| **Page** | **Section** | **Line** | **Type** | **Comment/ Rationale** | **Source of Comment (Name/Agency)** | **Suggested Disposition** | **Disposition**  **(Completed by Principal Editor)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1-1 to 1-2 | 1.2 | 33  1 | ed/te | I think this statement may attract unnecessary CESG action as written; by reversing the order it becomes less of a target. | David S. Berry / NASA | From: "ICDs are expected (especially...), but not necessary for most RDM exchanges."  To: "ICDs are not necessary for most RDM exchanges, but are expected in some cases (especially...)." |  |
| 1-4 | 1.4.2 | 2, 4 | ed | Inconsistent use of possessive | David S. Berry / NASA | Line 2 has "object's" (singular possessive), line 4 has "objects'" (plural possessive). Should be consistent... since the RDM deals with a single object I think the singular possessive is better. |  |
| 2-1 | 2.2 | 4th bullet in para2 | ed/te | The acronym "OD" is used for the first time without spelling it out. | David S. Berry / NASA | From: "OD"  To: "orbit determination (OD)" |  |
| 2-1 | 2.2 | para4, line 2 | ed | Grammar | David S. Berry / NASA | From: "... event by specified the appropriate..."  To: "... event by specifying the appropriate... " |  |
| 3-1 | 3.1.1 | 2 (end) | te | The requirement: "It shall be easily readable by both humans and computers." is really a requirement on the Navigation WG when the RDM is designed. In order to satisfy this, we choose ASCII formats instead of binary, use easily understandable keywords, etc. I don't think this is a requirement on a user, as long as they conform to the standard. | David S. Berry / NASA | Remove the part of the requirement: "It shall be easily readable by both humans and computers." |  |
| 3-3 | Table 3-2 |  | te | For the "OBJECT\_TYPE" metadata keyword:  CDM has PAYLOAD, ROCKET BODY, DEBRIS, OTHER, UNKNOWN  OCM has PAYLOAD, ROCKET BODY, UPPER STAGE, DEBRIS, OTHER, UNKNOWN  RDM has PAYLOAD, ROCKET BODY, DEBRIS, UNKNOWN | David S. Berry / NASA | The OCM has 2 values for OBJECT\_TYPE not in the RDM. The CDM has 1 value not in the RDM. If the RDM included "OTHER" (and maybe "UPPER STAGE" in the list of possible values for OBJECT\_TYPE, it would be possible to re-use an enumerated list in the XML schema. |  |
| 3-3 | Table 3-2 |  | te | For the OBJECT\_OWNER and OBJECT\_OPERATOR keywords, the description indicates it is possible to list a country as the value, but also indicates that "the value should be taken from the SANA registry for organizations". | David S. Berry / NASA | Note that countries are not listed in the "organizations" registry. |  |
| 3-4 | Table 3-2 |  | te | For the CENTER\_NAME keyword, the description indicates that "another spacecraft" could be the center. This seems to be an odd application of the RDM, since the re-entry implies an atmosphere, correct? Is re-entry to another spacecraft defined? | David S. Berry / NASA | Consider removing the text after "solar system barycenter" from the Description. |  |
| 3-5 | Table 3-2 |  | ed | From SOLAR\_RAD\_PRESSURE through IMPACT\_LOCATION\_METHOD there are some inconsistencies at the start of the Description... sometimes "Indicator on...", sometimes "Indication of...", sometimes "Indication on...". | David S. Berry / NASA | Suggest that these indicator/indications all be consistently phrased. |  |
| 3-5 | Table 3-2 |  | ed | On "REENTRY\_DISINTEGRATION keyword, there is a typo I believe. | David S. Berry / NASA | From: "... the impact area in the date.."  To: "... the impact area in the data..." |  |
| 3-7 | Table 3-3 |  | ed/te | On ORBIT\_LIFETIME keyword, numerical expression cannot be taken literally as it is currently expressed. | David S. Berry / NASA | From: "integer values assumed to be .0"  To: "integer values assumed to have .0 fractional portion" or something like that. |  |
