**CNES comments / questions on the CESG report distributed on April 19, 2016**

General:

Sometimes the report looks like an area report to the CESG and the questions raised to the CESG are not answered in the same presentation.

This makes the messages to the CMC unclear as there is no evidence of an issue or no issue beyond what can be read in the slides: some examples in the detailed comments below but there are more cases…

Slide 3

- Will the CESG request that the replacement of SOIS AD and DAD is discussed at this CMC ?

- At last, we have a picture with Wallace !

Slide 10

- DEDSL : is it a new procedure that two prototypes are required for an OB ?

Slide 14

- Is it reasonable to discuss new NAV topics (FDM, LDM, RDM) when resources are not available for the ongoing ones (ADM, PRM, NHM, SMM)?

- Are the new requirements coming from SC14 and if so, will they provide resources?

Slide 21

- What is the rationale of publishing a green book called “Telerobotic standard RMP” … if there is no standard (no Blue Book) being published afterwards?

Slide 53

- The last sentence of this slide do not clearly indicate which next steps may be anticipated and in which timeframe: will a concrete plan be presented at the CMC or on which basis may the CMC decide to continue or terminate the WG? (reminder: last CMC had agreed on a last chance six month delay).

- Is it a correct understanding that if the disagreement on the HDR continues, the whole BB production of the WG will be stuck and the good progress reported on slide 52 (LC and HPE) will be a waste ?

- Has the option of restructuring the production of the WG been considered, to have BB’s per domains of utilization ? (reminder: as was initialy requested by IOAG and IOP-3, as the urgencies are not the same depending the future project needs). If no, why ?

Slide 71/72

- One SEA report should be enough
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Slide 86

- what is the CMC expected to review or request ? (last line not clear)

Slide 88

- not all the added items (in red) seem to be real discriminators : whether they are required or optional fields should be clarified…

- some of the items have no concrete value (e.g.: expected lifetime) or may be difficult to collect (e.g.: exact frequencies).

Slide 89

- all agreed but agencies do not only assign SCId’s for their own projects but also to partners and industry; it may take time to explain the case to those organizations and to get their agreement.

Slide 90

- Participation in the XSG SIG was quite high this time and the conclusion is that no resource could be identified to produce the guidelines. Will the SIG eventually disband?

Slides from 91

- Several projects in the CSS Area seem to be pending on the creation of registries. Is this critical and what kind of delays are anticipated ? Who is the actionee on these creations, the WG or SANA or other ?

Slide 101

- On celestial bodies, is the CMC expected to convey the questions to SEA or MOIMS Areas ? … or could the message be clarified (what is the issue) ?

Slide 106

- Did the CESG follow the recommendation of the CSS Area in last line ? Is there an issue ?