CESG POLL ITEM DISPOSITION (PID) INITIATION FORM

AREA PID NUMBER: **SLS-01**

SUBMITTING AREA: **Space Link services Area (SLS)**

------------------------------------------------------------------

REVIEWER'S NAME: Gian Paolo Calzolari

E-MAIL ADDRESS: Gian.Paolo.Calzolari@esa.int

------------------------------------------------------------------

DOCUMENT NUMBER: CCSDS 313.2-Y-1.1

DOCUMENT NAME: Procedures for SANA Registry Specification

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: 2-4 PARAGRAPH NUMBER: 2.3

PID SHORT TITLE: RELATIONSHIP section

------------------------------------------------------------------

DESCRIPTION OF REQUESTED CHANGE: (Use From: "..." To "..." format)

FROM:

The registry is expected to be complete and stable prior to the start of Agency review.

TO:

The registry design should be as complete and stable as possible prior to the start of Agency review.

------------------------------------------------------------------

CATEGORY OF REQUESTED CHANGE:

 Technical Fact \_\_\_ **Recommended** \_\_\_ Editorial \_\_\_

NOTES:

TECHNICAL FACT: Major technical change of sufficient magnitude as to render the Recommendation inaccurate and unacceptable if not corrected. (Supporting analysis/rationale is essential.)

RECOMMENDED: Change of a nature that would, if incorporated, produce a marked improvement in document quality and acceptance.

EDITORIAL: Typographical or other factual error needing correction. (This type of change will be made without feedback to submitter.)

------------------------------------------------------------------

SUPPORTING ANALYSIS:

This should be a good willing statement as agency review may impact the design of the register.

------------------------------------------------------------------

DISPOSITION: Rejected. The clear intent of this section is to have the initial registry created and available in the BETA set of registries prior to Agency review. This is so that the Agencies may evaluate these Normative registries, just as they evaluate the rest of the draft standard. It is true that Agency review may impact the registry (just like the rest of any standard that is being reviewed). The possibility of changes is why they will be created as BETA registries and only promoted to Production after CMC approval.

 CESG POLL ITEM DISPOSITION (PID) INITIATION FORM

AREA PID NUMBER: **SLS-02**

SUBMITTING AREA: **Space Link services Area (SLS)**

------------------------------------------------------------------

REVIEWER'S NAME: Gian Paolo Calzolari

E-MAIL ADDRESS: Gian.Paolo.Calzolari@esa.int

------------------------------------------------------------------

DOCUMENT NUMBER: CCSDS 313.2-Y-1.1

DOCUMENT NAME: Procedures for SANA Registry Specification

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: 2-4 PARAGRAPH NUMBER: 2.3

PID SHORT TITLE: CESG Verification

------------------------------------------------------------------

DESCRIPTION OF REQUESTED CHANGE: (Use From: "..." To "..." format)

FROM:

The CESG will verify that it exists before approving the Red Book for initial Agency review.

TO:

Delete this sentence.

------------------------------------------------------------------

CATEGORY OF REQUESTED CHANGE:

 **Technical Fact** \_\_\_ Recommended \_\_\_ Editorial \_\_\_

NOTES:

TECHNICAL FACT: Major technical change of sufficient magnitude as to render the Recommendation inaccurate and unacceptable if not corrected. (Supporting analysis/rationale is essential.)

RECOMMENDED: Change of a nature that would, if incorporated, produce a marked improvement in document quality and acceptance.

EDITORIAL: Typographical or other factual error needing correction. (This type of change will be made without feedback to submitter.)

------------------------------------------------------------------

SUPPORTING ANALYSIS:

Is this putting the task on the CESG to verify in the SANA database all the details of the request the WG has given to SANA?

I do not think all CESG Members are expected to do this.

Then who is CESG here? CESG Chair, all CESG Members? Or what?

IMO it is WG task to interact with SANA and finalize the matter before submitting the book for agency review.

IMO this responsibility is identical to the one for interoperability reports where WG Chair is responsible for them.

------------------------------------------------------------------

DISPOSITION: Rejected. The explicit intent of this is to ensure that the CESG provides technical oversight of these normative registries, just as it has responsibility for technical oversight of other contents in normative standards. This is completely in line with the treatment of the approval steps and expected maturity levels for CCSDS normative standards as specified in CCSDS A02.1-Y-4, Sec B1.2, a).

Similarly, the CESG gets interoperability test reports for normative standards that are expected to be reviewed for coverage and completeness as part of the CESG approval process. There is nothing different in kind here.