| 3-7 | Table 3-3 |  | ed/te | On ORBIT\_LIFETIME keyword, it is stated that "if the NOMINAL\_REENTRY\_EPOCH keyword is present, its value is to be used for computations rather than the ORBIT\_LIFETIME." However, since the ORBIT\_LIFETIME is a double precision number of days, it seems it should be possible to compute the number of days from the EPOCH\_TZERO to the NOMINAL\_REENTRY\_EPOCH and use that number as the ORBIT\_LIFETIME. In other words, it seems that the ORBIT\_LIFETIME and NOMINAL\_REENTRY\_EPOCH should resolve to the same date/time value even if both are present. | David S. Berry / NASA | Consider rewording current description based on the information in the comment. |  |
| 3-7 | Table 3-3 |  | te | The Description cites "altitude over a spherical Earth", but this isn't consistent with the use of a different central body. | David S. Berry / NASA | From: "... over a spherical Earth..."  To: "... over a spherical central body..." |  |
| 3-8 | Table 3-3 |  | te | For NOMINAL\_IMPACT\_\* keywords, the relevant frame is implied but not explicitly stated. | David S. Berry / NASA | Indicate that these keywords are "with respect to the IMPACT\_REF\_FRAME". |  |
| 3-8 | Table 3-3 |  | te | For IMPACT\_\*\_START/STOP\_\* keywords, the relevant frame is implied but not explicitly stated. | David S. Berry / NASA | Indicate that these keywords are "with respect to the IMPACT\_REF\_FRAME". |  |
| 3-9 | Table 3-3 |  | te | For X\_DOT, Y\_DOT, Z\_DOT keywords, the "Description is incorrect". | David S. Berry / NASA | From: x/y/z-component of the object state vector  To: x'/y'/z'-component of the object state vector |  |
| 3-12 | 3.4.8 |  | te | Should the keywords PROBABILITY\_OF\_IMPACT and/or PROBABILITY\_OF\_LAND\_IMPACT also be required (or recommended)? | David S. Berry / NASA | Consider. |  |
| 3-13 | 3.4.18 | 2 | ed | Clarification. | David S. Berry / NASA | From: "not foreseen"  To: "not foreseen by this standard" |  |
| 5-10 | 5.4.3.6 |  | te | Clarification | David S. Berry / NASA | At end of current statement, add " (see 5.3.3.5)." |  |
| A-1 | Title |  | ed | Typo | David S. Berry / NASA | From: "RELARED"  To: "RELATED" |  |
| D-18 | D2 |  | ed/te | Should the SANA document be added to the References in Sec 1.5 | David S. Berry / NASA | Consider. |  |
| F-21 |  |  | te | It was recommended that the requirement stated in 3.1.1 (tail end, ... "easily readable") be removed from the document. I think it is appropriate to add it as a mandatory requirement in Table F-1. | David S. Berry / NASA | Consider. |  |
| F-21 | RDM-0010 |  | ed | Word choice: I think "automated" is better than "automatic" in this instance. | David S. Berry / NASA | From: "... automatic interaction"  To: "... automated interaction" |  |
| F-21 | RDM-0055 |  | te | The "Requirement" should indicate whether or not the state is "unknown". The statement "Unknown is a valid value as well." can be removed from the "Rationale". | David S. Berry / NASA | From: "... re-entry is controlled or not"  To: "... re-entry is controlled, uncontrolled, or unknown". |  |
| H-25 | H1.2 |  | ed | Spell out acronym | David S. Berry / NASA | From: "w.r.t"  To: "with respect to" |  |
| H-25 | H1.2 | para2 last, para 3 first | ed/te | Refers to "ballistic parameter" (two uses, the only two uses in the document). Should "parameter" be changed to "coefficient"? Also, the references occur in the section describing the equation for da/dt which use the components of the ballistic coefficient in the equation, but not the term "B", which is defined in the nomenclature as the ballistic coefficient. | David S. Berry / NASA | Ensure that the equation, text, and nomenclature are consistent. Could consider providing the equation for "B". |  |
| H-27 | H1.4 | 2 | ed | Possibly confusing abbreviation | David S. Berry / NASA | From: "continuum super-"  To: "continuum supersonic" |  |
| H-28 | H2 |  | ed | In description of "LIFETIME\_DISPERSION", second paragraph, there is an "Error! Reference source not found." message. | David S. Berry / NASA | Fix. |  |