### Dwarf Planet Features Matrix

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Ceres** | **Pluto** | **Eris** | **Makemake** | **Haumea** |
| **Location** | | | | | |
| Asteroid belt or Kuiper belt (trans-Neptunian object)? |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Interior** | | | | | |
| Relative size (S/XS) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Composition? |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shape? |  |  |  |  |  |
| Active “ice geology” surface features? |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Satellites** | | | | | |
| (Known) major moons? |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tiny moons (number)? |  |  |  |  |  |

1. How do you think we should classify small worlds like these, in order to get the most scientific information from the classification? Should we call them all planets? Keep using “dwarf planet”? Call them “large Kuiper Belt Objects”? Other ideas?

2. What criteria **should** we use in classifying something as a planet or not a planet, scientifically?