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 313.0-Y-2.1

DOCUMENT NAME: SANA Role, Responsibilities, Policies, & Procedures

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: Many PARAGRAPH NUMBER: 3.6

PID SHORT TITLE: RELATIONSHIP section

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

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

There are three section on RELATIONSHIP, namely

3.6 CESG RELATIONSHIP

3.7 SECRETARIAT RELATIONSHIP

3.10 CCSDS WORKING GROUP RELATIONSHIP

It is recommended to keep them in sequence starting with the relationship with WGs as the WGs are the first to contact SANA. Note also that a section on CMC RELATIONSHIP is missing: it is recommended to add it (see also **SLS-02**). The following sequence is recommended:

3.6 CCSDS WORKING GROUP RELATIONSHIP

3.7 CESG RELATIONSHIP

3.8 CMC RELATIONSHIP

3.9 SECRETARIAT RELATIONSHIP

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

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:

Putting those relationships in sequence helps the reader.

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

DISPOSITION: Rejected. This document is intended to document the first and foremost, the SANA Operator roles and responsibilities. As stated in Sec 1.2 Document Scope, pg 1-1:

This document defines the SANA and SANA Operator realm of responsibilities. The assignment of the SANA Operator and the liaison roles to other standards organizations or space-related organizations is the responsibility of the CCSDS Management Council (CMC). The processes, roles, and responsibilities of CCSDS Working Groups related to the SANA are defined in *Procedures for SANA Registry Specification* (see reference [8]).

This document does also document the CESG and Secretariat interactio0ns with the SANA, largely because they are involved in SANA operations and the approvals of registries. All of the necessary WG details are now in the Procedures for SANA Registry Specification. WG need not concern themselves with this document.

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 313.0-Y-2.1

DOCUMENT NAME: SANA Role, Responsibilities, Policies, & Procedures

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: 1-2 PARAGRAPH NUMBER: 1.5

PID SHORT TITLE: CMC Relationship

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

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

Reference:

The document describes the relationship between SANA and the other stakeholders within CCSDS, such as the CCSDS Engineering Steering Group (CESG), the CMC, WGs, and the CCSDS Secretariat.

Please add a section on CMC Relationship for consistency with this statement.

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

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:

A section on CMC Relationship is absent.

This section is worth to be added also if some interactions with CMC are spread through the document.

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

DISPOSITION: Rejected. The essential roles of the CMC are already addressed in Sec 2, Sec 3.1, Sec 3.3, and Sec 3.8. Since this is largely a governing role, carried out at a remove, it has not warranted a separate section. The other CMC roles that appear are essentially just a part of normal document production and approval.

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 313.0-Y-2.1

DOCUMENT NAME: SANA Role, Responsibilities, Policies, & Procedures

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: 3-3 PARAGRAPH NUMBER: 3.6

PID SHORT TITLE: WG Relationship in CESG section #1

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

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

FROM:

The SANA Operator shall be informed by a WG of any new registries, or of changes to existing registries, prior to when the WG submits the Red Book (or Pink Sheet) for its first agency review. The SANA Operator shall provide notice to the SSG that there is a new registry and a technical assessment of whether SANA has all the information it needs to create the registry. This notice shall be via an email to ssg@ccsds.mailman.org.

TO:

Move this information to the section on WG RELATIONSHIP (except the part already present there; i.e. do not introduce duplications).

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

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 paragraph does not describe CESG Operations.

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

DISPOSITION: Reject. All of this does, in fact, describe SANA operations, when they are to be notified, what they must do, and how they are to do it.

Sec 3.10, pg 3-5, says this:

The CCSDS WGs requiring development of a new registry, or adaptation of an existing registry, shall contact the SANA Operator at the earliest opportunity.

This section then points the WG to the revised Procedures for SANA Registry Specification (reference [8]) where all of the details that the WG needs to be aware of are spelled out. This was done to provide the WG with what they needed, for normal processes, in one convenient place. They need not consult this document unless they wish to.

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 313.0-Y-2.1

DOCUMENT NAME: SANA Role, Responsibilities, Policies, & Procedures

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: 3-3 PARAGRAPH NUMBER: 3.6

PID SHORT TITLE: WG Relationship in CESG section #2

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

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

FROM: The new Candidate registry, or any alterations to the structure of an existing registry, will be managed by the SANA in the SANA Beta site, https://beta.sanaregistry.org. The CESG shall review the Candidate registry prior to approving the release of the document for its first Agency review. When clarifications or changes are required, they must be performed by the WG prior to the request for approval of the document for Agency Review.

