CID	Comment Originator	Organization	IS-GPS Document	Page (of IS-GPS document)	Paragraph (of IS-GPS document)	Importance	Change Category
3	Thomas Nagle	GPC	IS-GPS-800B, IRN-001	Page 3	3.2.1.3	Substantive	L1C Phase Noise
4	Shawkang Wu	SE&I	IS-GPS-800B, IRN-001	IS-GPS-800B, IRN-001	3.2.1.3	Substantive	L1C Phase Noise

Consolidated Comment Resolution Matrix (IS-GPS-200-F, IS-GPS-705-B, & IS-GPS-800-B)		
Comment	**From (WAS)**	**To (IS)**
The proposed "IS" language is vague and furthermore continuing to specify phase noise for only a single loop design (both transfer function form and bandwidth) is not useful for most users whose equipment does not use this design. The vagueness arises from the terminology "approximation to the third-order Jaffe-Rechtin phase locked loop". Jaffe and Rechtin were authors of a paper written in 1955 that included various loop designs including more than one third-order loop. It is likely that the proposed "IS" language is referring to a phase locked loop with closed-loop transfer function H(f) such that $\|1 - H(f)\|^2 = f^6/(f_n^6 + f^6)$ where $f_n = 3B_L/(5\pi)$ and $B_L = 10$ Hz is the one-sided loop bandwidth. It is suggested, if this is the case, that "approximation to the third-order Jaffe-Rechtin phase locked loop" be replaced with this more explicit language.

Above it was also noted that specifying phase noise for just one loop bandwidth and one loop design is of little utility to most users whose equipment does not use this design and/or bandwidth. This comment has been made by DOT/GPC representatives to the GPS Interface Control Documents and Interface Specifications consistently since 2000. It would be preferable to include a single-sideband specification (as per the wording before the "or" in the "WAS" IS-GPS-800 language). It would be acceptable, in my view, for the curve to be sufficiently loose so as to integrate to a value significantly exceeding 0.01 radians for a 10-Hz Jaffe-Rechtin filter (as defined above). As a minimum, it would be useful to include a typical phase noise profile in Section 6 even if it is not practical to include a curve as | RFC-00118 Proposed Text: The phase noise spectral density of the unmodulated carrier shall not exceed the magnitude of a straight line (on a log-log plot) between -30 dBc/Hz at 1 Hz and -70 dBc/Hz at 1 x 10^4Hz, and the one-sided integrated phase noise spectrum between 1 Hz and 10 kHz shall not exceed 0.01 radians rms. Or.

The phase noise spectral density of the unmodulated carrier shall be such that an approximation to the third order Jaffe-Rechtin phase lock loop, which has a 10 Hz one-sided loop noise bandwidth, shall be able to track the carrier to an accuracy of 0.01035 radians rms. | RFC-00118 New Proposed Text: The phase noise spectral density of the unmodulated carrier shall be such that an approximation to the third order Jaffe-Rechtin phase lock loop, closed-loop transfer function H(f) such that $\|1 - H(f)\|2 = f6/(fn6 + f6)$ where fn = 3BL/(5π), which has a 10 Hz one-sided loop noise bandwidth, shall be able to track the carrier to an accuracy of 0.01035 radians rms. |
| The last sentence in the Proposed Rationale stated "..Deleting this requirement is consistent with the carrier phase noise requirement for IS-GPS-200 and IS-GPS-705…" Need clarification on in what way it's consistent with IS-GPS-200? The IS-GPS-200 F spec still has the carrier phase noise at an accuracy of 0.1 radian rms in Sec 3.3.1.3. | N/A | N/A |

Rationale	PO Resolution	Resolution Rationale	Originator Concurrence	Concurrance Rationale
The language in IS-800 should be more specific about the implementation of the phase noise requirement.	Reject	Defer until public ICWG. Provisionally accept until 2019. The proposed language for RFC-00118 follows the language structure with the carrier phase noise requirement in IS-GPS-200. Section 3.3.1.3 of IS-GPS-200 states "Carrier Phase Noise. The phase noise spectral density of the unmodulated carrier shall be such that a phase locked loop of 10 Hz one-sided noise bandwidth shall be able to track the carrier to an accuracy of 0.1 radians rms" the proposed RFC-0018 language follows this same format.	Concur	Group concurs. Defer until public ICWG. Provisionally accept until 2019. The proposed language for RFC-00118 follows the language structure with the carrier phase noise requirement in IS-GPS-200. Section 3.3.1.3 of IS-GPS-200 states "Carrier Phase Noise. The phase noise spectral density of the unmodulated carrier shall be such that a phase locked loop of 10 Hz one-sided noise bandwidth shall be able to track the carrier to an accuracy of 0.1 radians rms" the proposed RFC-0018 language follows this same format.
The phase noise requirements for all signals should be the same.	Reject	The reason that the rationale states "consistency with IS-GPS-200 and IS-GPS-705" is that IS-GPS-800 (at present) presents two phase noise requirements while IS-GPS-200 and 705 detail just one requirement.	Concur	Group concurs. The reason that the rationale states "consistency with IS-GPS-200 and IS-GPS-705" is that IS-GPS-800 (at present) presents two phase noise requirements while IS-GPS-200 and 705 detail just one requirement.

