| **Page** | **Section** | **Line** | **Type** | **Comment/ Rationale** | **Source of Comment (Name/Agency)** | **Suggested Disposition** | **Disposition****(Completed by Principal Editor)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 39 | 4.1 |  | te | The URL to CDM/XML will be obsolete after the publication on new NDMXML. A link to qualified and unqualified version or a more general references to SANA contents will be needed. | J. M. Lozano/ESA-GMV | Consider adding both references. This will help to make people aware of the two different XML schemas. | 23-May-21: DLO: Agree – awaiting new references. This has the same confusion that we discussed for the ODM. |
| 4-1 | 4.1 | Para 6 | editorial | The link to the CDM/XML XSLT converter is not valid. | F. Dreger – ESA/ESOC | Fix URL (could not find the valid path) | 20-May-21: BDS: Links have not yet been reviewed and will be corrected. |
| 4-2 | 4.3.3.3 | Para 2 | editorial | The link to the CDM namespace location is not valid. | F. Dreger – ESA/ESOC | Fix URL (could not find the valid path) | 20-May-21: BDS: Links have not yet been reviewed and will be corrected. |
| 4-3 | 4.3.3.8 | Para 2 | editorial | The link to the CDM namespace location is not valid. | F. Dreger – ESA/ESOC | Fix URL (could not find the valid path) | 20-May-21: BDS: Links have not yet been reviewed and will be corrected. |
| - | - |  | ed | The links of the CDM/XML schema, converter locations and master are outdated (e.g. sections 4.1, 4.3.3.3), but perhaps there are some places which do not need to update (e.g. Annex C subsection C2). | VB/ESA | Check if the links shall be updated, and in that case how the actual links would be: <https://sanaregistry.org/r/ndmxml/ndmxml-2.0-cdm-1.0.xsd> <http://sanaregistry.org/r/ndmxml/ndmxml-2.0-cdm-1.0.xsl> <http://sanaregistry.org/r/ndmxml/ndmxml-2.0-master.xsd> | 20-May-21: BDS: Links have not yet been reviewed and will be corrected if necessary. |
| 3-10 | 3.4 | Row 4, 5 | Ed | Sana Registry for gravity\_models and for atmosphere\_models do not yet exist | CGramling/NASA-GSFC | Perhaps the expectation is that these sana registries will be completed prir to the release of the CDM. | 14-May-21: BDS: SANA link have not yet been addressed in this update. |
| 4-2 | 4.3.2 | 2 | ed | The xml version should be changed to 2.0, commensurate with the version of the document. | CGramling/NASA-GSFC | Please consider updating the XML version number to align with the document. | 14-May-21: BDS: XML has not yet been addressed as part of this update. |
| 4-3 | 4.3.3.8 | 1, 4 | Ed | The CCSDS version should be updated to 2.0, commensurate with the version of the document. | CGramling/NASA-GSFC | Please consider updating the CCSDS version number in the XML to align with the document. | 14-May-21: BDS: XML has not yet been addressed as part of this update. |
| C-4; C-5 | Annex C | 3, 4; 33, 34 | Ed, te | The COMMENTs for Object 1 and Object 2 identify Apogee Altitude and Perigee Altitude. But, there are specific keywords available for these parameters: APOAPSIS\_HEIGHT and PERIAPSIS \_HEIGHT. It seems that the example should encourage the adopter of the standard to use available keywords for parameters rather than place them in comment fields. | CGramling/NASA-GSFC | Please consider modifying the example to use the keywords defined in the message rather than a comment field for those very same parameters. | 14-May-21: BDS: Examples will be updated to V2 format in due course, we have not done this yet. |
| C-8 | Annex C2 | 2 | Ed | In the XML example, the version is given as 1.0. Since this will be version 2.0 of the document, should the XML version be updated to 2.0? Similarly, the CCSDS CDM VER version should be updated to 2.0. | CGramling/NASA-GSFC | Consider aligning the example version numbers w the document version number and updating to 2.0. | 14-May-21: BDS: XML has not yet been addressed as part of this update. |
| C-11 | Annex C2 | 41, 42 | Ed, te | The COMMENTS used indicate the apogee and perigee altitude. However, the updated CDM includes keywords for APOAPSIS\_HEIGHT and PERIAPSIS\_HEIGHT. It seems worthwhile to have the examples use the available keywords in the updated standard to encourage their use rather than place the data in comment fields. | CGramling/NASA-GSFC | Please consider modifying the example to use the keywords defined in the message rather than a comment field for those very same parameters. | 14-May-21: BDS: Examples will be updated to V2 format in due course, we have not done this yet. |
| 3-5 | Table 3-3 |  | te | COLLISION\_PROBABILITY: I think some more instruction on how to assign the value if COLLISION\_PERCENTILE is desirable. | David S. Berry / NASA | Clarify usage. Provide at least one example, and perhaps a plot in Annex F | 30-June-21: DLO: Added clarifying language06-Oct-21: NAV WG: Make sure an example in the Annex has a good example |
| 4-2 | 4.3.3.3 | 4 | ed/te | Link needs an update. It may also change again depending on how the ODM and ADM progress, | David S. Berry / NASA | From: "http://sanaregistry.org/r/ndmxml/ndmxml-1.0-master.xsd"To:"http://sanaregistry.org/r/ndmxml\_unqualified/ndmxml-2.0.0-master-2.0.xsd" | 14-May-21: BDS: SANA links have not yet been addressed as part of this update. |
| 4-3 | 4.3.3.8 |  | ed/te | Link needs an update. It may also change again depending on how the ODM and ADM progress, | David S. Berry / NASA | From: "http://sanaregistry.org/r/ndmxml/ndmxml-1.0-master.xsd"To:"http://sanaregistry.org/r/ndmxml\_unqualified/ndmxml-2.0.0-master-2.0.xsd" | 14-May-21: BDS: SANA links have not yet been addressed as part of this update. |
| G-1 | Ref [G2] |  | ed | I believe there's a new version about to be released.  | David S. Berry / NASA | Check with Dan since it's coming out of one of his SC14 WGs. | 30-June-21: DLO: Not yet released, but close. |
| General | 3.5 |  | te | As a by-product of a lot of “churn” discussion regarding the now-approved Space Traffic Coordination (STC) new work item in SC14 WG3, one of the aspects that I’ve heard from both USG as well as EU people is an interest in being able to share what one’s maneuver characteristics, conops and timelines are that could lead to an operator taking action to respond to a potential collision threat.  I’ve given this some thought, and I believe that the natural place to put such information (as optional content) would be in the CDM itself.  | D. Oltrogge / COMSPOC | Please consider comment | 11-Nov-21: BDS: Maybe we could include the following new keywords: MIN\_DV array of minimum RTN DVs, MAX\_DV array of maximum DVs, and TIME\_REQD\_TO\_CONDUCT\_MANVR (needs shorter name)  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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