ID	Title
14	BIT-MASK Example is Wrong and Unclear Expression of Bit-Mask of Arbitrary Length
	Description
	Problem 1: <BIT-MASK>E07</BIT-MASK> at page 102 is not xml-schema conform. HexBinary values must have an even number of characters. Problem 2: According to checker rule 184, the BIT-MASK must be equal to the BIT-LENGTH of the DOP (data object property). How can a user express a BIT-MASK of a length that is not a multiple of 8? Using a bit mask that is longer than the DOP may probably create the intended result. Please note: • Such a file violates rules 184, is not standard conform and might be rejected by tools. • The behavior is not standardized and may change between different diagnostic tools.
ID	Title
15	LENGTH-KEY Example is Wrong
	Description
	The example for LENGTH-KEY parameter (chap. 7.4.8 page 220) is wrong. The example suggests that the physical value represents a byte-length, but it is a bit-length. The DOP (data object property) used in the figure is actually wrong. It should, as in the example in the annex, be a multiple of the value of 8.
ID	Title
16	Overwriting of Complex Comparams at Logical-Link Level Unclear
	Description
	Overwriting of complex comparams (e.g.ResponseIdTable) at the level of the Logical-Link is a important use case. But the logical link is mostly excluded from the documentation of comparam-inheritance documentation. Especially the documentation of the functional addressing (or base-variant- and variant-identification) should include the overwriting of ResponseIdTable at the Logical-Link. At least in section "7.4.9.4 Sequence of events for functional addressing" the meaning of "the entry found on BASE-VARIANT level" in subclause iii) is unclear. Does this actually include the comparameters set on all logical links pointing to that base variant? Similar problems will occur in the base variant identifications section. At runtime the base variants cannot actually be addressed. At runtime only logical links can be addressed.
ID	Title
65	The Meaning of IS-FINAL on a DIAG-COMM is Unclear
	Description
	Attribute IS-FINAL (page 72) shall prevent a DIAG-COMM from being changed in lower layers of the inheritance hierarchy. The ODX

	standard only prevents that DIAG-COMM itself from being overridden. It is unclear if contained parameters still may be changed, by overriding their respective DOPs (data object property). As the standard does not explicitly prohibits this, it seems to be allowed. This might be unintentional. To prevent your service from being overridden entirely, use only ODX-Links instead of SHORT-NAME-REFS when defining the “final” diag-comm.
ID	Title
99	Typo: Missing 'r' in Word 'potocol'
	Description
	Typing error of word "potocol" character "r" is missing. Location: Annex B Rule 39 (general): "At least one potocol layer shall exist in the inheritance hierarchy of DIAG-LAYERS."
ID	Title
100	Attribute CPTYPE is not Defined for COMPARAM "CP_ECULayerShortName"
	Description
	The attribute CPTYPE for COMPARAM "CP_ECULayerShortName" should be defined in chapter "7.4.9.2 COMMUNICATION ON THE VEHICLE BUS" with attribute value CPTYPE="STANDARD", but it is not. Note: The COMPARAM "CP_ECULayerShortName" is only defined within the ODX specification (ISO 22901-1) and not within the D-PDU API (ISO 22900-2). Therefore, the ODX specification has to contain all corresponding information e.g. its attributes. The other mandatory properties of COMPARAM (ID, PARAM-CLASS, CPUSAGE, and PHYSICAL-DEFAULT-VALUE) are already defined.
ID	Title
101	PARAM-CLASS of COMPARAM CP_ECULayerShortName Unclear
	Description
	There is a conflict between the statement (see chapter 7.4.9.3) "The PARAM-CLASS of the COMPLEX-COMPARAM and all contained COMPARAMs shall be set to UNIQUE_ID." and the defined checker rule 202 "The PARAM-CLASS of the COMPLEX-COMPARAM "CP_UniqueRespIdTable" and all contained COMPARAMs except for the "CP_ECULayerShortName" shall be set to UNIQUE_ID.". The text of checker rule 202 indicates that the PARAM-CLASS of COMPARAM “CP_ECULayerShortName” should not be “UNIQUE_ID”. That implication is wrong.
ID	Title
104	Missing Description for an Empty COMPLEX-PHYSICAL-DEFAULT-VALUE
	Description

	Currently the ODX specification (see 7.3.3 COMMUNICATION PARAMETER) doesn't contain any description about the semantics of an empty COMPLEX-PHYSICAL-DEFAULT-VALUE element. A description should be added: Suggestion: "An empty COMPLEX-PHYSICAL-DEFAULT-VALUE represents an empty D-PDU API structfield."
ID	Title
105	Typo: Double Word "the", "Id" with Lowercase
	Description
	The chapter 7.3.3 COMMUNICATION PARAMETER contains following sentence: "This is needed, e.g. in the use case of functional addressing, where the the CAN-Ids of multiple responding ECUs have to be set up."
ID	Title
106	Checker Rule 180: ODX Element "VEHICLE-INFORMATION-CONNECTOR" Does Not Exist
	Description
	Currently rule no. 180 contains an ODX element "VEHICLE-INFORMATION-CONNECTOR" which does not exist within the ODX specification. The connection between function dictionary and vehicle information indeed does not seem to exist. Rule 180 is thus superfluous and should be removed.
ID	Title
107	Checker Rules 181, 182: ODX Element "VEHICLE-INFORMATION-CONNECTOR" Does Not Exist
	Description
	Currently rule no. 181 and no. 182 contains an ODX element "VEHICLE-INFORMATION-CONNECTOR" which does not exist within the ODX specification. It seems that VEHICLE-INFORMATION-CONNECTOR has to be replaced by the ODX element COMPONENT-CONNECTOR. Furthermore the element EXECUTABLE-REF, DIAG-LAYER-CONNECTOR (should be replaced with DIAG-OBJECT-COINNECTOR), EXECUTABLE-REF and DIAG-VARIABLE does not exists within package FUNCTION-DICTIONARY and seems to be false, too. The rules should be redefined to again describe the necessary consistency check.
ID	Title
108	Checker Rule 236 is a duplicate of rule 226
	Description
	The description of rule no. 236 is a 1 to 1 subset of definition of rule no. 226. Therefore, I suggest removing rule 236. In addition rule 236 references COMPU-SCALE/V, a constellation that is forbidden by the schema.
ID	Title
109	Clarification of STANDARD-LENGTH-TYPE for String DOPs
	Description