CID	Comment Originator	Organization	IS-GPS document	Page Number	Paragraph (of IS-GPS document)	Importance	Change Category	Comment
20	Steven Brown	LM	IS-GPS-705B, IRN-001	Page 21	6.1	Administrative	Public Signals in Space (SiS) Updates	Typo in the AFMC description: "Air Force Materiel Command" should be "Air Force Material Command", and a few "-"s missing between the acronym and the description throughout the list.
56	Steven Brown	LM	IS-GPS-200F, IRN-001	Page 51	6.2.1.1	Administrative	Public Signals in Space (SiS) Updates	RFC-86 deleted header 6.2.1.1 and the one paragraph following this header. This header number and a "Deleted" placeholder text should have remained in the document, to prevent renumbering of the subsequent section, 6.2.1.2 User Differential Range Accuracy. Now Rev F shows 6.2.1.1 User Differential Range Accuracy.
57	Steven Brown	LM	IS-GPS-200F, IRN-001	Page 52	6.2.2.2.6	Administrative	Public Signals in Space (SiS) Updates	RFC-86 deleted header 6.2.2.2.6 and the one paragraph following this header. This header number and a "Deleted" placeholder text should have remained in the document, to prevent renumbering of the subsequent section, 6.2.2.2.7 GPS III SVs. Now Rev F shows 6.2.2.2.6 GPS III SVs.
84	Tony Marquez	SE&I	IS-GPS-200F, IRN-001	Page 52	6.2.6	Administrative	Public Signals in Space (SiS) Updates	Given that Section 6.2.5 is dedicated to the L5 signal in IS-GPS-200 should there be a corresponding refererence to the L1C signal (IS-GPS-800)?
86	C. Pocher	SMC/GPA	IS-GPS-200F, IRN-001	Page 5	3.3.4	Critical	Public Signals in Space (SiS) Updates	Essential requirement deleted.
87	C. Pocher	SMC/GPA	IS-GPS-705B, IRN-001	Page 3	3.3.4	Substantive	Public Signals in Space (SiS) Updates	Essential requirement deleted.
88	C. Pocher	SMC/GPA	IS-GPS-800B, IRN-001	Page 3	3.4.1	Substantive	Public Signals in Space (SiS) Updates	Essential requirement deleted.
100	Thomas Nagle	GPC	IS-GPS-200F, IRN-001	Page 44	3.3.4	Substantive	Public Signals in Space (SiS) Updates	The rationale to delete the existing requirement on the accuracy of the Nav data relating GPS time to UTC is that "the time accuracy stated (90-ns one sigma) is not aligned to the PPS and SPS PS (40ns)". If this specification in IS-GPS-200 should be tightened, then I'd suggest we tighten it rather than delete it. The proposed "IS" text later refers to a 97 nanosecond (one sigma) error under normal operating circumstances. This later statement is also inconsistent with the PPS and SPS PSs.
101	Thomas Nagle	GPC	IS-GPS-800B, IRN-001	Page 28	3.4.1	Substantive	Public Signals in Space (SiS) Updates	The rationale to delete the existing requirement on the accuracy of the CNAV-2 data relating GPS time to UTC is that "the time accuracy stated is not aligned to the PPS PS and the SPS PS". Neither the PPS PS nor SPS PS address the L1C signal, so this does not appear to be a good rationale to delete a requirement that has been in IS-GPS-800 for a long time. The "IS" text was intended to be consistent with SS-SYS-800. If this is still the case, I'd suggest leaving the "IS" text in IS-GPS-800.
102	Thomas Nagle	GPC	IS-GPS-705B, IRN-001	Page 19	3.3.4	Substantive	Public Signals in Space (SiS) Updates	The rationale to delete the existing 90 ns requirement on the accuracy of the CNAV data relating GPS time to UTC is that "the time accuracy stated is not aligned to the PPS PS and the SPS PS (40 ns)". Neither the PPS PS nor SPS PS address the L5 signal, so this does not appear to be a good rationale to delete this requirement. If this specification in IS-GPS-705 should be tightened, then I'd suggest we tighten it rather than delete it.