TO: The CESG shall review the document (including the Annex with Candidate registry) within the CESG Poll for releasing the document for its first Agency review.

Moreover, move to the section on WG RELATIONSHIP the relevant part of the paragraph, i.e.

The new Candidate registry, or any alterations to the structure of an existing registry, will be managed by the SANA in the SANA Beta site, https://beta.sanaregistry.org. When clarifications or changes are required, they must be performed by the WG prior to the request for approval of the document for Agency Review.

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

CATEGORY OF REQUESTED CHANGE: **Technical Fact**

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

SUPPORTING ANALYSIS:

The existing sentence it ambiguous as it looks there is dedicated review of the candidate review while there is simply a CESG Poll to approve releasing a document - that includes a SANA Annex - for Agency Review)

The part to be moved does not describe CESG Operations.

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

DISPOSITION: Rejected. The creation of the candidate registry is, indeed, a part of SANA operations and this specified how that is to be carried out. The explicit intent of this clarification is to describe where the draft registry will be created and to ensure that the CESG is aware of their responsibility to review that registry, along with the rest of the normative content of the document.

The WG aspects of this are documents in the CCSDS 313.2-Y-2. They need not consult this document at all.

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 313.0-Y-2.1

DOCUMENT NAME: SANA Role, Responsibilities, Policies, & Procedures

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: 3-3 PARAGRAPH NUMBER: 3.6

PID SHORT TITLE: Technical review prior to CESG approval to publish

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

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

FROM: As part of the final CESG review and approval of CCSDS Blue and Magenta documents prior to publication, the CESG will again review the documents and what should, at this point in the process, be the final form of the registry, with at least representative contents. This last technical review will be done prior to CESG approval to publish. As a consequence of the CESG and the CMC approval of the document for publication the registry is also approved. This will trigger promotion of the registry from Candidate status on the Beta site to Approved status on the SANA Production site.

TO: As part of the final CESG review and approval of CCSDS Blue and Magenta documents prior to publication, the CESG will again review the documents and what should, at this point in the process, be the final form of the registry, with at least representative contents.

MOREOVER, move to a section on CMC Relationship the statements:

As a consequence of the CESG and the CMC approval of the document for publication the registry is also approved. This will trigger promotion of the registry from Candidate status on the Beta site to Approved status on the SANA Production site.

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

CATEGORY OF REQUESTED CHANGE: **Technical Fact**

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

SUPPORTING ANALYSIS:

The sentence “This last technical review will be done prior to CESG approval to publish” gives the impression there is a CESG technical review before CESG Poll but this kind of review does not exist.

The other parts are related to CMC RELATIONSHIP and not to CESG.

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

DISPOSITION: Accept with changes.

From: This last technical review will be done prior to CESG approval to publish.

To: This last technical review of the registry and representative contents will be done as part of the normal CESG review and approval to publish.

It is the CESG technical review that provides the assurance that the registries are well formed, mature, and appropriately populated with representative data. The CMC does give the final approval to publish, and this is the “gate” for promotion of the registry to Production status, but the CMC seldom involves itself with this level of technical review.

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 313.0-Y-2.1

DOCUMENT NAME: SANA Role, Responsibilities, Policies, & Procedures

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: 3-3 PARAGRAPH NUMBER: NOTE in 3.6

PID SHORT TITLE: Delete NOTE

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

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

Delete the following:

NOTE – The CESG will not permit any standard specifying a registry to be sent for Agency review until the existence of the registry, and a check of its structure and contents, has been verified and approved on the SANA Beta site.

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

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 final NOTE in section 3.6 is ambiguous and it looks as it is putting on CESG (Chair? Members?) some obligations that go beyond the CESG Poll for publication.

Does CESG mean CESG Chair?

Who will trigger the verification on the SANA Beta site?

Should the relevant Area request/produce a SANA blessing before a poll for publication?

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

DISPOSITION: Rejected. The explicit intent of Sec 3.6 is to ensure that the CESG provides technical oversight of these normative registries, just as it has responsibility for technical oversight of 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).