 CESG POLL ITEM DISPOSITION (PID) INITIATION FORM

AREA PID NUMBER: **SLS-03**

SUBMITTING AREA: **Space Link services Area (SLS)**

------------------------------------------------------------------

REVIEWER'S NAME: Gian Paolo Calzolari

E-MAIL ADDRESS: Gian.Paolo.Calzolari@esa.int

------------------------------------------------------------------

DOCUMENT NUMBER: CCSDS 313.2-Y-1.1

DOCUMENT NAME: Procedures for SANA Registry Specification

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: 2-4 PARAGRAPH NUMBER: 2.3

PID SHORT TITLE: CESG asking changes

------------------------------------------------------------------

DESCRIPTION OF REQUESTED CHANGE: (Use From: "..." To "..." format)

FROM:

The CESG may ask for changes to the registry during approval polling.

TO:

CESG Members may ask for changes to the registry during approval polling.

------------------------------------------------------------------

CATEGORY OF REQUESTED CHANGE:

 **Technical Fact** \_\_\_ Recommended \_\_\_ Editorial \_\_\_

NOTES:

TECHNICAL FACT: Major technical change of sufficient magnitude as to render the Recommendation inaccurate and unacceptable if not corrected. (Supporting analysis/rationale is essential.)

RECOMMENDED: Change of a nature that would, if incorporated, produce a marked improvement in document quality and acceptance.

EDITORIAL: Typographical or other factual error needing correction. (This type of change will be made without feedback to submitter.)

------------------------------------------------------------------

SUPPORTING ANALYSIS:

The proposed wording better reflects that there is no CESG wide statement but rather request by one or more CESG Members via conditions.

------------------------------------------------------------------

DISPOSITION: Rejected. It is always the case that it is just the CESG that is referenced. Specifically, the CCSDS Org and Proc, A02.1-Y-4 does not make this distinction. It uses language like this (example from Sec 2.3.2.2):

Working Groups must demonstrate that consensus processes were followed when drafting documents. The entire CESG must review each CCSDS document prior to its entering a track, and CESG consensus is required before that document can move forward.

 CESG POLL ITEM DISPOSITION (PID) INITIATION FORM

AREA PID NUMBER: **SLS-04**

SUBMITTING AREA: **Space Link services Area (SLS)**

------------------------------------------------------------------

REVIEWER'S NAME: Gian Paolo Calzolari

E-MAIL ADDRESS: Gian.Paolo.Calzolari@esa.int

------------------------------------------------------------------

DOCUMENT NUMBER: CCSDS 313.2-Y-1.1

DOCUMENT NAME: Procedures for SANA Registry Specification

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: A-1/3-1 PARAGRAPH NUMBER: 3.1

PID SHORT TITLE: Statement not needed

------------------------------------------------------------------

DESCRIPTION OF REQUESTED CHANGE: (Use From: "..." To "..." format)

Delete the statement:

Areas or Working Groups with questions about the process, or whether their proposed changes are well formed, may always contact either the SANA Operator, the SSG, or both.

------------------------------------------------------------------

CATEGORY OF REQUESTED CHANGE: **Technical Fact**

------------------------------------------------------------------

SUPPORTING ANALYSIS:

I think this statement is not needed in this point in this document.

------------------------------------------------------------------

DISPOSITION: Rejected. This document is specifically guidance to the WG. This is telling them, up front, that if they have questions there are places where they can get answers. Since our experience with many WG is that they are either unaware of this, or do not bother to ask, including this seems well advised.

 CESG POLL ITEM DISPOSITION (PID) INITIATION FORM

AREA PID NUMBER: **SLS-05**

SUBMITTING AREA: **Space Link services Area (SLS)**

------------------------------------------------------------------

REVIEWER'S NAME: Gian Paolo Calzolari

E-MAIL ADDRESS: Gian.Paolo.Calzolari@esa.int

------------------------------------------------------------------

DOCUMENT NUMBER: CCSDS 313.2-Y-1.1

DOCUMENT NAME: Procedures for SANA Registry Specification

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: Many PARAGRAPH NUMBER: Many

PID SHORT TITLE: Contact addresses

------------------------------------------------------------------

DESCRIPTION OF REQUESTED CHANGE: (Use From: "..." To "..." format)

Move to a dedicated section or clause the contact addresses for SANA Operator, the SSG, etc.

------------------------------------------------------------------

CATEGORY OF REQUESTED CHANGE: **Recommended**

------------------------------------------------------------------

SUPPORTING ANALYSIS:

The contact addresses are actually in section 2.3. IMO they should be highlighted better e.g. in dedicated section or dedicated clauses.