105	Thomas Nagle	GPC	IS-GPS-200F, IRN-001	Page 50	6.2.1	Substantive	Public Signals in Space (SiS) Updates	The currently proposed change to note #3 is confusing and does not correct a basic weakness in the first phrase of the existing note. The first phrase of the note is vague in that it says that the probability does not apply under the specified conditions. This leaves the reader/user to wonder what probability does apply. The phrase needs to be more precise and specify that the URA is not required to bound the URE under the specified conditions (therefore, no probability applies).

The language of the currently proposed change is awkward in that it tries to lump both bounding conditions under the case where the integrity status flag is "on." This inherently fails because there are two failure cases to cover: 1) where both bounds are violated and 2) where the lower bound (4.42) is violated and the upper bound (5.73) is not. It is much simpler, more precise, and less confusing to lump the lower bound consditions together whether the integrity flag is "off" or "on, " which follows the same construction as the basic text of paragraph 6.2.1. |
108	Navneet S. Paul	2 SOPS	IS-GPS-200F, IRN-001	Page 158	30.3.3.1.3, Table 30-I (2 of 2)	Substantive	Public Signals in Space (SiS) Updates	The proposed 'Parameter' column description (circled) as written is exactly the description for Omega(sub)0-w - not Omega(sub)0-n - as expounded under the '****' note. As a suggestion, a more accurate Parameter wording for Omega(sub)0-n might be 'Longitude of Ascending Node at reference time'. (The phrase, "of Orbit Plane", is redundant/obvious/exclusive when talking about this element of orbital mechanics and - for succinctness' sake - doesn't need to be included in this description).
120	Steven Brown	LM	IS-GPS-800B, IRN-001	Page 5	3.2.1.8.3	Administrative	Public Signals in Space (SiS) Updates	missing "<" and ">" around website address
122	Steven Brown	LM	IS-GPS-800B, IRN-001	Pages 1-116	every title	Administrative	Public Signals in Space (SiS) Updates	added "." after every title
133	Steven Brown	LM	IS-GPS-200F, IRN-001	Page 5	3.2.1.5.1-1	Administrative	Public Signals in Space (SiS) Updates	Recommend moving the table title outside of the word table, prior to the table.
140	Steven Brown	LM	IS-GPS-705B, IRN-001	Page 63	20.3.3.2.4	Administrative	Public Signals in Space (SiS) Updates	Recommend replacing "-" with " " in the phrase "accuracy of-IAURA" to correct typo.

Consolidated Comment Resolution Matrix (IS-GPS-200-F, IS-GPS-705-B, & IS-GPS-800-B)	
From (WAS)	**To (IS)**
Air Force Materiel Command	Air Force Material Command
6.2.1.1- User Differential Range Accuracy	6.2.1.1- DELETED 6.2.1.2- User Differential Range Accuracy
6.2.2.2.6- GPS III SVs	6.2.2.2.6- DELETED 6.2.2.2.7- GPS III SVs
N/A	6.2.6 L1C Civil Signal. L1C is the GPS downlink signal at a nominal carrier frequency of1575.42 MHz. The L1C signal is only available on GPS III and subsequent blocks of SVs and the signal is specified/described in interface specification IS-GPS-800.
The NAV data contains the requisite data for relating GPS time to UTC. ~~The accuracy of this data during the transmission interval shall be such that it relates GPS time (maintained by the MCS of the CS) to UTC (USNO) within 90 nanoseconds (one sigma).~~ This data is generated by the CS; therefore, the accuracy of this relationship may degrade if for some reason the CS is unable to upload data to a SV.	The NAV data contains the requisite data for relating GPS time to UTC. The accuracy of this data during the transmission interval shall be such that it relates GPS time (maintained by the MCS of the CS) to UTC (USNO) within 40 nanoseconds (one sigma). This data is generated by the CS; therefore, the accuracy of this relationship may degrade if for some reason the CS is unable to upload data to a SV.
The L5 CNAV data contains the requisite data for relating GPS time to UTC. ~~The accuracy of this data during the transmission interval will be such that it relates GPS time to UTC (USNO) to within 90.0 nanoseconds (one sigma).~~ This data is generated by the CS (or provided to the CS); therefore, the accuracy of these relationships may degrade if for some reason the CS is unable to upload data to an SV.	The L5 CNAV data contains the requisite data for relating GPS time to UTC. The accuracy of this data during the transmission interval will be such that it relates GPS time to UTC (USNO) to within 40.0 nanoseconds (one sigma). This data is generated by the CS (or provided to the CS); therefore, the accuracy of these relationships may degrade if for some reason the CS is unable to upload data to an SV.
The L1C message (henceforth referred to as CNAV-2) contains the requisite data for relating GPS time to UTC. ~~The accuracy of this data during the transmission interval shall be such that it relates GPS time to UTC (USNO) to within 1.5 nanoseconds (RMS over 30 days).~~ This data is generated by the GPS CS; therefore, the accuracy of this relationship may degrade if for some reason the GPS CS is unable to upload data to a SV.	The L1C message (henceforth referred to as CNAV-2) contains the requisite data for relating GPS time to UTC. The accuracy of this data during the transmission interval shall be such that it relates GPS time to UTC (USNO) IAW SS-SYS-800. This data is generated by the GPS CS; therefore, the accuracy of this relationship may degrade if for some reason the GPS CS is unable to upload data to a SV.

