| **Page** | **Section** | **Line** | **Type** | **Comment/ Rationale** | **Source of Comment (Name/Agency)** | **Suggested Disposition** | **Disposition**  **(Completed by Principal Editor)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4-13 | 4.1.1 | 3 | Ed | “The message recipient must have a means of interpolating” | NASA/JPL | Suggest, “The message recipient must have a suitable means of interpolating” |  |
| 4-14 | 4.2.3.2 | Bottom | Te | (I just note that the reference frames contained in reference H4 are missing a number of key reference frames that are in the (draft) ODM. | NASA/JPL | We should perhaps infuse those into the Nav Data Def document as a separate exercise |  |
| 4-15 | 4.2.3.2 | Top | Te | ATTITUDE\_DIR: “Rotation direction of the attitude specifying from which frame the transformation is to:” | NASA/JPL | Suggest, “Direction of the attitude transformation:” |  |
| 4-16 | 4.2.3.2 | Top | Te | “A2B specifies a transformation from the REF\_FRAME\_A to the REF\_FRAME\_B” | NASA/JPL | Suggest removing the “the” words, i.e., “A2B specifies a transformation from REF\_FRAME\_A to REF\_FRAME\_B” |  |
| B-2 | B-3 | 15 | TE | Suggest that we align the ADM and ODM reference frames. | NASA/JPL | In particular, ITRF and ICRF should be replaced by ITRFyyyy and ICRFyyyy etc. But we should discuss. Ideally, these should be moved over to SANA registry or Definitions doc. |  |
| B-1 | B2 | 10 | Te | These timing systems are not synchronized with the ODM, and the ODM is not synchronized with the NavWg Definitions doc or SANA | NASA/JPL | Suggest we move to SANA registry |  |
| 4-17 | 4.2.3.2 | 10 | Te | Time system - - as noted above, these are not synch’d w/other docs | NASA/JPL | “” |  |
| 4-17 | 4.2.3.2 | 15 | Te | Suggest that “START\_TIME” and “STOP\_TIME” be optional | NASA/JPL |  |  |
| 4-18 | 4.2.3.2 | 8 | Ed | See Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable. fo | NASA/JPL | Broken link |  |
| 4-18 | 4.2.3.2 | 20 | Te | I’m curious about how these interpolation degrees & methods are applied… This is not a straight interpolation of Qs etc, correct ? | NASA/JPL |  |  |
| 4-17 | 4.2.3.2 | Bottom | TE | Let’s discuss, but I think we should have it as an optional switch, | NASA/JPL | … because folks just think differently. I typically see it ordered as Epoch, Q1, Q2, Q3, QC, Q1\_DOT, Q2\_DOT, Q3\_DOT, QC\_DOT (as you state above) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | NASA/JPL |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | NASA/JPL |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | NASA/JPL |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | NASA/JPL |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | NASA/JPL |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | NASA/JPL |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |