

**ANNEX B**

**TABLE OF RECEIVED COMMENTS**

1. The following table details all the comments received as part of the ‘Draft Specifications for On-Line Data Interchange (OLDI) and ATS Data Exchange Presentation (ADEXP)’ Consultation.
2. The table headings are as follows:

ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATIONS FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation

- a) The first column refers to the unique number assigned to the comment during the review process.
- b) The ‘**§ No**’ column cross-refers to the relevant paragraph number in the ‘Draft Specifications for On-line Data Interchange (OLDI) and ATS Data Exchange Presentation (ADEXP)’.
- c) The ‘Comment’ and ‘Reason(s) for Comment’ and ‘Proposed Change/Text’ copy exactly the textual comments as provided in the Consultation Response Sheet.
- d) The ‘**Response**’ column provides the detailed response to the comment.
- e) The ‘Disposal’ column provides information about the way the received comment was treated.
- f) The ‘Organisation’ column identifies the source of the comment.
- g) Comments are grouped by draft Specifications:, **Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange** and **Draft Specification for ATS Data Exchange Presentation (ADEXP)**.

<b>ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)</b>							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
1	Page 32, Section 6.3.3.2	Small format error with entry OLDI-ACT-200-M			<i>The format error will be corrected and the missing "shall" statement will be re-inserted.</i>	Accepted	German Federal Supervisory Authority for ANS
2	Foreword, Section 6, Point 5	The word "over" should be "cover"	It seems like a syntactic error	Replace "over" with "cover"	<i>Correction will be made as proposed.</i>	Accepted	LFV Sweden
3	Section 3.3, Requirement ODI-GEN-60-M	The abbreviation for 'Context Management' is 'CNLCM'. This wrong - it should be 'CM'	Syntactic error	Replace 'CNLCM' with 'CM'	<i>Correction will be made as proposed.</i>	Accepted	LFV Sweden
4	Section 6.3.3.2, Requirement OLDI-ACT-200-M	Requirement OLDI-ACT-200-M has been incorrectly placed in the Note to requirement OLDI-ACT-190-M	Requirement OLDI-ACT-200-M is missing.	Amend the Note to requirement OLDI-ACT-190-M to remove requirement OLDI-ACT-200-M and make requirement OLDI-ACT-200-M a stand-alone requirement	<i>The format error will be corrected as proposed and the missing "shall" statement will be re-inserted.</i>	Accepted	LFV Sweden

ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
5	General comment	It would be more readable if each new message section started on a new page	To improve readability of the document	Start each Section for each message on a new page	<i>Readability improvement will be implemented.</i>	Accepted	LFV Sweden
6	Section 6.3.3.3, Requirement OLDI-ACT-240-M	In the Note to requirement OLDI-ACT-240-M it refers to requirement OLDI-ACT-90-M. it should also refer to requirements OLDI-DCT-110-M and OLDI-DCT-120-M	Requirement OLDI-DCT-90-M only refers to 1 potential COP format rather than all 3 formats that can be used. Adding the other 2 requirements in the Note will make it correct.	Add requirements OLDI-DCT-110-M & OLDI-DCT-120-M to the Note for requirement OLDI-ACT-240-M	<i>Agreed, the note of OLDI-ACT-20-M will be amended as follows :  "When a flight is transferred on a direct routing the requirement above will refer to the point determined in accordance with OLDI-DCT-90-M, OLDI-DCT-110-M and OLDI-DCT-120-M."</i>	Accepted	LFV Sweden
7	Section 6.5.3.2, Requirement OLDI-MAC-150-R	Syntactic comment - amend "LOF" and/or NAN Messages" to be "LOF and/or NAN message"	It reads better	Propose to change the text as per the 'comment' field	<i>Text will be amended as suggested: "LOF and/or NAN message"</i>	Accepted	LFV Sweden

<b>ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)</b>							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
8	Section 6.6.3.2, Requirement OLDI-PAC-230-M	The new requirement referenced "OLDI-PAC-160-Man d" should be "OLDI-PAC-160-M"	Syntactic error	Amend 'OLDI-PAC-160-M and" to be "OLDI-PAC-160-M"	<i>The spacing error in OLDI-PAC-230-M will be corrected.</i>	Accepted	LFV Sweden
9	Section 14.4.1	The new text on the third line "referring to" is not correct English - change this back to the original "to refer"	Syntactic comment	Proposed change according to the comment	<i>Section 14.4.1 will be amended to revert back to original wording.</i>	Accepted	LFV Sweden
10	Sections 15.3.2.1 & 15.3.3.1, Requirements OLDI-SDM-20M & OLDI-SDM-100-M	Requirements OLDI-SDM-20-M & OLDI-SDM-100-M are a bit ambiguous - if a 'Direct clearance' is done according to OLDI-SDM-20-M then it might impact the coordination data, so contradicting requirement OLDI-SDM-100-M	2 requirements are ambiguous	There should be some clarifying text added to remove the ambiguity.	<i>A note to SDM-20-M will be added as follows: <b>Note:</b> This requirement refers to the direct clearances that do not need to be acknowledged or coordinated.</i>	Accepted	LFV Sweden
11	Section A.21.2	Section A.21.2 needs	Direct routing to/from	Add text to section	<i>Agreed, GEO points</i>	Accepted	LFV Sweden

ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
		to have reference to latitude/longitude and/or GEO points added in the same way as for ICAO format above in Section A.21.1 (requirement OLDI-FC-DRTR-30-O)	latitude/longitude points is an everyday occurrence and the information needs to be included in ADEXP format messages as well as ICAO format messages	A.21.2. referencing latitudes/longitude s and/or GEO points.	<p><i>will be added to A.21.2 as proposed:</i></p> <p><i>“Primary field “dct” containing:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• the point at which the deviation is requested to commence, defined as one of:</i></li> <li><i>• a known reference point; or</i></li> <li><i>• a range and bearing from a known reference point, as defined in the same message by Primary field “ref”; or</i></li> <li><i>• a reference point defined by latitude and longitude by Primary field “GEO”, or</i></li> <li><i>• the value “ZZZ” if a direct routing is being requested by the receiving ATC unit but the precise point at which it would commence is not known.</i></li> </ul>		

ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>the point situated on the original flight plan route to which the aircraft is requested to be cleared, defined as:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>a known reference point; or</i></li> <li>• <i>a range and bearing from a known reference point, as defined in the same message by Primary field "ref", or</i></li> <li>• <i>a reference point defined by latitude and longitude by Primary field "GEO".</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
12	OLDI document formatting	typographic: OLDI draft document footer should contain the whole edition number (4.3) and the total number of pages as in precedent edition.		To include whole standard edition and total number of pages in the footer of final version of OLDI standard document.	<i>The edition number will be fixed, while the total page number is visible in the PDF menu bar.</i>	Accepted	ROMATSA

ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
13	OLDI Foreword, 6 Significant Changes from Edition 4.2 point 7. page 12	typographic: In the messages list mentioning updated messages ( 7.): 7. Several new examples have been drafted for TIM, SDM, REV, LOF and CPR messages. Instead "CPR" should be written "CRP".	Accuracy of text	7. Several new examples have been drafted for TIM, SDM, REV, LOF and CRP messages.	<i>It will be corrected, CPR will be replaced by CRP in point 6(7) of the Foreword.</i>	Accepted	ROMATSA
14	OLDI Foreword, 6 Significant Changes from Edition 4.2 page 12	Not all fields added/corrected/updated/deleted are present in the list of significant changes (only ADESOLD mentioned at 13.) Examples of messages having fields added/corrected/updated/deleted: XIN, XRQ, XAP, COF, MAS, ROF, HOP,OCM	For easier review of changes that would require software implementation updates.	To add the messages having fields added/corrected/updated/deleted. To specify the changed fields for each message.	<i>The purpose of paragraph 6 of the foreword is to identify significant changes, not all changes are listed.</i>  <i>It is proposed to add an additional point that XIN, XRQ, XAP messages have been aligned with ADEXP specification as follows: " XIN, XRQ, XAP messages content have been aligned</i>	Partially accepted	ROMATSA

ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
					<p><i>with ADEXP specification"</i></p> <p><i>RTI, HOP and TIP messages will be added in the second as follows:</i></p> <p><i>" 2. The optional requirements and/or notes have been added/:modified to the ABI/ACT/REV/PAC/C FD/COF/MAS/COD/P NT/ROF/HOP/CDN/R TI/TIP and LOF messages description."</i></p>		
15	<p>OLDI 6.2.2 Message Contents ABI message fields page 27</p> <p>- ABI Example 2 page 29</p> <p>- OLDI A.11 annex page 136</p> <p>- OLDI A.54</p>	<p>OLDI-ABI-80-M and OLDI A.11 Notes are about using ADEXP adesold field when there is a change of destination of aerodrome to be transmitted in ABI message.</p> <p>ades and adesold are distinct independent</p>	<p>To be more specific about fields definition and usage.</p>	<p>To add a separate optional requirement for ABI message to specify Previous Aerodrome of Destination (specified in OLDI A.54) insertion in case of changing</p>	<p><i>When preparing the draft Specification the following optional requirement was evaluated with experts in the OLDI TF: "OLDI-ABI-25-O The ABI message may contain the previous aerodrome of departure if</i></p>	<p><b>Rejected</b></p>	<p>ROMATSA</p>



ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
	annex page 147	fields in ADEXP standard, ABI message section is missing a reference to Previous Aerodrome of Destination (ADEXP adesold field). A.54 of OLDI standard contains Previous Aerodrome of Destination (ADEXP only) definition which refers ADEXP adesold field. Previous Aerodrome of Destination is not referred in any other section of OLDI standard.		the destination aerodrome, as follows : OLDI-ABI-86-O A revised ABI message may contain Previous Aerodrome of Destination if there is a change of destination aerodrome.	<i>available."</i> <i>However, it was concluded not to include such a requirement as the content of A.54 is deemed sufficient.</i>		
16	OLDI 6.3.3.2 Processing in the Receiving Unit page 32 OLDI-ACT-200-M	typographic: Requirement OLDI-ACT-200-M should appear in a separate paragraph having the same format style as other	typographic: Requirement OLDI-ACT-200-M should appear in a separate paragraph having the same format style as other	To re-align OLDI-ACT-200-M (separate paragraph having the same format style as other	<i>Requirement will be amended as follows</i> <b>"OLDI-ACT-200-M</b> <i>If a corresponding flight plan cannot be found and the sector responsible for accepting control of</i>	Accepted	ROMATSA

ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
		requirements.	requirements.	requirements).	<i>the flight can be identified, the operational content of the message <b>shall</b> be displayed at the appropriate working position."</i>		
17	OLDI 6.5.5.2 Example 2 (MAC message) page 41	typographic: The second MAC example in ADEXP format refers statreason ADEXP subfield of cstat primary field. -STATREASON ROUTE "RTE" string should be used instead of "ROUTE" since OLDI-MAC-110-M mentions "RTE" as a possible text string for change of route. ADEXP standard doesn't mention possible predefined text strings foreseen for statreason subfield, the MAC	For using pre-defined text for string constant from OLDI document standard.	To modify second ADEXP MAC example by replacing "ROUTE" with "RTE". -STATREASON RTE	<i>According to ADEXP, statreason is a string of 3 to 7 characters and for consistency, the example of 6.5.5.2 will be aligned with OLDI-MAC-110-M.</i>	Accepted	ROMATSA

<b>ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)</b>							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
		example should be according OLDI-MAC-110-M .					
18	OLDI A.16.2 ADEXP Primary field cstat page 138 OLDI-FC-CSR-40-M	typographic: Instead of ADEXP subfields name coorstatusident and coorstatusreason are written coordstatusident and coordstatusident.	To correct field names.	OLDI-FC-CSR-40-M Auxiliary items “coorstatusident” and “coorstatusreason” shall contain the new status and reason as specified above respectively.	<i>The typos in OLDI-FC-CSR-40-M will be corrected for auxiliary items “coorstatusident” and “coorstatusreason” as proposed.</i>	Accepted	ROMATSA
19	OLDI 7.3.2 Message Contents OLDI-CFD-30-O and OLDI 7.3.6 Message example page 52,53	OLDI-CFD-30-O is missing field Equipment Capability and Status (ADEXP eqcst field) which is included in CFD message example (eqcst was also included in previous OLDI standard version CFD exemple). If Equipment	Possible useful field is present in message example, but missing from optional requirement.	Equipment Capability and Status to be added as an optional CFD field at OLDI-CFD-30-O. If there is a justification for not allowing Equipment Capability and	<i>Agreed to update the CFD message to optionally include the equipment capability and status by amending CFD-30-O as follows:</i>  <i><b>“OLDI-CFD-30-O The CFD message may contain the following items of data:</b></i> • Sector Identifier;	Accepted	ROMATSA

ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
		Capability and Status is foreseen for CFD by the OLDI standard (as an option, bilaterally agreed) equipment changes could be transmitted by means of automatic CFD messages, in a similar way to REV.		Status to be transmitted in CFD message, to correct the example from CFD message by removing Equipment Capability and Status.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Previous SSR Mode and Code;</i></li> <li>• <i>Next SSR Mode and Code.</i></li> <li>• <i>Estimated Off-Block Time;</i></li> <li>• <i>Equipment Capability and Status.</i></li> </ul> <b>Note:</b> (..)”.		
20	- OLDI 8.2.3.1 Processing General OLDI-XIN-30-M page 56 - OLDI 8.3.3.1 Processing General OLDI-XRQ-30-M page 58	typographic : "Route" element mentioned in requirements OLDI-XIN-30-M and OLDI-XRQ-30-M refers to "Route Points" field.	To be more specific about the field used.	OLDI-XIN-30-M OLDI-XRQ-30-M The Route Points element shall contain a description of the crossing route including at least two points.	<i>Agreed. for consistency, "Route element" will be replaced by "Route points element" in OLDI-XIN-30-M and OLDI-XRQ-30-M</i>	Accepted	ROMATSA
21	- OLDI 8.2.6 Message Example (XIN page 57)	The XIN / XRQ message examples refer to a formation flight (-NBARC 3).	Example contains different field than specified in message definition.	To modify XIN/XRQ examples by one of the following :	<i>The XIN example will be amended to describe the use of NBARC 1 and FL,</i>	Accepted	ROMATSA

ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
	- OLDI 8.3.6 Message Example (XRQ page 59)	According to OLDI-XIN-60-M / OLDI-XRQ-60-M inside ADEXP rtepts flight level block field (ADEXP flblock) has to be used for formation flights, instead of ADEXP fl subfield of pt field.		- To replace fl field with flblock field or - To replace number of aircraft with 1.	<p><i>while the XRQ example will described the use of NBARC 3 and FLBLOCK as follows. A missing dash preceding END RTEPTS in both examples was also noted:</i></p> <p>“-TITLE XIN (..) -ARCID AL25 (...) -NBARC 1. -BEGIN RTEPTS -PT -PTID GEO01 -TO 150500 -FL F230 -PT -PTID GEO02 -TO 150600 -FL F230 -END RTEPTS (...)”</p>		

ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
					“-TITLE XRQ (...) -ARCID DEUCE22. (...) -NBARC 3 (...) -BEGIN RTEPTS -PT -PTID GEO01 -TO 163000 -FLBLOCK -FL F245 -FL F255 -PT -PTID GEO02 -TO 163100 -FLBLOCK -FL F255 -FL F265 -END RTEPTS (...)”		
22	OLDI 8.6.3.1 SBY Rules of Application, General OLDI-SBY-20- M page 63	typographic : CRQ message doesn't appear in the list of messages that are acknowledged by SBY message.	For completeness of message specification.	To add CRQ message as a separate bulleted item or to mention CRQ in the first bulleted list of messages from OLDI-SBY-20-M.	Agreed to add CRQ to the first bullet of OLDI-SBY-20-M as proposed:  <b>“OLDI-SBY-20-M</b> The SBY message <b>shall</b> be generated and transmitted automatically	Accepted	ROMATSA

ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
				Example: OLDI-SBY-20-M The SBY message shall be generated and transmitted automatically immediately in response to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a RAP, RRV, RTI, TIP, CRQ or CDN message;</li> <li>• a XAP or XRQ message</li> <li>• an ACT or REV message which fails the filter.</li> </ul>	<i>immediately in response to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a RAP, RRV, RTI, TIP, CRQ or CDN message;</li> <li>• a XAP or XRQ message;</li> <li>• an ACT or REV message which fails the filter.</li> </ul>		
23	- OLDI 12.2.2 Message contents OLDI-CRQ-20-M page 91 - ADEXP par 4.2.8, 4.3.6, 4.3.7, A.3 , A.4	From OLDI-CRQ-20-M it results that optional Transfer Flight Level field (ADEXP tfl subfield) can be used as a primary ADEXP field on first ADEXP level	Definition of optional Transfer Flight Level field in CRQ message (primary ADEXP field) not consistent with ADEXP tfl definition (not a primary ADEXP field).	To exclude Transfer Flight Level field (ADEXP tfl subfield) from optional level fields definition in OLDI-CRQ-20-M.	<i>This issue has been discussed by OLDI group. It was concluded that TFL and RFL can be used. We cannot exclude TFL/RFL as it is required in cases of Estimated Take-Off</i>	Accepted	ROMATSA

ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
		<p>in CRQ message. According to ADEXP standard tfl is not a primary field, it is a basic subfield of primary fields coordata and propfl. coordata primary field is already defined as a field of CRQ message and it includes Transfer Flight Level (tfl) (if Estimate Data is selected to be sent in CRQ) by OLDI-CRQ-10-M. The CRQ message definition and also CRQ example should be revised.</p>		<p>Requested Flight Level(ADEXP rfl primary field) to be kept as an optional level field in OLDICRQ-20-M. Another proposal could be to include tfl into ADEXP primary fields category, in this case the change would have a bigger impact, many messages and systems would be affected (also ADEXP paragraphs 4.3.6 and 4.3.7 have to be modified). To update the CRQ example accordingly.</p>	<p><i>Time which is without flight level. Indeed TFL is not primary field. ADEXP format does restrict the usage of subfield, but indeed a common practice is to start with the primary field. To be on the safe side, TFL will be used in case of estimated data as it is part of "coordata" field. In case of Estimated Take-off Time only RFL to be used as bilaterally agreed field. As TFL is a sub-field and there are no strict requirements for the usage of primary field, we propose not to risk with TFL as subfield. The updated requirement:</i></p> <p><i>It is proposed that OLDI-CRQ-20-M is to</i></p>		



ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
					<p><i>be amended as follows:</i>  <b>“OLDI-CRQ-20-M</b> <i>If bilaterally agreed, the CRQ message shall contain any of the following items of data:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Message Reference;</i></li> <li>• <i>Estimated Off-Block Time;</i></li> <li>• <i>Departure Runway;</i></li> <li>• <i>Requested Flight Level (if the estimate data are not in the message);</i></li> <li>• <i>Number and Type of Aircraft;</i></li> <li>• <i>SID or COP (if the estimate data are not in the message);</i></li> <li>• <i>Route.”</i></li> </ul> <p><i>In addition, the examples will be updated.</i></p>		
24	- OLDI 12.2.2 Message contents	typographic : Departure Runway field is on the same	To keep text formatting consistency with the rest of the document and to avoid	For OLDI-CRQ-20-M	<i>The typo will be corrected.</i>	Accepted	ROMATSA

<b>ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)</b>							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
	OLDI-CRQ-20-M page 91	line (bullet) with other optional fields (level).	possible ambiguity (about inserting Departure Runway when other fields are present in CRQ message).	Departure Runway field to be written on separate line (bullet) from the other optional fields.			
25	- OLDI 12.2.3 Rules of application OLDI-CRQ-90-M page 92	typographic : for final text of OLDI-CRQ-90-M below: "(and optionally a flight level in the format of estimate data" This text remained from previous document version, it should be removed because the flight level is mandatory field in Estimate Data (ref OLDI-FC-ESTD-10-M ).	To eliminate ambiguity of field content specifying.	OLDI-CRQ-90-M A message sent in accordance with requirement OLDI-CRQ-80-M shall contain the estimate data (refer to OLDI-FC-ESTD-10-M).	<i>Agreed to remove the text "(and optionally a flight level in the format of estimate data)" from OLDI-CRQ-90-M as proposed.</i>	<b>Accepted</b>	ROMATSA

<b>ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)</b>							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
26	- OLDI 12.2.3 Rules of application OLDI-CRQ-120 -M page 92	typographic : Letter 'l' in requirement number should be removed : OLDI-CRQI-120-M	text accuracy	OLDI-CRQ-120-M	<i>The typo will be corrected as proposed.</i>	Accepted	ROMATSA
27	- OLDI 12.3.2 Message contents OLDI-CRP-10-M page 95 - ADEXP par 4.2.8, 4.3.6, 4.3.7, A.3 , A.4	Similar comment as in Form No. 12 : From OLDI-CRP-10-M it results that optional Transfer Flight Level field (ADEXP tfl subfield) can be used as a primary ADEXP field on first ADEXP level in CRP message. According to ADEXP standard tfl is not a primary field, it is a basic subfield of primary fields coordata and propfl. Proposed Transfer Flight Level field (ADEXP propfl primary field) is foreseen in ADEXP	Definition of optional Transfer Flight Level field in CRP message (primary ADEXP field) not consistent with ADEXP tfl definition (not a primary ADEXP field).	In OLDI-CRP-10-M to replace Transfer Flight Level field (ADEXP tfl subfield) with Proposed Transfer Flight Level field (ADEXP propfl primary field). To update the first CRP example accordingly.	<i>This issue has been discussed by the OLDI group. It was concluded that TFL can be used. The real content of CRQ will be the transfer Flight level (TFL) contained in PROPFL field.</i>  <i>The example will be changed using PROPFL and TFL items.</i>	Accepted	ROMATSA