CURRENTLY PROPOSED CHANGE:	PROPOSED REVISION TO THE CHANGE:
Note #3: The above integrity assured probability values do not apply if: (a) an alert is issued to the users before the instantaneous URE exceeds either of the scaled URA bounds**.;** or (b) **if the integrity status flag is 'off' and** an alert is issued to the users no more than 8.0 seconds after the instantaneous URE exceeds the 4.42 times URA bound**, and; or** (c) if the integrity status flag is 'on' and an alert is issued to the users **both no more than 8.0 seconds after the instantaneous URE exceeds the 4.42 times URA bound** and no more than 5.2 seconds after the instantaneous URE exceeds the 5.73 times URA bound. In this context, an "alert" is defined as any indication or characteristic of the conveying signal, as specified elsewhere in this document, which signifies to users that the conveying signal may be invalid or should not be used, such as the health bits not indicating operational-healthy, broadcasting nonstandard code, parity error, etc.	Note #3: ~~The above integrity assured probability values do not apply if~~ **The URA is not required to bound the instantaneous URE when** : (a) an alert is issued to the users before the instantaneous URE exceeds either of the scaled URA bounds**, and; or** (b) ~~if~~**when the integrity status flag is "off" or "on"** and an alert is issued to the users no more than 8.0 seconds after the instantaneous URE exceeds the 4.42 times URA bound; or (c) **when**~~if~~ the integrity status flag is 'on' and an alert is issued to the users no more than 5.2 seconds after the instantaneous URE exceeds the 5.73 times URA bound. In this context, an "alert" is defined as any indication or characteristic of the conveying signal, as specified elsewhere in this document, which signifies to users that the conveying signal may be invalid or should not be used, such as the health bits not indicating operational-healthy, broadcasting nonstandard code, parity error, etc.
"Longitude of Ascending Node of Orbit Plane at Weekly Epoch"	"Longitude of Ascending Node at reference time"
3.2.1.8.3 Space Service Volume (SSV) Group Delay Differential. The group delay differential for the radiated L1 signal with respect to the Earth Coverage signal for users of the Space Service Volume are provided in http://www.igs.org/products/ssv	**3.2.1.8.3 Space Service Volume (SSV) Group Delay Differential.** The group delay differential for the radiated L1 signal with respect to the Earth Coverage signal for users of the Space Service Volume are provided in <http://www.igs.org/products/ssv>
Title .	Title
20.3.3.2.4 Non-Elevation-Dependent (NED) Accuracy Estimates. Bits 50 through 54, and 55 through 57, and 58 through 60 of message types 30 through 37 shall contain the non-elevation-dependent (NED) component URANED0 Index,URANED1 Index, and URANED2 Index, respectively, of the SV (reference paragraph 6.2.1) for the unauthorized user. The following equations together with the broadcast URANED0 Index, URANED1 Index, and URANED2 Index shall give the clock-related user range accuracy of IAURANED over the current clock/ephemeris fit interval. While the actual NED-related URA may vary over the satellite footprint, the IAURANED calculated using the parameters in message type 10 at each instant during the current clock/ephemeris fit interval shall bound the maximum IAURANED expected for the worst-case location within the satellite footprint at that instant.	**20.3.3.2.4 Non-Elevation-Dependent (NED) Accuracy Estimates.** Bits 50 through 54, and 55 through 57, and 58 through 60 of message types 30 through 37 shall contain the non-elevation-dependent (NED) component URANED0 Index,URANED1 Index, and URANED2 Index, respectively, of the SV (reference paragraph 6.2.1) for the unauthorized user. The following equations together with the broadcast URANED0 Index, URANED1 Index, and URANED2 Index shall give the clock-related user range accuracy of IAURANED over the current clock/ephemeris fit interval. While the actual NED-related URA may vary over the satellite footprint, the IAURANED calculated using the parameters in message type 10 at each instant during the current clock/ephemeris fit interval shall bound the maximum IAURANED expected for the worst-case location within the satellite footprint at that instant.

