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Peter:

The CESG poll to approve publication of CCSDS 313.2-Y-2, Procedures for SANA Registry Specification Yellow Book, Issue 2) concluded with conditions. Please negotiate disposition of the conditions directly with the AD(s) who voted to approve with conditions and CC the Secretariat on all related correspondence.

>CESG E-Poll Identifier: CESG-P-2020-02-003
>Approval to publish CCSDS 313.2-Y-2, Procedures
>for SANA Registry Specification Yellow Book, Issue 2)
>Results of CESG poll beginning 4 February 2020 and ending 19 February 2020: >
> Abstain: 0 (0%) Approve
> Unconditionally: 3 (50%) (Shames, Burleigh, Wilmot)
>Approve with Conditions: 3 (50%) (Barkley, Merri, Calzolari)
>Disapprove with Comment: 0 (0%)
>CONDITIONS/COMMENTS:
>

* >  Erik Barkley (Approve with Conditions):
* 1)
* >  Section 3.2.3 -- Does this need to be ammended
* >  to indicate inclusion of such evaluation in
* >  whatever subsequent request to SANA is issued?

**<<Accepted, with mods:**

**Sec 3.2.3, pg A-2 (CTE Note: should be 2-2), from:**

**3.2.3** Every CCSDS Area or Working Group requiring a registry shall evaluate the existing registries in the SANA for re-use or adaptation.

**Sec 3.2.3, pg A-2, To:**

**3.2.3** Every CCSDS Area or Working Group developing a new registry or modifying an existing registry shall evaluate the existing registries in the SANA for re-use or adaptation.

**>>**

* 2) Item 3.2.6 reads "Any requirement for a
* >  registry referencing global data, SANA,
* >  Terminology/Glossary, XML, Uniform Resource
* >  Name (URN), or Object Identifier (OID) shall
* >  use or extend an existing global category
* >  registry". This is confusing. What is meant by
* >  a registry referencing SANA? By definition is
* >  not a registry in SANA? What is meant by a
* >  registry referencing Extensible Markup Language
* >  (XML) using or extending an existing global
* >  category registry? XML is simply a language and
* >  not a registry category? Please rephrase this
* >  sentence Also, note I don't think there is a
* >  URN registry (I have suggested that this be
* >  considered in the CCSDS URN document poll). >

**<<Accepted, with mods.**

**Sec 3.2.6, pg A-2, From:**

**3.2.6** Any requirement for a registry referencing global data, SANA, Terminology/Glossary, XML, Uniform Resource Name (URN), or Object Identifier (OID) shall use or extend an existing global category registry.

**Sec 3.2.6, pg A-2, To:**

**3.2.6** Any requirement for a registry referencing global data, such as SANA Terminology / Glossary (https://sanaregistry.org/r/glossary), XML (several registries), Uniform Resource Name (URN, https://sanaregistry.org/r/urn), or Object Identifier (OID, https://sanaregistry.org/oid/tree/) shall use or extend an existing global category registry.

**>>**

>3) Item 3.2.13 -- use the term "body" rather
>"group" in the phrase "...any CCSDS group that >acts..." Rationale: avoid implication that only >CCSDS working groups perform this function; a >more inclusive term will help to make this more clear. >

**<<Accepted, with mods**

**Sec 3.2.13, pg A-3, From:**

**3.2.13** Each working meeting of any CCSDS group that acts as a Review Authority shall, when necessary, review and determine dispositions for proposed changes, additions, or deletions to any existing registries and contact points under their purview.

**Sec 3.2.13, pg A-3, To:**

**3.2.13** Each working meeting of any CCSDS group or other entity that acts as a Review Authority shall, when necessary, review and determine dispositions for proposed changes, additions, or deletions to any existing registries and contact points under their purview.

**Rationale: There are several kinds of groups, WG, SIG, SSG, CESG in CCSDS that may create registries or act as a review authority. The CMC is unlikely to do such a thing, nor is the CESG outside of some WG or other group. >>**

>4) Item 3.2.14 -- please indicate how use of
>registry during prototype testing is to be
>documented. What would be the success criteria for a test plan in this case? >

**<<There are many different kinds of registries, so it is impossible to provide a single, simple, useful answer. Here are some possibly useful examples that come to mind:**

1. **An XML registry is create. The success criteria for a standard using that XML schema to transfer data would use the registry to create data transfer artifacts and to validate the data on receipt.**
2. **A “protocol magic numbers” registry would be populated with defined values, or representative values, and then exercised in the create of PDUs and processing of those PDUs. An existing example might be the SCID registry.**
3. **One of the SM WG standards that needs to reference Service Sites, or Apertures, in order to exchange service requests or schedule results would reference representative values in the testing of data format exchanges.>>**

5) Annex A -- is this really intended as
>Normative template? A1 indicates that these are
>examples. As such replace "(NORMATIVE)" with "(INFORMATIVE)".
>

**<<Accepted, with mods.**

**This is defined as a NORMATIVE ANNEX in that all standards track documents are required to include a SANA section, just like all are required to include a Security section and a Patent section. Reference CCSDS A20.4-Y4, CCSDS Publications Manual, Sec 3.5.2.2.2.**

**It is possible that any given document may have all of these, none of these, or some set of these. The appropriate sections are then required to be used. This section is roughly the same in structure and use as the Publications Manual itself.**

**That said, it does appear that the examples that were provided in Sec A.3 could possibly be misinterpreted as mandatory. So I suggest this:**

**Sec A3, Pg 3.3 (CTE Note, should be A-3), From:**

**A3 DISCUSSION—EXAMPLES OF SANA CONSIDERATIONS ANNEX SUBSECTION ENTRIES**

**Sec A3, Pg 3.3 (CTE Note, should be A-3), To:**

**A3 DISCUSSION—EXAMPLES OF SANA CONSIDERATIONS ANNEX SUBSECTION ENTRIES (NON-NORMATIVE)**

**>>**

6) Annex A -- Strongly suggest putting
>the instructional aspects of this annex in
>italic font or in some other way offset from
>what is the body of text to be included verbatim from the example templates. >
>

**<<Rejected, see above. This is the same approach as used in the CCSDS Publications Manual.>>**

Mario Merri (Approve with Conditions):

1)
> Page 1-1 If the document contains "Normative
> Text" shouldn't it be a blue book instead of a Yellow book?
>

**<<Rejected, please see the answer to the same request on CESG-P-2020-02-002, MM 1). >>**

>2) I appreciate the desire to provide in a
>single book all what a WG needs to know.
>However, it seems to me that there are several
>overlaps between this document and CCSDS
>313.0-Y-3, Space Assigned Numbers Authority
>(SANA)—Role, Responsibilities, Policies, and
>Procedures Yellow Book. Duplicated requirements
>will make maintenance a nightmare. Please
>identify all duplicated requirements and assign them only to a single book.
>

**<<Rejected, please see the answer to the same request on CESG-P-2020-02-002, MM 2). >>**

> Gian Paolo Calzolari (Approve with
> Conditions): See attached pdf file with PIDs.
>It is anticipated that some PIDs can require CESG wide discussion.
>

**<< GPC issues addressed separately in that document. >>**

>
>PS: The winword file is also attached for convenience.
>
>
>Total Respondents: 6
>
>All Areas responded to this question.
>
>
>
>SECRETARIAT INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS: Approved with Conditions >PROPOSED SECRETARIAT ACTION: Generate
>CMC poll after conditions have been addressed
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