**PID resolutions for CESG-P-2020-02-001, review of CCSDS 313.0-Y-3, Draft SANA Role, Responsibilities, Policies, and Procedures**

**Contents of PDF file CESG-P-2020-02-001 email.pdf**

**SEA / SSG Responses shown as <<response>>**

Peter:

The CESG poll to approve publication of CCSDS  
313.0-Y-3, Space Assigned Numbers Authority  
(SANA)—Role, Responsibilities, Policies, and  
Procedures Yellow Book, Issue 3) 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.

>Date: Thu, 20 Feb 2020 16:40:26 -0500  
>To: cesg-all@mailman.ccsds.org  
>From: CCSDS Secretariat <thomas.gannef@tgannef.net>  
>Subject: Results of CESG Polls closing 19 February 2020  
>  
>CESG E-Poll Identifier: CESG-P-2020-02-001  
>Approval to publish CCSDS 313.0-Y-3, Space  
>Assigned Numbers Authority (SANA)—Role,  
>Responsibilities, Policies, and Procedures Yellow Book, Issue 3)  
>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)

>  General: Consider renaming SANA to give it a

>  more accurately reflect its proper scope. SANA

>  has long since outgrown such things spacecraft

>  identifiers, APIDs. We have such things as

>  role definitions, contacts registry, XML schema

>  registries, sites and apertures, quasar

>  catalogs, celestial body reference frames,

>  CCSDS glossary etc. all of which are more than

>  just mere registration of numbers. given that

>  we have the sanaregistry.org URL etc. up and

>  running it may be more trouble than it's worth

>  to rename this. Alternatively, perhaps the

>  document title could be revised (with any

> related scoping changes if needed) with an  
> added indication in the document that for convenience it is known simply SANA. >

**<<Granted that the Space Assigned Numbers Authority (SANA) contains more than just “numbers”. That said, the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA), which the SANA was patterned after also contains more than just “numbers”. When you Google for SANA it shows SCID, Terms, Nav messages, XML, When you Google for IANA it just points to the IANA, and the IANA says “names, numbers, protocol assignments”.**

**I fail to agree that we need to make any drastic changes, but would agree to clarifying, in the intro and scope sections of this SANA document, that it is the registrar for all sorts of names, number, and other objects that need to be registered.**

**Sec 3.1 Scope, already says:**

The SANA Operator assigns and registers CCSDS protocol parameters and other CCSDS objects as directed by the criteria and procedures specified in CCSDS documents. SANA is the core registrar and first-level authority for CCSDS registries. The SANA registers a variety of standards-related information, such as protocol identifiers, agencies, service and data providers, XML schema, a glossary of terms, and other information that is used across CCSDS.

**Proposed changes:**

**Sec 1.3, pg 1-1, From:**

It defines an operational entity called the SANA and a process that will allow creation and operation of registries of objects that will be used by protocol and data exchange standard designers and implementers.

**Sec 1.3, pg 1-1, To:**

It defines an operational entity called the SANA and a process that will allow creation and operation of registries for several different kinds of objects that will be used by protocol and data exchange standard designers and implementers.

**Sec 3.1, pg 3-1, From:**

The SANA registers a variety of standards-related information, such as protocol identifiers, agencies, service and data providers, XML schema, a glossary of terms, and other information that is used across CCSDS.

**Sec 3.1, pg 3-1, To:**

The SANA registers a wide variety of standards-related information, such as protocol identifiers, agencies, contacts, service sites and apertures, and data providers, XML schema, Quasar catalogs, a glossary of terms, and other information that is used across CCSDS.

**>**

2) Re section 3.3: I highly recommend that CMC  
>adopt a high level data governance policy and  
>that this section be revised when such a policy  
>is well defined. Rationale: it seems to me that  
>once SANA has achieved a certain "weight" or  
>"size" (which it has), summarily terminating  
>SANA operations as indicated in the section  
>could in fact be dangerous/ruinous. (For  
>example, does "killing" the quasar catalog  
>adversly affect ongoing interferometry  
>determiations -- I suspect it might - or is the  
>CCSDS policy such that any data maintained by  
>SANA shall never be "rated" as worthy for  
>inter-agency operations? I don't think that is  
>the current intention but this kind of thing,  
>for example, has never been stated). Some sort  
>of overall policy/high level principles for data  
>governance for the CCSDS organization should be  
>stated and the management of SANA operations  
>brought in line with such a policy. Such a high  
>level policy should also address firng with  
>legal data protection considerations (e.g, the  
>GPDR -- hfps://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GeneraltiDatatiProtectiontiRegulation). >

**<<Concur that some additional “beefing up” of data governance may be appropriate.**

**Sec 3.3, pg 3-2, From:**

The CMC may ask the Secretariat to change the SANA Operator contract as necessary, but must ensure that the contract preserves the databases and transfers them to the new SANA Operator.

**Sec 3.3, pg 3-2, To:**

The CMC may ask the Secretariat to change the SANA Operator contract as necessary, but must ensure that the contract preserves intact the databases, services, interfaces, and processes, and transfers them to the new SANA Operator to support on-going operations and maintenance of the SANA for CCSDS and the user community.