Rationale	PO Resolution	Resolution Rationale	Originator Concurrence	Concurrance Rationale
Correct spelling error for the word "materiel" to "material."	Reject	For correctness.	Concur	Group rejects comment to change "materiel" to "materiel." This is the name of Major Command and cannot be renamed.
A change from the 2011 public ICWG had deleted the section 6.2.1.1 Integrity Assured URA. Due to the deletion of this section 6.2.1.2 was promoted to 6.2.1.1. The section 6.2.1.1 should have stated "DELETED."	Reject	Rejected Due to the deletion of a section 6.2.1.1 in Rev resulted in the subsequent seciton, 6.2.1.2, user Differential Ramge Accuracy, to be promoted to 6.2.1.1.	Concur	Group concurs. Section numbering of 6.2.1.1 User Differential Range Accuracy will stand.
In the 2011 Public ICWG Section 6.2.2.2.6 Block IIIA and 6.2.2.2.7 Block IIB were combined into one section- GPS III SVs. The IRN had reflected Section 6.2.2.2.6 as "DELETED" and 6.2.2.2.7 as GPS III SVs.	Reject	Reject . In Rev E Section 6.2.2.2.6 and 6.2.2.2.7 were divided into 6.2.2.2.6 Block IIIA and 6.2.2.2.7 Block IIIB. RFC-00077 had combined the two sections thus deleting the need for Section 6.2.2.2.7.	Concur	Group concurs. Section numbering of 6.2.2.2.6 will stand.
For the sake of completeness IS-200 refers to IS-705 (L5 signal) the document should also detail IS-800 (L1C).	Reject	IS-200 is seen as the GPS Bible. If this is the case then all applcable SiS should be decsribed here.	Concur	Group concurs with the reject. This comment adds no technical value.
User equipment specifications/technical requirements documents call out IS-GPS-200 for UTC accuracy requirement. UTC accuracy is an enterprise level requirement across all three segments. Since there is no Gen III enterprise level system specification applicable to all three segments, IS-GPS-200 remains the best place for this requirement. The PPS and SPS Performance Standards are not requirements documents and are not contractually binding.	Reject	This requirement is detailed in the SS-CS-800 (find citation)	Concur	Group concurs with the reject. The UTCOE quantity can be found in the performance standards and is also governed at the control segment level. The UTCOE number without the associated URE does not add any value. The impact to non public program will be briefed and accounted for per the process.
Due to the change in IS-200, the UTCOE should be synchronized with the IS-200 quanitity (40ns).	Reject	Due to the change in IS-200, the UTCOE should be synchronized with the IS-200 quanitity (40ns).	Concur	Group concurs with the reject. The UTCOE quantity can be found in the performance standards and is also governed at the control segment level. The UTCOE number without the associated URE does not add any value. The impact to non public program will be briefed and accounted for per the process.
Due to the change in IS-200, the UTCOE should be synchronized with the IS-200 quanitity (40ns).	Reject	Due to the change in IS-200, the UTCOE should be synchronized with the IS-200 quanitity (40ns).	Concur	Group concurs with the reject. The UTCOE quantity can be found in the performance standards and is also governed at the control segment level. The UTCOE number without the associated URE does not add any value. The impact to non public program will be briefed and accounted for per the process.
If any number is to be placed IAW the performance specification then the number then the number should be aligned with the performance standards (SPS PS and PPS PS).	Reject	If any number is to be placed IAW the performance specification then the number then the number should be aligned with the performance standards (SPS PS and PPS PS).	Concur	Group concurs. This comment is beign rejected since the disposition of the UTCOE spec is that it is being removed from the IS-200, 705, and 800 documents.
If any number is to be placed IAW the performance specification then the number then the number should be aligned with the performance standards (SPS PS and PPS PS).	Reject	If any number is to be placed IAW the performance specification then the number then the number should be aligned with the performance standards (SPS PS and PPS PS).	Concur	Group concurs. This comment is beign rejected since the disposition of the UTCOE spec is that it is being removed from the IS-200, 705, and 800 documents.
If any number is to be placed IAW the performance specification then the number then the number should be aligned with the performance standards (SPS PS and PPS PS).	Reject	If any number is to be placed IAW the performance specification then the number then the number should be aligned with the performance standards (SPS PS and PPS PS).	Concur	Group concurs. This comment is being rejected since the disposition of the UTCOE spec is that it is being removed from the IS-200, 705, and 800 documents.

