**Orbit Data Messages Pink Book P-2.40 Review "Divide & Conquer" Assignments**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section/Annex/Page** | **Reviewer #1** | **Reviewer #2** | **Reviewer #3** | **Pages** |
| 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 | Hinagawa Hideaki | Elena Vellutini | Vitali Braun |  30 |
| Sec 6 | David Berry | Julie Halverson |   |  40 |
| Sec 7, 8 | Frank Dreger | José Miguel Lozano  |  David Berry |  26 |
| Annex A | Patrick Zimmerman | Vincent Schaeffer |   |  30 |
| Annex D, E, F, G, H | Cheryl Gramling | Ralph Kahle |   |  29 |
| Annex B, C, I, J, K, L, M, N | Alain Lamy | Brian Swinburne |  |  29 |
| Total |  |  |  | 184 |

Target Date: Per Nav WG convention, our internal reviews are one month in duration. These instructions are being distributed on 09-Oct-2020, so the target date to complete reviews is 09-Nov-2020. During the upcoming Fall Meetings Dan plans to focus on the ODM Test Plan.

Review Types: This is a TECHNICAL review, as opposed to a PROOFREADING review. There is a distinction between a proofreading review and a technical review. A proofreading review is done when we think the document is ready from a technical standpoint to be published, so we focus on errors of spelling, references to page numbers, references to section numbers, etc. A technical review focuses on the technical material (correctness, completeness, clarity, etc.), and things like erroneous page numbering, etc., can be ignored.

When Your Review Is Complete: email your Comment Resolution Matrix (CRM) to the WG at moims-nav-exec@mailman.ccsds.org .

Assignment: Read assigned sections, and if you find something you think is technically incorrect, or incomplete, or unclear, document it on the CRM. In the CRM you identify the page, section, line, etc. related to your comment so the Lead Editor can locate it to address it in the next draft. You are welcome to review more of the document if you like, but the assigned sections are the nominal minimum. We have a convention that we distribute a version with changes tracked, and one with the changes accepted. Usually it is easier to review the document with the changes accepted. Page, section, and line references in the CRM should be made relative to the changes accepted version.

Principle: In the past we would send out documents for internal review, but since they can be rather large, they can be time consuming to review. Consequently, Lead Editors often received very little feedback on the documents. A few years ago, it was suggested that we try to split up the work to reduce the burden in hopes of receiving a greater amount of feedback. An attempt is made to divide up the document into manageable portions based on the page count and the composition of the Working Group.

Final Note: If you don't find anything wrong, incomplete, or unclear, that's great! But often there are things that need to be addressed by the Lead Editor.