------------------------------------------------------------------

DISPOSITION: Reject: Section 2.3, “**CCSDS AREA AND WORKING GROUP REGISTRY WORKFLOW OVERVIEW”** is already a separate section where all of the key email addresses and URLs are provided for the WGs. Many are already in dedicated clauses. In fact, I can find only one such reference that is not in Sec 2.3, and that is a reference to the BETA registry in sec 3.3.1.1.d. which is CESG guidance rather than WG guidance.

 CESG POLL ITEM DISPOSITION (PID) INITIATION FORM

AREA PID NUMBER: **SLS-06**

SUBMITTING AREA: **Space Link services Area (SLS)**

------------------------------------------------------------------

REVIEWER'S NAME: Gian Paolo Calzolari

E-MAIL ADDRESS: Gian.Paolo.Calzolari@esa.int

------------------------------------------------------------------

DOCUMENT NUMBER: CCSDS 313.2-Y-1.1

DOCUMENT NAME: Procedures for SANA Registry Specification

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: A-3 / 3-3 PARAGRAPH NUMBER: 3.3.1.1

PID SHORT TITLE: List of CESG tasks

------------------------------------------------------------------

DESCRIPTION OF REQUESTED CHANGE: (Use From: "..." To "..." format)

This clause has a very detailed list of task assigned to CESG (Chair? All Members?). It looks that such requirements are too strong and not balanced with respect to the rest of the material to be reviewed by CESGers before an Agency review.

Consider converting to simpler statement(s) as agreed by CESG.

------------------------------------------------------------------

CATEGORY OF REQUESTED CHANGE:

 **Technical Fact** \_\_\_ Recommended \_\_\_ Editorial \_\_\_

NOTES:

TECHNICAL FACT: Major technical change of sufficient magnitude as to render the Recommendation inaccurate and unacceptable if not corrected. (Supporting analysis/rationale is essential.)

RECOMMENDED: Change of a nature that would, if incorporated, produce a marked improvement in document quality and acceptance.

EDITORIAL: Typographical or other factual error needing correction. (This type of change will be made without feedback to submitter.)

------------------------------------------------------------------

SUPPORTING ANALYSIS:

See description above. Moreover, part of the checks in 3.3.1.1a (e.g. presence of the Annex) are part of the sanity check performed by the CCSDS Technical Editor. All the other checks are part of the normal check to be done when a poll is requested.

------------------------------------------------------------------

DISPOSITION: Rejected. These are specific checks to be performed by the CESG which are in parallel with, and entirely consistent with, the same kinds of checks to be made on other content in normative specifications. This is completely in line with the treatment of the approval steps and expected maturity levels for CCSDS normative standards as specified in CCSDS A02.1-Y-4, Sec B1.2, a).

 CESG POLL ITEM DISPOSITION (PID) INITIATION FORM

AREA PID NUMBER: **SLS-07**

SUBMITTING AREA: **Space Link services Area (SLS)**

------------------------------------------------------------------

REVIEWER'S NAME: Gian Paolo Calzolari

E-MAIL ADDRESS: Gian.Paolo.Calzolari@esa.int

------------------------------------------------------------------

DOCUMENT NUMBER: CCSDS 313.2-Y-1.1

DOCUMENT NAME: Procedures for SANA Registry Specification

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: A-3/3-3 PARAGRAPH NUMBER: 3.3.1

PID SHORT TITLE: International Review?

------------------------------------------------------------------

DESCRIPTION OF REQUESTED CHANGE: (Use From: "..." To "..." format)

Change everywhere needed

FROM:

INTERNATIONAL REVIEW.

TO:

AGENCY REVIEW.

------------------------------------------------------------------

CATEGORY OF REQUESTED CHANGE: **Technical Fact**

------------------------------------------------------------------

SUPPORTING ANALYSIS:

CCSDS A02.1-Y-4 does not use the term International Review.

------------------------------------------------------------------

DISPOSITION: Accepted.

In all instances … change From: INTERNATIONAL REVIEW.

To: AGENCY REVIEW.

 CESG POLL ITEM DISPOSITION (PID) INITIATION FORM

AREA PID NUMBER: **SLS-08**

SUBMITTING AREA: **Space Link services Area (SLS)**

------------------------------------------------------------------

REVIEWER'S NAME: Gian Paolo Calzolari

E-MAIL ADDRESS: Gian.Paolo.Calzolari@esa.int

------------------------------------------------------------------

DOCUMENT NUMBER: CCSDS 313.2-Y-1.1

DOCUMENT NAME: Procedures for SANA Registry Specification

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: A-4/3-4 PARAGRAPH NUMBER: 3.3.2.1a

PID SHORT TITLE: Who is this clause for?