<b>ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)</b>							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
		standard to be sent from accepting to transferring unit, it is more appropriate be used in CRP message, instead tfl. The first CRP example in OLDI document should be revised : tfl subfield is inserted as a primary ADEXP field.					
28	OLDI 14.6.2 Message Contents OLDI-CDN-20-M page 111	typographic : Route and Direct Routing Request fields are mutual exclusive in CDN message, but written on different bulleted lines. As other mutual exclusive fields they should be written on the same line separated by "or".	For uniformity of text formatting and clear field usage.	For OLDI-CDN-20-M to be specified on the same bulleted line : • Route or Direct Routing Request.	<i>Accepted as "Route or Direct Routing Request"</i>	Accepted	ROMATSA
29	OLDI 15.2.3.2	OLDI-TIM-70-M text	For uniformity of	OLDI-TIM-70-M	<i>This issue has been</i>	Accepted	ROMATSA

ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
	Criteria for Message Transmission OLDI-TIM-70-M page 120	should be kept from previous OLDI standard version(4.2). In draft 4.3 version it refers to an "Adaptation Data Parameter". "Adaptation Data" term can be particular to some systems, it is not a general term. "Adaptation Data Parameter" should be replaced with "Variable System Parameter" , which is more general. The term "System Parameter" is already used in many other places in the standard document.	terminology	The TIM generation parameter <b>shall</b> be Variable System Parameter which may be changed, based on the provisions of the LoAs.	<p><i>discussed by the OLDI group and we agree to change the wording. In order to satisfy your change request we propose to reformulate OLDI-TIM-70-M as follows:</i></p> <p><b><i>“OLDI-TIM-70-M The TIM generation parameter shall be the system parameter which may be changed, based on the provisions of the LoAs.”</i></b></p> <p><i>In addition, we will add a note to OLDI-TIM-70-M as follows:</i></p> <p><b><i>“Note : The system parameters in the context of the OLDI specification and particularly for TIM message (OLDI-TIM-70-M , OLDI-TIM-80-R, OLDI-TIM-100-M) are</i></b></p>		

ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
					<i>considered to the adaptation data parameters that are modifiable off-line."</i>		
30	OLDI 15.3.2.1 Messages from the Transferring Unit OLDI-SDM-20-M page 121	Fields - Assigned Heading/Track or Direct Clearance - Assigned Speed - Assigned Rate of Climb/Descent are specified to be present in TIM message if bilaterally agreed, for SDM message they are specified as mandatory ("shall") in OLDI-SDM-20-M.	Fields - Assigned Heading/Track or Direct Clearance - Assigned Speed - Assigned Rate of Climb/Descent are specified to be present in TIM message if bilaterally agreed, for SDM message they are specified as mandatory ("shall") in OLDI-SDM-20-M.	Fields Assigned Heading/Track or Direct Clearance, Assigned Speed , Assigned Rate of Climb/Descent to be specified as "bilateral agreed" in SDM as in TIM, by moving them from OLDI-SDM-20-M to OLDI-SDM-30-M. Example : OLDI-SDM-30-M If bilaterally agreed, the SDM message shall contain any of the following items of data if they have changed :	<i>When preparing the draft Specification the SDM message content was reassessed by experts of the OLDI Task Force.  At this stage, we cannot identify a need that SDM and TIM messages should have the same structure. It can be considered for a future edition of OLDI specification.</i>	<b>Rejected</b>	ROMATSA

ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assigned Heading/Track or Direct Clearance;</li> <li>Assigned Speed;</li> <li>Assigned Rate of Climb/Descent;</li> <li>Route</li> </ul>			
31	OLDI A.9.2 Level Data OLDI-FC-EST D-60-M page 135	<p>OLDI-FC-ESTD-60-M is about crossing condition in supplementary flight level describes the two cases below :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Letter 'A'; if the flight will be at or above the transfer flight level; or</li> <li>Letter 'B'; if the flight will be at or below the transfer flight level.</li> </ul> <p>The text is ambiguous because it specifies that letters 'A' and 'B' refer to transfer flight level which is a different standard field from supplementary flight</p>	To avoid ambiguity and possible wrong interpretation of field usage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Letter 'A'; if the flight will be at or above the supplementary flight level; or</li> <li>Letter 'B'; if the flight will be at or below the supplementary flight level.</li> </ul>	<i>Indeed, the crossing conditions are related to SFL not to TFL. The update will be done in all paragraphs where the crossing conditions are mentioned.</i>	Accepted	ROMATSA