	The description of STANDARD-LENGTH-TYPE (chapter 7.3.6.2 SIMPLE DATA - DATA-OBJECT-PROP p. 95) seems to be too restrictive for string types. It claims “If a provided value is shorter than the specified length, an error has to be signaled.” This will prevent the text "AB" to be assigned to a 5 byte ASCII parameter. Yet that statement is unclear. • Interpretation 1: The provided value "AB" is indeed "shorter than the specified length" and an error shall be signaled. • Interpretation 2: The provided value "AB" is just a shortcut literal for "AB<TERM><TERM><TERM>" and thus has the required length. It will be written as 0x41 0x42 0x00 0x00 0x00. • Interpretation 3: The provided value "AB" is the unrestricted physical value. In mapping it IDENTICAL to the internal value the result is 0x00 0x00 0x00 0x41 0x42 (or any other natural/obvious mapping). To be on the safe side now provide a text of the requested length, e.g. "AB ".
ID	Title
110	Table A.15 DATAFORMAT-SELECTION Does Not List USER-DEFINED
	Description
	The table A.15 Enumeration "DATAFORMAT-SELECTION" does not list the value "USER-DEFINED". This value is defined in the schema and used in the DATAFORMAT class used in the flash context. The DATAFORMAT-SELECTION type is also used in the context of ECU configuration as an attribute of DATA-RECORD. Here, according to the text, the value USER-DEFINED is not allowed (all other values are listed).
ID	Title
239	TRANSMISSION-MODE: Make Clear That Negative Responses are Handled Just As Positive Ones
	Description
	Sec. 7.3.5.3 TRANSMISSION-MODE In the descriptive texts of TRANSMISSION modes RECEIVE-ONLY and SEND-AND-RECEIVE, only positive responses are mentioned, although solely negative responses are also valid. It is assumed, that a D-Server will work as described below. ASAM MCD-2 D V2.2 p. 74: Replace: RECEIVE-ONLY (The D-server will not send a request message. But shall listen for one of the referenced positive responses.) By: RECEIVE-ONLY (The D-server will not send a request message. But shall listen for one of the referenced responses.) Replace:

	SEND-AND-RECEIVE (That is the regular diagnostic service. The D-server sends a request message and will listen for one of the referenced positive responses.) By: SEND-AND-RECEIVE (That is the regular diagnostic service. The D-server sends a request message and will listen for one of the referenced responses.)
ID	Title
3693	Examples of FACTOR-SI-TO-UNIT Are Inconsistent and Description is Unclear
	Description
	It is unclear what the correct interpretation of FACTOR-SI-TO-UNIT is. Although the standard already tries to describe the meaning of that field in detail, different interpretations occur in the field and questions arise. For example, some readers expect FACTOR-SI-TO-UNIT for unit km/h to be 3.6, because 1m/s equals 3.6km/h. Others claim it to be 0.2777, because 0.2777m/s equal 1km/h. ODX 2.2.0 tells us on page 127 that 0.2777 is correct. ODX 2.0.0 tells us on page 84 that 3.6 is correct. ODX 2.0.1 tells us on page 89 that 3.6 is correct. ODX 2.2.0 shows in examples on pages 104 and 417 to use factor 3.6. Additional examples using the interpretation of ODX 2.0 can be found in ODX 2.2.0: p. 194: FACTOR-SI-TO-UNIT for Revolutions per Minute is 60 (not 0.01666) p. 417: FACTOR-SI-TO-UNIT for Revolutions per Minute is 60 (not 0.01666) p. 417: FACTOR-SI-TO-UNIT for Kilometer is 0.001 (not 1000) The description of FACTOR-SI-TO-UNIT was changed between ODX 2.0.1 and ODX 2.2.0. Thus, it can be assumed that the change in interpretation was intended. In ODX_RS_UNIT_LIB.odx-d the correct value 0.2777 is used.
ID	Title
	Description

About This Document

This document lists known issues for the standard and version as identified in the document header. Issues in the context of ASAM standards have one of the following characteristics:

- Error: unintended or wrong content.
- Contradiction: inconsistent or contradictory content.
- Specification gap: missing content required for a functional system and for complete understanding.
- Lack of clarity: Unclear, vague or ambiguous description, which leads to misunderstandings and misinterpretations.

The issue may exist in the base standard, in associate standards, schema files, interface definition files, model files, examples or any other supplements of the standard.

For each issue, the table contains an ID, title and description.

ID: Unique identification number assigned by the ASAM change request system.

Title: Summary of the issue description in headline style

Description: Identifies the parts of the standard that are affected by the issue, provides a reason why this is considered as an issue and allows the reader to understand the technical implications of the issue. Optionally, the description includes a resolution proposal and a proposed workaround for the issue.

Issue are resolved in the release of a new version of a standard. Please regularly check ASAM's web page and news publications to stay informed about new versions. If an issue has been resolved in a new version, then it is not listed in the List of Known Issues document for this version any longer.

The List of Known Issues document for former versions of the same standard will be frozen and will not be further maintained. ASAM advises all users of its standards to always use the latest version of its standards.