**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

§;-)&

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 ?

*CSS AD Response: It is becoming critical. The main actionee is on SANA for creation of the registries. My understanding is that SANA is putting the registry strucutre into place per the new RMP (Registry Management Policy) and will then turn its attention to the CSS registry requests. Estimated dates are not currently available but that will be pursued.*

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) ?

*CSS AD Response: The issue is that there is no single, authorized designated source to identify celestial bodies for those recommendaitos for which this matters. The CSS Area does not particularly care what the designated source is but does what to minimize and/or eliminate (if possible) the prolifieration of identify schemes that CCSDS recommendations utilize. The MOIMS NAVWG standards have referenced the JPL Solar System Dynamics website for this kind of thing in the past (http://ssd.jpl.nasa.gov/ ) and referenced JPL NAIF – Navigation Ancillary Information Facility (*[*http://naif.jpl.nasa.gov/*](http://naif.jpl.nasa.gov/)*). At the same time the SEA DDOR WG has created a registy, in SANA for Quasars. The CSS Area originally considering referencing the Internatual Astronimical Union for reference of celestial body names but has decided that adding yet another “source” of celestial identifiers is not good policy for CCSDS in general. It strikes me that this is a system engineering issue for CCSDS. What is the recognized source? How is it managed – as a CCSDS registry or does CCSDS fromal;u recognize and sanction some 3rd party authority? It is the CSS AD’s opinion that referencing multiple sources and therey by requiring standards implememtatopms to engage in translations is contrary to the general charter and goals of CCSDS.*

Slide 106

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

*CSS AD Response: The CSS AD has supplied the functional resource model and this will be subsequenetly discussed at the CESG meeting in Rome.*