| **Page** | **Section** | **Line** | **Type** | **Comment/ Rationale** | **Source of Comment (Name/Agency)** | **Suggested Disposition** | **Disposition****(Completed by Principal Editor)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3-1 | 3.2.4 |  | Ge | Do we really need to say that the exchange method should be on a case-by-case basis? | Oltrogge/NASA | Consider removing? |  |
| 3-3 | 3.4.2 | 3 | GE | Suggest putting a colon after “… of all the epoch information” and all other inter-table “sub-headers” |  | “information:” |  |
| 3-3 | 3.4.2 | 6 | TE | We should collaborate to arrive at consensus text for OBJECT\_DESIGNATOR |  | In the ODM, I have: “*Free text field specification of the unique satellite identification designator for the object. It may be useful to provide the control authority/source of this ID as well (e.g., 18SPCS, ISON, independent key ID). If the ID is not known (uncorrelated object), “UNKNOWN” may be used.*” |  |
| 3-3 | 3.4.2 | 7 | TE | Not necessarily trying to rock the boat, but I’d tried to adopt the object categories contained in the ESA object DB, and this specification is more simplistic.  |  | Suggest we discuss to see if we could arrive at consensus content. |  |
| 3-4 | 3.4.2 | 10 | TE | Would it be worth being more specific? |  | “Unique free-text identifier (e.g. file name) of an …” |  |
| 3-7 | 3.5.2 | 6,7,9.10 | TE | Curious why you need/want separate window start/end values depending upon accuracy? |  | Consider deleting one set. |  |
| 3-8 | 3.5.2 | 2 | TE | Curious why you need/want separate window start/end values depending upon accuracy? |  | Consider deleting one set. |  |
| 3-8 | 3.5.2 | 5,6 | TE | True that Pimpact+Pburnup=1.0?  |  | If so, recommend explicitly stating that this is the case for sake of clarity. |  |
| 3-8 | 3.5.2 | 10 | TE | In the case of fragmentation(s), what should be considered as NOMINAL\_IMPACT\_EPOCH? |  | Is this the largest fragment by mass? Etc. You explicitly state in 3.5.17 that the nominal location corresponds to the highest probability of fragments impacting there. I presume that the epoch corresponds to this (?) |  |
| 3-8 | 3.5.2 | 11,12 | TE | Is the start/end of impact correspond to some confidence %, or is this 0th and 100th percentile? |  | May want to explicitly state. |  |
| 3-12 | 3.5.2 | 3 | TE | Is THRUST\_ACCELERATION meant to be directional? Is it only meant to be in-track? What happens if the user intents to combine in-track and cross-track (or more likely, radial)? |  | Suggest clarification. |  |
| 3-12 | 3.5.2 | 6,7 | TE | Unclear if TIME\_LASTOB\_START and \_END are epochs, or time since epoch, or what. |  | Suggest we find good solution and make consistent between RDM and ODM. At a minimum, this needs an example, and needs to clearly show if these are epochs or relative times or what. |  |
| 3-12 | 3.5.2 | 8 | TE | Unclear in an RDM why “RECOMMENDED\_OD\_SPAN” is useful? |  | Consider deleting. |  |
| 3-12 | 3.5.2 | 12,13 | TE | “TRACK” is not defined |  | Consider defining |  |
| 3-13 | 3.5.5 |  | TE | I still find this multiple prediction span use of separate WINDOW keywords unnecessary. This opens the door to having inconsistencies throughout, as you point out in 3.5.7, 3.5.8, 3.5.9. Not clear why you want to introduce this complexity. |  | Consider. |  |
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