This change clarifies that URA bounding does not apply, therefore, no probability applies, rather than leaving the reader/user wondering what probabilities might apply. This change also uses simpler, more precise, and less confusing language to specify the conditions when URA bounding does not apply.	Reject	The premise text is misleading in that the basic text outlines conditions that is not accurate and that URA does NOT apply under all conditions (violates the premise of Note #3).	Concur	Group concurs. This comment is rejected due to the disposition of the new reivised language "Note #3: The above integrity assured probability values do not apply if: (a) an alert is issued to the users before the instantaneous URE exceeds either of the scaled URA bounds; or (b) if the integrity status flag is 'off' an alert is issued to the users no more than 8.0 seconds after the instantaneous URE exceeds the 4.42 times URA bound; or (c) if the integrity status flag is 'on' an alert is issued to the users no more than 8.0 seconds after the instantaneous URE exceeds the 4.42 times URA bound; or (d) if the integrity status flag is 'on' an alert is issued to users no more than 5.2 seconds after the instantaneous URE exceeds the 5.73 times URA bound. In this context, an "alert" is defined as any indication or characteristic of the conveying signal, as specified elsewhere in this document, which signifies to users that the conveying signal may be invalid or should not be used, such as the health bits not indicating operational-healthy, broadcasting non-standard code, parity error, etc."
As a suggestion, a more accurate Parameter wording for Omega(sub)0-n might be 'Longitude of Ascending Node at reference time'. (The phrase, "of Orbit Plane", is redundant/obvious/exclusive when talking about this element of orbital mechanics - for succinctness' sake	Reject	a more accurate Parameter wording for Omega(sub)0-n might be 'Longitude of Ascending Node at reference time'. (The phrase, "of Orbit Plane", is redundant/obvious/exclusive when talking about this element of orbital mechanics - for succinctness' sake	Concur	Group concurs with the rejected comment.
The brackets around the website address should not have been removed.	Reject	Reject. The IRN from the 2011 Public ICWG showed <http://www.igs.org/products/ssv> However, brackets are unnecessary around a url and it is recommended that the url be left without the brackets. http://www.igs.org/products/ssv	Concur	Group concurs. The removal of the brackets does not present any technical impact.
There were no periods after the section titles in the previous revisions and there is no reason to add them.	Reject	The fact that there are no periods in the Section header titles does not place any technical impact to the user.	Concur	Group concurs. Leave the periods in the section title. The fact that there are no periods in the Section header titles does not place any technical impact to the user.
	Reject	This change made no technical impact.	Concur	Group concurs that the "Table" should eb kept inside the Table.
The 2011 Public ICWG IRN looks different than the up rev.	Reject	Reject. The 2011 IRN from the Public ICWG listed the term "accuracy of-IAURANED" as a product of track changes being left o from exporting from MS Word to pdf, thus leaving a "dash" in the term. Dash has been erased.	Concur	Group concurs that the dash serves no technical impact and will not be reinserted.

CID	Comment Originator	Organization	Page (of IS-GPS document)	Paragraph (of IS-GPS document)	Importance	Change Category	Comment
1	Matthew Kim	SE&I					Need clarification bewteen use of URA and UDRA. At present, there is no clear disinction between the priority utility bertween the two functions.

Consolidated Comment Resolution Matrix (IS-GPS-2003, IS-GPS-705-A, & IS-GPS-800A)			
From (WAS)	To (IS)	Rationale	PO Resolution

Resolution Rationale	Originator Concurrence	Concurrance Rationale	Notes