This looks like a very useful RFP and certainly something that will be used.

The specification is well written and detailed. The concepts need to be defined as there are several undefined terms.

The following are my comments on the specifications.

Objective of this RFP

There is an inconsistency in terminology in the first section. The first paragraph refers to the “spacecraft scheduling products” and the bullet points reference a “spacecraft contact schedule”. This should be normalized or at least explained.

The first paragraph references “products”: are these all bespoke products or is there also a wide variety of standards as well?

Also, is there an international collaboration aspect to this as well? If so, this should be mentioned as another complicating factor. If not, is this a US standard only?

Also, should there be an interchange standard as well as a consistent model? Otherwise there will be no inter-operability.

Section 6.1

Possibly this is common terminology, but ephemeris propagator should be in the glossary.

Section 6.2

The sentence “A Platform Independent Model (PIM)….” contains a list enclosed in parentheses. The parentheses are not needed.

The scope should also contain an example of the schedule for the PIM and PSM.

Section 6.3.1

What is meant by “for reference as to outcome”?

Section 6.4

CCSDS should be defined.

Section 6.5.3.1

What is an IRON? Also further on an ERP, PRN, TLE, etc. Basically, all acronyms should be defined.

Section 6.5.4.1

“The minimum information required for a dissemination model entry shall be like the descriptions of the information required in the request - the only difference being the dissemination model conveys the adjudicated schedule.”

I am not sure what this means. To many references and clauses. Please clarify.

Section 6.8

The timetable allows for only one meeting cycle for submission. At least two are required to allow for a well-crafted specification as well as to ensure that responders have time to create their specification.

Section A.1 References

I am surprised that there are no references to this specification, given the well-established nature of the technology.

Section A.2 Glossary

This really needs a glossary due to the specialist language and domain terminology.