------------------------------------------------------------------

DESCRIPTION OF REQUESTED CHANGE: (Use From: "..." To "..." format)

Is this clause for CESG Chair to go checking the SANA web site?

------------------------------------------------------------------

CATEGORY OF REQUESTED CHANGE: **Technical Fact**

------------------------------------------------------------------

SUPPORTING ANALYSIS:

This is too detailed and not appropriate.

I suggest deleting.

------------------------------------------------------------------

DISPOSITION: Reject. This clause is completely in line with the treatment of the approval steps and expected maturity levels required to allow publication of CCSDS normative standards as specified in CCSDS A02.1-Y-4, Sec B1.2, c). The language addressing the “CESG” is consistent with parallel requirements in CCSDS A02.1-Y-4. It is understood as a joint CESG responsibility, as are all other CESG document review and approval duties.

 CESG POLL ITEM DISPOSITION (PID) INITIATION FORM

AREA PID NUMBER: **SLS-09**

SUBMITTING AREA: **Space Link services Area (SLS)**

------------------------------------------------------------------

REVIEWER'S NAME: Gian Paolo Calzolari

E-MAIL ADDRESS: Gian.Paolo.Calzolari@esa.int

------------------------------------------------------------------

DOCUMENT NUMBER: CCSDS 313.2-Y-1.1

DOCUMENT NAME: Procedures for SANA Registry Specification

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: A-4/3-4 PARAGRAPH NUMBER: 3.3.2.1b

PID SHORT TITLE: Who is this clause for?

------------------------------------------------------------------

DESCRIPTION OF REQUESTED CHANGE: (Use From: "..." To "..." format)

Move clause 3.3.2.1b to WG Chair duties or delete.

b) The CESG shall verify that the required interactions with identified registries are documented in an interoperability test report.

------------------------------------------------------------------

CATEGORY OF REQUESTED CHANGE: **Technical Fact**

------------------------------------------------------------------

SUPPORTING ANALYSIS:

As per CCSDS A02.1-Y-4 section 6.2.6.1 Approval Criteria, first bullet of item b) 1):

* the WG Chair is responsible for documenting the specific implementations that qualify the specification for CCSDS Recommended Standard status, along with reports relevant to their testing;

Why should this responsibility be moved to CESG?

Consider also whether an update to CCSDS A02.1-Y-4 is required to make clear that the interoperability test report(s) shall also include this documentation about these interactions.

------------------------------------------------------------------

DISPOSITION: Reject. It is indeed the responsibility of the WG to verify that the registry is correctly formed, verified, and tested as needed. And, as with Yellow Book test reports for normative standards, it is the responsibility of the CESG to review the standard, and the test reports, and the registries, and validate that they are correctly formed and that correct processes were followed.

 CESG POLL ITEM DISPOSITION (PID) INITIATION FORM

AREA PID NUMBER: **SLS-10**

SUBMITTING AREA: **Space Link services Area (SLS)**

------------------------------------------------------------------

REVIEWER'S NAME: Gian Paolo Calzolari

E-MAIL ADDRESS: Gian.Paolo.Calzolari@esa.int

------------------------------------------------------------------

DOCUMENT NUMBER: CCSDS 313.2-Y-1.1

DOCUMENT NAME: Procedures for SANA Registry Specification

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: 3-1 (actually A-1) PARAGRAPH NUMBER: Annex A

PID SHORT TITLE: Change title for Annex A

------------------------------------------------------------------

DESCRIPTION OF REQUESTED CHANGE: (Use From: "..." To "..." format)

FROM: SANA CONSIDERATIONS.

TO: Template for SANA Considerations Annex

------------------------------------------------------------------

CATEGORY OF REQUESTED CHANGE: **Technical Fact**

------------------------------------------------------------------

SUPPORTING ANALYSIS:

No recursive titles, please.

And according to section A1: This annex provides Working Groups with a template for the SANA Considerations annex subsection that is to be included in all CCSDS normative track documents (see reference [3]).

Examples of different customizations of the template are provided

------------------------------------------------------------------

DISPOSITION: Accepted, with mods.

Sec Annex A, pg 3-1 (really A-1), From:

SANA CONSIDERATIONS.

Sec Annex A, pg 3-1 (really A-1), To:

TEMPLATE FOR SANA CONSIDERATIONS.