<b>ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)</b>							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
		level (referred by OLDI-FCESTD-60-M). According to the supplementary flight level definition from ICAO field 14 (ICAO 4444 doc), and also from ADEXP standard definition of sfl field , the crossing condition should refer to supplementary crossing level.					
32	OLDI A.21.1 Direct Routing Request, ICAO OLDI-FC-DRT R-20-M page 139	typographic : The text of OLDI-FC-DRTR-20-M should be further indented to be clear which fields are possible choices. Bullets 1, 5, 6 should be on the same indentation level (first level), bullets 2,3,4,7,8 should be on the same	To avoid ambiguity and possible wrong interpretation of optional fields.	proposed text indentation OLDI-FC-DRTR-20-M It shall contain: • the point at which the deviation is requested to commence, defined as one of: • a known reference point;	<i>Agreed the bullet points will be aligned as proposed.</i>	Accepted	ROMATSA



ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
		indentation level (second level).		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a range and bearing from a known reference point;</li> <li>• the value "ZZZ" if a direct routing is being requested by the receiving ATC unit.</li> <li>• the abbreviation 'DCT',</li> <li>• the point situated on the original flight plan route to which the aircraft is requested to be cleared, defined as:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a known reference point; or</li> <li>• a range and bearing from a known reference point.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			

ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
33	OLDI A.12 Number and Type of Aircraft A.12.2 page 136	From A.12.2 : Primary field 'wktrc' is used for the indication of wake turbulence category. The above statement doesn't clarify if field wktrc is mandatory to be used when field arctyp is used or wktrc can be omitted from the message when arctyp is used. ADEXP standard doesn't specify that arctyp field has to be used with wktrc field. A "bilaterally agreed" clause could be added in order to have the possibility to configure wktrc to be used or not for a particular OLDI message type and OLDI connection.	To avoid ambiguity and possible wrong interpretation of field wktrc usage.	proposed text : If bilaterally agreed, primary field 'wktrc' is used for the indication of wake turbulence category.	<i>Agreed to amend A.12.2 as proposed: "If bilaterally agreed, the primary field 'wktrc' is used for the indication of wake turbulence category."</i>	Accepted	ROMATSA
34	OLDI A.14	1) The fields to be	For consistency of field	1) A.14.1 ICAO last	<i>Agreed to add NAV</i>	Accepted	ROMATSA

ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
	Other Flight Plan Data (page 137) OLDI A.32 Equipment Capability and Status (page 142)	used for RNAV information exchange in OLDI messages are detailed in A.32 section. Pseudo field number 81 (FPL F10a) and PBN indicator of F18 are mentioned for ICAO format. For ADEXP subfield eqpt (inside eqcst field) and pbn field are recommended to be used. According to ICAO 4444 doc, for RNAV equipment also NAV indicator of F18 is to be used in case PBN indicator length in F18 is more than 16 characters. In order to comply with 4444 doc, NAV indicator should be added to the list of F18 elements in OLDI A.14 section. 2) In A.14.1 RALT	usage and to align OLDI standard specification with other standard documents.	sentence to be modified to : One or more of the following field type 18 elements in field type 22 format: REG, OPR, STS, TYP, PER, DEP, DEST, ALTN, RALT, RMK, NAV. 2) A.14.2 ADEXP to be modified to : Primary fields: "fltrul", "depz", "destz", "opr", "per", "reg", "rmk", "altrnt1", "altrnt2", "sts", "typz", nav, ralt. We can not change OLDI-FC-EQCS-6 0-M as it mimics ICAO 4444.	and RALT in the list of permissible items  <i>It is proposed to add additional bullet points to A.14:</i> • en-route alternate aerodrome(s) • navigation equipment, other than specified in PBN."  And to amend A.14.1 and A.14.2 as proposed: <i>"A.14.1 ICAO Field type 8, element (a) Flight Rules in field type 22 format. One or more of the following field type 18 elements in field type 22 format: REG, OPR, STS, TYP, PER, DEP, DEST, ALTN, RALT, RMK, NAV.</i>  <i>A.14.2 ADEXP Primary fields: "fltrul", "depz", "destz", "opr",</i>		

<b>ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)</b>							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
		indication is present in ICAO F18 indicators, but similar ADEXP field ralt is missing from A.14.2.			<p><i>"per", "reg", "rmk", "altrnt1", "altrnt2", "sts", "typz", "ralt", "nav".</i></p> <p><i>As noted, we cannot change OLDI-FC-EQCS-60-M as it mimics ICAO Doc 4444.</i></p>		
35	OLDI A.23 Planned Transfer Position page 140 OLDI-FC-POS-50-M, OLDI-FC-POS-80-M, OLDI-FC-POS-90-M	For Planned Transfer Position field : OLDI-FC-POS-50-M refers to "current position" instead of "planned transfer position". OLDI-FC-POS-80-M refers to position primary field instead of plannedposition . OLDI-FC-POS-90-M is missing cto subfield which is mandatory for plannedposition field, according to ADEXP definition of	For accuracy of formal field description.	To update the following field content requirements : OLDI-FC-POS-50-M The planned position of the flight shall be included by the use of the "plannedposition" primary field. OLDI-FC-POS-80-M Primary field "plannedposition" shall contain the subfield "ptid"	<i>Agreed, the requirements should refer to the planned position, not the current position, and the 'cto' sub-field should be used in OLDI-FC-POS-90-M. The following amendments are proposed: <b>"OLDI-FC-POS-50-M</b> <i>The planned position of the flight shall be included by the use of the "plannedposition" primary field."</i> <b>"OLDI-FC-POS-80-M</b></i>	<b>Accepted</b>	ROMATSA

