.1.4 | 1 | 1 | ed | Typically "NOTE"s do not receive a separate section number... they are part of the preceding numbered section. | David Berry/NASA | Either:  (a) remove section number from the NOTE, or  (b) remove the "NOTE" designation; this option (b) is probably preferable, given that the NOTE contains a "should". |  |
| 5-10 | 5.3.1.4 | 1 | 2 | ed, te | I don't understand the phraseology "In that event, if the designator is not considered unique...". I think this is not particularly clear. | David Berry/NASA | Either remove the phrase, or simplify to something like simply "Addition of the designator to the SANA registry is preferred", or add clarification. I think what you are trying to say is that if the designator is unique to a particular mission and is unlikely to apply to other missions, then using an ICD is OK. But the multiple "not"s in the NOTE make it a bit difficult to understand. |  |
| 5-10 | 5.3.1.5.2 | 1 | 1 | ed, te | This paragraph is redundant. 5.3.1.2 already states that "The Mnemonic Keyword shall be an alphanumeric string...". | David Berry/NASA | Delete 5.3.1.5.2 |  |
| 5-10 | 5.3.1.5.3 | 1 | 1 | ed | Phrase is constructed redundantly. | David Berry/NASA | From: "The string contained in the Hardware Type Field shall be one of the strings..."  To: "The first 3 characters of the Hardware Type Field shall be one of the strings..." |  |
| 5-10 | 5.3.1.5 ff | N/A | N/A | te | This section illustrates one of the gaps in the syntax specification. Somewhere in this section it should be stated that "The Hardware Type Field consists of exactly 3 upper case alphabetic characters followed by an integer" | David Berry/NASA | Consider. |  |
| 5-10 | 5.3.1.5.3 | NOTE | 2 | ed, te | See comments above regarding the designator in the NOTE in 5.3.1.4 | David Berry/NASA | See suggested disposition above regarding the designator in the NOTE in 5.3.1.4 |  |
| 5-11 | 5.3.1.6.2 | 1 | 1 | ed, te | This paragraph is redundant. 5.3.1.2 already states that "The Mnemonic Keyword shall be an alphanumeric string...". | David Berry/NASA | Delete 5.3.1.6.2 |  |
| 5-11 | 5.3.1.6.3 | All | All | ed, te | Although this paragraph is in the section on "Data Group Field", it refers to "Hardware Type Field". Since I don't recall us planning to put Data Group Field strings into SANA, and Annex D has no examples of Data Group Fields, it makes me think this is a cut/paste error. | David Berry/NASA | Remove paragraph? |  |
| 5-11 | 5.3.1.7 | 1 | 1 | ed | Section title starts with a period "." | David Berry/NASA | Remove period. |  |
| 5-11 | 5.3.1.7.2 | 1 | 1 | ed | This paragraph is constructed redundantly. 5.3.1.2 already states that "The Mnemonic Keyword shall be an alphanumeric string...". | David Berry/NASA | From: "...shall consist of an alphanumeric string consisting of the character 'V' followed by an integer..."  To: "...shall consist of the character 'V' followed by an integer..." |  |
| 5-11 | 5.3.1.8.1 | 1 | 2 | ed | Word choice | David Berry/NASA | From: "... the form of the measurements..."  To: "... the formats of the measurements..." |  |
| 5-12 | 5.3.1.8.2 | 1 | 1 | ed, te | This paragraph is redundant. 5.3.1.2 already states that "The Mnemonic Keyword shall be an alphanumeric string...". | David Berry/NASA | Delete 5.3.1.8.2 |  |
| 5-12 | 5.3.1.8.3 | 1 | 1 | ed | Remove redundancy | David Berry/NASA | From: "The string of the Measurement Type field shall..."  To: "The Measurement Type Field shall... |  |
| 5-12 | Table 5-1 | Caption | N/A | ed | I think the title of the table should be changed to be more reflective of its purpose. | David Berry/NASA | From: "Format of NHM Mnemonic Keywords"  To: "Examples of NHM Mnemonic Keyword Fields" |  |
| 5-12 | Table 5-1 | SYSTEM Field | Description | ed, te | I think the part of the description describing the values should be removed as redundant. The user should be referred to the applicable document section. | David Berry/NASA | From: "- The values of this field... from the SANA Register.  To: "See 5.3.1.3" (or alternatively "See 5.3.2" if you implement the recommended renumbering) |  |