**>>**

>  Mario Merri (Approve with Conditions):

1)

>  Page 3-3 "NOTE ​The CESG will not permit any

>  standard specifying a registry to be sent for

>  Agency review ...". It seems too me to strict a

>  rule. I am sure that there will be situation

>  where the CCSDS has an interest in publishing a

>  book even if the associated registr(ies) is/are

>  not finalised. Maybe the sentence could be

>  modified to say ""NOTE ​In general the CESG

>  ..." and indicating that an AD who nevertheless

>  approves the CESG poll needs to spell out why

>  (s)he is content with a beta registry.  
>

**<<The policies and practices that have been in use are far too lax, unclear, and are often not followed. This has resulted in “draft” registries that persist for years, standards proposed for publication that “define” a new registry that was never created because it was just (loosely) stated in a document but never requested nor tested, and other weird situation. This policy, drafted after consultation with the SANA Operator, the CCSDS Chief Technical Editor, and the SSG results in clear ‘”gates” and assignment of responsibility. Anything less will fail to fix the existing problems and ensure a smooth path forward.**

**Our current rules already say that a registry must exist before a document can be published, they just are not as “tight” as they should be and things have fallen through the cracks. See CCSDS 313.0-Y-1, Sec 3.10, pg 3-3:**

The SANA operator shall notify the CESG and the related WG chairs when a new registry is ready for a preliminary or final review. It is the responsibility of the working group to test and validate the registry according to the rules that it established in the registry creation document. The Area Director for that WG or the CESG chair shall approve the registry. The SANA operator shall publish the approved registry.

**Furthermore, the Registry Management Policy, CCSDS 313.1-Y-1, has this in Sec 3.5.2, pg 3-23:**

**3.5.2.3** Responsibility for the registry definition and updates may be delegated down to a CCSDS WG, but the Area Director retains overall responsibility for any registry.

**3.5.2.4** The registry shall be defined according to the procedures contained in reference [6]. **3.5.2.5** The registry definition shall include the detailed registry specification and the registration rules.

**3.5.2.6** The registration rules for protocol identifiers will typically be either type a) change requires a CCSDS approved document, or type d) Change requires no review (cf. reference [5]); assignments are done on a first-come, first-served basis.

**3.5.2.7** The initial registry specification shall be defined prior to the first Agency Red Book Review, and reviewed with the SANA (and/or SSG) at the earliest possible opportunity.

**3.5.2.8** Upon request to the SANA the initial registry may be created based on the draft Recommended Standard and placed in the Candidate Registry section of the SANA.

**3.5.2.9** After approval of the defining document the Area Director should request that the registry be promoted to Approved Registry status.

**It seems pretty clear to me that we had many of the necessary rules, but they were not being followed. Part of the reason for this editing effort, as stated during prior CESG meetings, was to clarify exactly who was to do what and when. And to put the guidance for the WG into one more convenient document, CCSDS 313.2-Y-2. >**

>2) Page 3-5, Sec 3.10, last paragraph "The SANA  
>Operator is responsible ...". See point 1 above.

**<<See response to 1). >>**

>3) Page 3-6 "the SANA shall send an email to >cesg@mailman.ccsds.org to notify ...". I do not  
>think this is necessary. CESG receives already too many emails.

**<<The CESG is the technical body that is assigned responsibility for ensuring the technical quality of CCSDS standards. That includes any registries that are normative entities that are created and operated in support of these standards.>>**

4) Page 3-7 "The SANA Operator must not change  
>the structure of any CCSDS registry without  
>prior consent of the CESG or SSG ...". Not clear  
>what CESG or SSG means. Is this "or" rather an "and"?  
>

**<<Propose to change this to “SSG. The CESG shall be consulted in the event of and issues that arise.**

**Sec 3.14, pg 3-7, From:**

The SANA Operator must not change the structure of any CCSDS registry without prior consent of the CESG or SSG and without a change in the CCSDS specification that created the registry.

**Sec 3.14, pg 3-7, To:**

The SANA Operator must not change the structure of any CCSDS registry without prior consent of the SSG and without a change in the CCSDS specification that created the registry.

**Note that any issues that arise in SANA and SSG operation may be escalated to the CESG, and, if necessary, the CMC. See sec 3.18, pg 3-9.>>**

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

>PS: The winword file is also attached for convenience. >

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

> Jonathan Wilmot (Approve  
> Unconditionally): I agreed with many of the

> other conditions and just have two minor edits to add  
>  
>1) ISection 3.11 "where is shall persist in  
>Candidate" should be "where it shall persist in Candidate" >

**<< Agreed. CTE shall fix the typo. >>**

>2) Section 3.12 the phrase "defined in the CCSDS  
>Registry Management Policy" should have the actual book reference.  
>  
**<< Agreed. CTE shall fix the typo. >>**

>Total Respondents: 6  
>  
>All Areas responded to this question.  
>  
>  
>  
>SECRETARIAT INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS: Approved with Conditions >PROPOSED SECRETARIAT ACTION: Generate  
>CMC poll aler conditions have been addressed  
>