**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…

**You are making, from my humble point a view, a wrong interpretation of the findings presented by the CESG report. Our report is not only conclusive, but also informational.**

**Some Area's request needs further discussion in future CESG's webex to reach a consensus.**

**We have agreed to produce a new template for the presentation, and there we can separate the final findings as**

* **resolutions,**
* **CESG decisions**
* **CESG issues under internal discussion**
* **issues to CMC and outside the CESG decision making power.**

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 !

**No. It was agreed to discuss this during the October CMC. We are suggesting that Rick can continue his support until Oct 2016**

Slide 10

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

**MM>No. What I meant is that the decision to make it an OB was due to the fact that the DAI could not identify any Agency that could sponsor Proto2. However, UKSA is now considering offering the development of the Proto2. If this were the case, than – I guess – the book color should return to Blue, hopefully without the need of CESG/CMC polls as this was the original color. Can the CMC to confirm this?**

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?

**MM>The WG chair is fully aware of the available resources and convinced that NAV should complete the work in the pipeline before embarking in new work. On the other hand, the NAV WG allows new ideas to be presented. In summary, about one hour during the Cleveland meeting was dedicated to the presentation of these new proposed activities, but there is no intention to work on them at this time.**

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?

**MM>The rationale is to preserve the work done up to today instead of throwing away a few man months of efforts distributed across several space agencies. Considering the recent boost of the various exploration programs, chances are that the WG might pick up again in the future.**

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).

**Last sentence states "At the request of ESA and DLR, the Working Group members agreed to postpone the discussion on the possible path forward." as the matter was postponed and not discussed at all in Cleveland it is hard to anticipate steps and they timing. While ESA, DLR, and NASA discuss there is no chance that a concrete plan will be presented at the CMC in Brasil. It may be that ESA, DLR, and NASA delegates in CMC may add some more information.**

- 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 ?

**Yes, disagreement on the HDR continues.**

**Yes, the whole BB production of the WG is stuck at the moment.**

**The good progress reported on slide 52 (LC and HPE) will NOT be a waste, unless all activities of the WG are cancelled.**

- 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 ?

**The agreed structure of the books is NOT jeopardising the work while the missing agreement is. In principle even with a different structure one or more agencies could retire support creating absence of consensus. Once there is consensus on the contents of the book(s) any structure will be valid.**

Slide 71/72

- One SEA report should be enough

§;-)&

**Double the pleasure, double the fun.**

Slide 86

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

**The CMC is expected to receive the new Registry Management Policy (RMP), the WG handbook, and the revised SANA YB within the month after the Cleveland working meetings.**

Slide 88

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

**The items in red are the items that have changed from the current baseline SCID registry. They add specific new information needed to make the registry work correctly. Not all new fields are shown, there are others that track who made the changes and when they are made.**

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

**In order to permit this registry to record different SCIDs in different frequency bins (which is still in discussion) these fields are required. If we fail to adopt the frequency bin approach we will shortly find ourselves (CCSDS, the agencies) unable to assign type 2 SCIDs. This is a major problem. The agencies, and their spectrum managers, must know which frequencies are in use because there are operating licenses. All we need to know accurately is the frequency BIN, not the 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.

**Each agency has an assigned Agency Representative (AR) who handles assignments for all agencies and other organizations in their country. Nothing in this changes that policy. In any event the only case in which re-using a SCID for a “flight-less bird” would cause a problem is if that “SIM” SCID was actually being used for RF radiation. The argument that SCIDs are being used for archive data is similarly flawed since the standard has, from the outset, stated that this is not to be done.**

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?

**There was a one hour XSG SIG meeting which did have moderate participation, but key WGs were absent. It remains the case that there is no dedicated resource to produce an XML Guideline. The potential source of support from outside any agency has evaporated. The SEA proposal is to transition this work into the SAWG, but there is scant resource there as well.**

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.***