| **Pg** | **Sec** | **Para** | **Line** | **Type** | **Comment/ Rationale** | **Reviewer (Name/Agency)** | **Suggested Disposition** | **Final Disposition**  **(Do Not Fill In)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3-10 | 3.2 | 2 | 4 | ed, te | The wording in the note is supposed to indicate that processed data as well as raw data. This is properly included in the NOTE but it might be better to add an explicit statement. | J.Hashmall/NASA/GSFC | Consider the following change:  From “Any piece of information can be treated …”  To “Any piece of information (including processed data”) can be treated …” | **Rejected.** Any type of information includes raw and processed data. |
| 3-11 | 3.2 | 3 | 5 | ed | “Agency Center” should start on a new line | J.Hashmall/NASA/GSFC | Add carriage return | **Accepted.** |
| 3-12 to 3-13 | 3.3.1 | all |  | Te | Examples a) and b) of characteristics given are not the most important characteristics and the description of a) doesn’t really center on the heading (division of data). B) is better than a) and C is great as is. | J.Hashmall/NASA/GSFC | Consider whether a) should be replaced by some description of the data content---perhaps divided between spacecraft data (e.g. position, velocity, attitude, etc.) and mission data (anything that might be put in an ICD and which normally doesn’t change within a mission (e.g. units, spacecraft structure, mission specific terms, etc.). If you decide to keep the characteristic of session division, it should be put near the end of the list. | **Deferred.** These changes were considered, but deemed unnecessary at this time. |
| 3-13 | 3.3.1 | Fig 3-3 |  | te,ed | I don’t understand why the data transfers in b) is from Operations Center to Operations Center while that in a) is from Flight Dynamics Center to Flight Dynamics Center. Different agencies may call the same operational organization by different names but we should at least be consistent. | J.Hashmall/NASA/GSFC | Change “Flight Dynamics Center” (which isn’t defined) to “Operations Center”. Perhaps bith should be changed to “Agency Center” which is defined in section 3-2. | **Accepted.** Changed to Operations Center. |
| 3-13 | 3.3.1 | Fig 3-3b |  | te | I don’t think that exchange of an ICD is an “event” in the same sense as exchange of spacecraft data. | J.Hashmall/NASA/GSFC | Suggest you eliminate “Event” or find a different word for it. | **Deferred.** These changes were considered, but deemed unnecessary at this time |
| 3-14 |  | Fig 3-4 |  | te | This is a good figure but the same comments as for Fig 3-3 apply. | J.Hashmall/NASA/GSFC | Change “Flight Dynamics Center” to “Operations Center” | **Accepted.** Changed to Operations Center. |
| 4-24-4-25 |  | 4.4 |  | te | The contents of this section were intended as discussion points. It should be cut down and rewritten (or eliminated). The intention was that it should be discussed and the conclusions put in the green book. We discussed it in the Spring 2015 meeting but no conclusions were made. | J.Hashmall/NASA/GSFC | Eliminate or completely rewrite the section. | **Accepted.** Removed during the CCSDS Spring 2015 meetings. |
| 4-28 to 4-29 | 4.5 | 1 and 2 and Fig 4-5 and 4-6 |  |  | Fig 4-6 was intended to replace 4-5. There is no reason not to keep both if you wish. | J.Hashmall/NASA/GSFC | Decide on whether to eliminate one or keep both but if you keep both you might want to change the caption to something like, “Use Case with Multiple Messages.” | **Rejected.** |
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| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4-18 | 4.2.2 | 4th from Last | Add | I’m assuming for now that mention of the proposed Orbit Hybrid Message is not desired at this point (?). If it is, then all of the ODM-relevant content requires augmentation | NASA | (add content) | **Accepted.** But, without details. Text was added to the ODM section (4.2.2) indicating that the document was under revision. |
| 4-19 | 4.2.2 |  | Delete | The sentence “Neither the OPM nor OMM is designed for higher fidelity dynamic modeling.” Is relative and misleading. An OPM is a way to specify a state vector that can be extracted from a HIGHLY accurate simulation or OD, just as mean elements can be from an accurate (albeit not quite as accurate) simulation. There is nothing inherently low- or medium- fidelity about sharing state vectors. | NASA | Recommend that this sentence simply be deleted. | **Partially accepted.** Modified the statement to make it clear that “high fidelity” refers to the use of the state, not its generation. |
| 4-19 | 4.2.2 | 7 | Delete | Any reference to “finite maneuvers” is incorrect (with document in current state) and should be removed. The ODMs do not actually contain any traditional specification of finite burns as the ODM does not allow and standardize the specification of thrust, Isp, propulsive efficiency, etc. | NASA | Remove current references to finite maneuvers \*OR\* insert the OHM (which does have full finite maneuver specification capability) and modify Green Book accordingly. Also recommend “fixing” the OPM specification to also allow true finite burns or remove from OPM. | **Partially accepted.** Modified it to clarify that a maneuver design is not a full design. |
| 4-19 | 4.2.2 | 15-16 | Delete | Again, statements such as “The OEM is the only ODM that supports a higher level of fidelity in the dynamic modeling” are misleading/incorrect and should be deleted. OEMs introduce another potentially large inaccuracy of interpolation error (depending upon step size and method used. | NASA | Recommend that this sentence simply be deleted. Also recommend adding interpolation best practices references into the ODM. | **Accepted.** Deleted the statement. Note that the interpolation discussion is not appropriate for the ODM. But, it will be okay in the Green Book Vol. 2. |
| 4-19 | 4.2.2 | 24-25 | Delete | Same as above; this should be removed. | NASA | Recommend deleting “Multiple OPM, OMM, or OEM messages may be provided in a message exchange session requiring different levels of ephemeris fidelity.” | **Accepted.** |
| 4-19 | 4.2.2 | 26-28 | Delete | Same as above; this should be removed | NASA | Recommend deleting “A difference in the exchange scenario is that the OPM and OMM do not accommodate high-fidelity dynamic modeling, whereas the OEM does.” | **Accepted.** |
| 4-19 | 4.2.2 | 30-36 | Delete | Force-model-matched propagation of osculating state vectors and ephemerides are equally able to support physical interaction. Electromagnetic Interference can easily be supported by even lower-fidelity (again, a relative and nebulous term) data to include OMMs. | NASA | Recommend deleting entire paragraph. | **Accepted.** |
| 4-26, 4-27 | 4.5 | All | Add | As presented in our London meetings, ODMs don’t have to stem only from tracking and orbit determination. Additional use cases are envisioned that \*could\* be inserted here are ODMs resulting from mission simulation, (e.g. for new launches or upcoming drift maneuvers) and mission design studies; | NASA | (add use cases) | **Deferred.** The use cases in the document are not meant to be exhaustive.It is envisioned that more use case examples will be added to the document in a future release. |