<b>ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)</b>							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
		plannedposition .		which refers to the defined reference or geographic point. OLDI-FC-POS-90-M If time information is to be included, 'cto' subfield shall be used. Either sub-field 'to' (hhmm) or 'sto' (hhmmss) shall be used, as bilaterally agreed.	<i>Primary field "plannedposition" shall contain the subfield "ptid" which refers to the defined reference or geographic point. "OLDI-FC-POS-90-M If time information is to be included, either 'cto' subfield either sub-field 'to' (hhmm) or 'sto' (hhmmss) can be used, as bilaterally agreed."</i>		
36	OLDI-GEN-380-R, pag.22	OLDI-GEN-380-R Whenever inserted in OLDI messages the item Route is supposed to contain the current operational data and as such should be based on the most up to	Operational reason: to have the latest information available (route changes performed by the Upstream ATSU – reflected in the OLDI route field). If the route field is only "supposed" to contain the latest information, the	OLDI-GEN-380-R Whenever inserted in OLDI messages the item shall contain the current operational data and as such shall be based on	<i>Agreed, the proposed rewording is accepted</i>	Accepted	ROMATSA

ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
		date information available.	implementation in adjacent ATSUs could be different. The requirements must be clear, in order to not to leave room for divergent implementations.	the most up to date information available.			
37	4.7 Operational Evaluation 4.4 Route Data to be detailed in OLDI Guidelines	Reference is made to Annex G – Test and validation procedures, but the Annex has been removed. Note: The evaluation will be done in accordance with the Test and Validation Procedures outlined in Annex G of this document. Although general, the procedures described in former Annex G are very useful for interoperability tests, they should be kept in other official document. Also route processing	Annex G is a guideline for testing and validation. Route processing is very important for operational use, hence during testing and validation route requires more detailed specification (further route is present or not, return to original route or not, etc).	To delete former Annex G reference from new OLDI standard version . To insert in a Guidelines document : - Former annex G – Test and validation procedures - More detailed requirements describing route field processing by the Receiving Unit	<i>Agreed to remove the note from requirement OLDI-GEN-480-M as the new Annex G is related to OLDI within FRA.</i>  <i>It is to be noted that the content of future OLDI guidance material is not fully defined. However, it there is an intention to cover route processing, test and validation processes may also be considered.</i>	Accepted	ROMATSA

ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
		is an important interoperability issue and needs to be considered in more detail, in another official document.					
38	F.1 State Transition Diagrams, Figure F-1, Figure F-2	<p>1) Discrepancy between Figure F1 and Figure F2 in terms of PAC, states Pre-Notify -&gt; Co-ordinating (It is needed to add Transmit _PAC between Pre-Notify and Co-ordinating states in F1)</p> <p>2) Because revised PAC could be sent after a PAC was sent, also because ACT is to be sent after PAC, a new link should be added from Co-ordinated status to Co-ordinating status in both F1 and</p>	The flow must be aligned in the 2 diagrams.	<p>- To add Transmit _PAC between Pre-Notify and Co-ordinating states in F1</p> <p>- To add a link for Revised PAC and ACT after takeoff, from Co-ordinated status to Coordinating status in both F1 and F2 .</p>	<p><i>As indicated in the second paragraph of Annex F, not all cases are illustrated. To avoid any mis-interpretation it is proposed to add a note before the diagram as follows:</i></p> <p><b>Note:</b> <i>The flight plan state transition depends of many factors linked with the local deployment modalities. Figure-F1 illustrates the possible flight plan state transitions triggered by transmission of OLDI messages. Figure-F2 illustrates the</i></p>	Partially accepted	ROMATSA

<b>ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)</b>							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
		F2 . For F1 the events for the link can be labelled "Transmit_Revised_PAC", "Transmit_ACT_after_takeoff" For F2 similar events should be specified.			<i>possible flight plan state transitions triggered by reception of OLDI messages.</i>  <i>It is agreed to amend Figure F1 with a PAC transmission. The revised PAC and ACT after-take-off are too detailed triggers for transition from one state to another, we deemed inappropriate to be included.</i>		
39	All pages footer	The edition number of the document is incorrect.		Please change the edition number to 4.3	<i>Agreed, the edition number will be changed</i>	Accepted	DFS
40	Page 44 Chapter 6.6.5.1 Page 93 Chapter 12.2.6.1	The chapter 6.6.5.1 contains the message CRQ and PAC, but in chapter 12.2.6.1 is only CRP/CRQ involved. What happens with PAC? Which declaration is	6.6.5.1. Boundary Estimate Data Format Requirement OLDI-ACT-60-M identifies that an ACT message is sent following the departure of a flight previously co-ordinated by	Clarify text.	<i>Both declarations are valid depending on the message sequence that is used.</i> <i>The requirement OLDI-60-M stated that ACT can be sent</i>	Noted	DFS



ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for On-Line Data Interchange</b>							
		valid?	the use of a PAC message using boundary estimate data. 12.2.6.1 En-route Point (COP) Format Requirement OLDI-ACT-60-M identifies that an ACT message is sent following the departure of a flight previously co-ordinated by the use of a CRQ message using an en-route point. Where a co-ordination dialogue procedure is in use, no further dialogue other than the CRP/CRQ takes place, i.e. such flights are ineligible for referral for acceptance by the receiving unit.		<i>if PAC or CRQ have been previously transmitted. In cases where PAC is used if the notification or co-ordination is required, paragraph 6.6. defines PAC message and relevant events and 6.6.5.1 elaborate the case of ACT transmission after PAC. Similarly in cases where CRQ is used if ATC clearance from another unit is required, paragraph 12.2 defines CRQ message and relevant events and 12.2.6.1 elaborate the case of ACT transmission after CRQ.</i>		

ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for ATS Data Exchange Presentation (ADEXP)</b>							
1	Page 43	There is no description for 'ifps discrepance'	The user doesn't know what this field is.	Add a description.	The following semantic definition for 'ifpsdiscrepancy' (page 43) will be inserted : "Provides an indication of the information item(s) within the flight plan that are inconsistent with the information held within the system originating the message."	Accepted	LFV Sweden
2	Page 49	There is no description for 'vec'	The user won't know what this field is.	Add a description.	The following semantic text for 'vec' (page 49) will be inserted: "An unpublished point along the route of flight where a change to the trajectory (vector point) is performed. Typically this may be the initiation or achievement of a climb or descent phase of flight."	Accepted	LFV Sweden

ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for ATS Data Exchange Presentation (ADEXP)</b>							
					Additionally, upon verifying 'vec', it is noted that reldist is defined as a primary field instead of being defined as a subfield. Reldist will be moved from section A.3 (page 46) to section A.4 (page 54) to be defined as a subfield only used by primary field vec.		
3	A.2 ADEXP Auxiliary Terms table page 36 : point subfield definition connected to refname and geoname fields	ADEXP point subfield is syntactically defined as 2{ ALPHANUM }5 . It would be more appropriate to add refname, geoname and renameid as possible choices at the definition of point. In fact, the definition of point refers these three fields. It should be noted that if point field is left as 2{ ALPHANUM }5 , this definition would be not	For clarity of fields definition.	ADEXP point subfield to be defined as : 2{ ALPHANUM }5   refname   geoname   renameid	Auxiliary terms such as 'point' contain assigned values i.e. they are not subfields. The semantic definition of 'point' recognises that the assigned value may be a geo, ref or renamed identifier and the syntax allows for this. The syntax of point indicates it can contain from two to five alphanumerics. The syntax definition for geo or ref points	Partially Accepted	ROMATSA

ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for ATS Data Exchange Presentation (ADEXP)</b>							
		compliant with the usage of geoname, because geoname was modified to "GEO" ! 2{DIGIT}3.			<p>may be more specific, hence the use of additional specific auxiliary terms. As long as they remain within the syntax definition of 'point' there is no need to list them separately. To do so now would not be technically wrong but would introduce a redundancy which may be confusing for some.</p> <p>Additionally, upon verifying 'point', it is noted that mfx is missing from the list of primary fields using point. On page 36, the mfx field will be added to the list of primary fields that use point.</p>		
4	6. NORMALISED DESCRIPTION OF ADEXP MESSAGES-	Different definitions are present in Annex A and Annex D for same fields names: ref field is defined in	For uniqueness of field titles and avoidance of unnecessary	To delete refid field definition from Annex D. To add an explanation about re-defining ref	The 'ref' and 'refid' fields will be removed from Annex D.	Accepted	ROMATSA

ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for ATS Data Exchange Presentation (ADEXP)</b>							
	6.1.8 page 27	<p>A.3 ADEXP Primary Fields table.                      refid field is defined in A.4 ADEXP Subfields table.                      ref and refid fields are also defined in ANNEX D – CENTRAL INDEX OF RESERVED FIELDS (NORMATIVE) , although 6.1.8 paragraph emphasizes that reserved fields from Annex D have not been agreed for use within the currently defined ADEXP messages.                      refid definition from Annex D is the same as refid definition in Annex A.                      In Annex A : ref := ' - ' "REFID" refname refname:= "REF" ! 2{DIGIT}2                      In Annex D : refid := ' - ' "REFID"</p>	redundancy.	field in Annex D or to add ref field definition from Annex D as optional choice to ref field definition in Annex A.			

ESDP/17-002 ON THE DRAFT SPECIFICATION FOR ON-LINE DATA INTERCHANGE (OLDI) AND ATS DATA EXCHANGE PRESENTATION (ADEXP)							
#	§ No	Comment	Reason(s) for Comment	Proposed Change/Text	Response	Disposal	Organisation
<b>Draft Specification for ATS Data Exchange Presentation (ADEXP)</b>							
		'REF'!2{DIGIT}2					
5	E.4.3 Primary Fields Composition, Crossing Clearance Request Message page 81	In the XRQ example, FL must be expressed identically for both GEO points. - BEGIN RTEPTS -PT -PTID GEO01 -TO 1630 -FL F250 -PT -PTID GEO02 -TO 1631 -FL250 -END RTEPTS	For consistency reasons.	- BEGIN RTEPTS -PT -PTID GEO01 -TO 1630 -FL F250 -PT -PTID GEO02 -TO 1631 -FL F250 -END RTEPTS	The proposed corrections will be made in section E.4.3 on page 81.	Accepted	ROMATSA
6	Page 57 to 59 Table, column "Introduced in Section"	The reference in table "CENTRAL INDEX OF ADEXP MESSAGE TITLES (NORMATIVE)" column "Introduced in Section" is wrong.	i.e. ABI Advanced Boundary Information E.3 But the reference should be "E.4 ATC Co-ordination Messages"	Update of reference	All references in the 3rd column of the table in Annex B (pages 57-60) to Annex E will be verified and corrected accordingly.	Accepted	DFS