| 5-12 | Table 5-1 | HARDWARE TYPE | Description | ed, te | Table Description contains a requirement | David Berry/NASA | Move the text "if only one instance exists..." into section 5.3.1.5. |  |
| 5-12 | Table 5-1 | HARDWARE TYPE | Description | ed, te | I think the part of the description describing the values should be removed as redundant. The user should be referred to the applicable document section. | David Berry/NASA | From: "- The three character code... a value from the SANA Registry"  To: "See 5.3.1.5" (or alternatively "See 5.3.3" if you implement the recommended renumbering) |  |
| 5-13 | Table 5-1 | DATA GROUP | Description |  | I think the part of the description describing the values should be removed as redundant. The user should be referred to the applicable document section. | David Berry/NASA | From: "- This string should be specified in an ICD  -  - ... character(s) in the field".  To: "See 5.3.1.6" (or alternatively "See 5.3.4" if you implement the recommended renumbering) |  |
| 5-13 | Table 5-1 | MEASUREMENT COUNT | Description | ed, te | The description is completely redundant with 5.3.1.7.2 | David Berry/NASA | Delete existing text in table and replace with "See 5.3.1.7" (or alternatively "See 5.3.5 if you implement the recommend renumbering). |  |
| 5-13 | Table 5-1 | MEASUREMENT TYPE | Description | ed, te | I think the part of the description describing the values should be removed as redundant. The user should be referred to the applicable document section. | David Berry/NASA | From: existing text  To: "See 5.3.1.8" (or alternatively "See 5.3.6 if you implement the recommend renumbering). |  |
| 5-13 | Table 5-1 | MEASUREMENT TYPE | Description | te | The Measurement Type is non-obligatory. Is there a default? | David Berry/NASA | If there is a default, it should be specified. If there is no default, that fact should probably be stated. |  |
| 5-13 | 5.4 | Title | Title | ed | I think the title of 5.4 should be "NHM Values" since there are values in the Header and Metadata Section that also must abide by the syntax rules in 5.4. In fact, one could make a case that the entire existing 5.3 could be a subsection of the existing 5.4 given that the Mnemonic Keywords are in fact values for metadata keywords. | David Berry/NASA | Consider changing title. Do not consider writing a separate section for "NHM Header and Metadata Values" because that would be very duplicative, and there would have to be exceptions made for values that represent Mnemonic Keywords. Consider making the existing 5.3 a major subsection of the existing 5.4. |  |
| 5-13 | 5.4.1 | 1 | All | te | Redundant (see 3.4.3 through 3.4.8) | David Berry/NASA | Remove paragraph |  |
| 5-13 | 5.4.2 | 1 | All | te | Redundant (see 5.3.1.9.3) | David Berry/NASA | Remove paragraph |  |
| 5-13 | 5.4.3 | 1 | All | te | Redundant (see 5.3.1.9.4) | David Berry/NASA | Remove paragraph |  |
| 5-14 | 5.4.3.2.2.2 | 1 | 1 | te | I'm not sure why it's necessary to list the ASCII character representation for the '+' or '-'. Along with the excessive section numbering here, listing the ASCII values seems a bit excessive. | David Berry/NASA | Remove "(ASCII character nn)" instances |  |
| 5-14 | 5.4.3.5 | 1 | All | te | Redundant (see 5.2.2) | David Berry/NASA | Remove paragraph |  |
| 5-14 | 5.4.3.5.1 | 1 | 2 | ed, te | Note that the single quotation symbol shown is not an ASCII 39 (the curly quotes aren't in the ASCII set). | David Berry/NASA | This is one case where the ASCII code may be useful, but maybe don't try to put an example since you don't know what the CCSDS editor will do with it. |  |
| 5-14 | 5.4.3.5.1 | NOTE | 1-2 | te | I don't think the note accurately describes the purpose of the quotes. As I understand it, the quotes are only "to accommodate character measurement fields that may contain white space". | David Berry/NASA | Re-write the NOTE. |  |