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 313.0-Y-2.1

DOCUMENT NAME: SANA Role, Responsibilities, Policies, & Procedures

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: 3-4 PARAGRAPH NUMBER: 3.9

PID SHORT TITLE: Who is the addressee of the SANA Considerations?

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

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

FROM:

A SANA Considerations subsection shall be included in an annex of all CCSDS standards track documents. The SANA Considerations shall document all information needed for SANA to make assignments or changes to, or to create new registries. In situations where the CCSDS standards track document does not add requirements to registries managed by SANA, the document’s SANA Considerations shall explicitly indicate that. In a draft Recommended Standard the SANA Considerations annex subsection shall document the registry, its design and operating rules, to provide guidance to the SANA Operator on how to implement it. In the published version of the document only the documentation of the final registry, guidance to the user, and a pointer to the Production registry shall remain.

TO:

A SANA Considerations subsection shall be included in an annex of all CCSDS standards track documents. In a draft Recommended Standard/Practice (i.e. Red/Pink book) the SANA Considerations ~~annex~~ subsection shall document the registry, its design and operating rules, to provide guidance to the SANA Operator on how to implement it. In the published version of the document only the documentation of the final registry, guidance to the user, and a pointer to the Production registry shall remain.

In situations where the CCSDS standards track document does not add requirements to registries managed by SANA, the document’s SANA Considerations shall explicitly indicate that.

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

CATEGORY OF REQUESTED CHANGE: **Technical Fact**

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

SUPPORTING ANALYSIS:

The “generalized” sentence “*The SANA Considerations shall document all information needed for SANA to make assignments or changes to, or to create new registries*.” is actually conflicting with the next two sentences distinguishing between Red/Pink Book vs the published version contents. In fact, this sentence only describes the interaction required with SANA before publication while the reader of the published may be interested in what happened but surely needs to get guidance in case he has to request creating new entries for a given registry.

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

DISPOSITION: Accepted, with the noted ~~change~~.

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 313.0-Y-2.1

DOCUMENT NAME: SANA Role, Responsibilities, Policies, & Procedures

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: 1-2 & 3-5 PARAGRAPH NUMBER: 1.6 & 3.11

PID SHORT TITLE: Undefined MACAO

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

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

Add a definition for MACAO.

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

CATEGORY OF REQUESTED CHANGE: **Editorial**

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

SUPPORTING ANALYSIS:

The acronym MACAO is used but never expanded/explained.

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

DISPOSITION: Accepted, with mods.

Sec 1.6, Pg 1-2, From:

NOTE – Compliant with the CCSDS SANA Registry Management Policy, the above definition of Registration Authority covers the SANA and other CCSDS organizations that perform registration, such as the Secretariat or a MACAO.

Sec 1.6, Pg 1-2, To:

NOTE – Compliant with the CCSDS SANA Registry Management Policy [3], the above definition of Registration Authority covers the SANA and other CCSDS organizations that perform registration, such as the Secretariat.

Sec 3.11, pg 3-5, From:

, MACAO originator and reviser

Sec 3.11, pg 3-5, To:

Remove this clause entirely

It is just not worth adding definitions for MACAO and SCA and SFDU to this document. These are thoroughly covered in the RMP.

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 313.0-Y-2.1

DOCUMENT NAME: SANA Role, Responsibilities, Policies, & Procedures

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: Many PARAGRAPH NUMBER: Many

PID SHORT TITLE: Editorials

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

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

Section 3.1

FROM: However, the SANA Operator shall not make any assignments of that protocol space, since it is not owned by CCSDS.

TO: However, the SANA Operator cannot make any assignments…

Section 3.11

FROM: The Candidate registry will persist on the SANA Beta site until the document is approved by the CESG for international review.

TO: The Candidate registry will persist on the SANA Beta site until the document is approved by the CESG for agency review.

FROM: … where is shall persist in Candidate status until final publication of the document associated with its creation

TO: … where it shall persist in Candidate status until final publication of the document associated with its creation

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

CATEGORY OF REQUESTED CHANGE: **Editorial** \_\_\_

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

SUPPORTING ANALYSIS:

Editorial corrections

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

DISPOSITION: Accepted as stated.

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 313.0-Y-2.1

DOCUMENT NAME: SANA Role, Responsibilities, Policies, & Procedures

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: 3-1 PARAGRAPH NUMBER: 3.2

PID SHORT TITLE: Supporting approval after the approval?

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

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

FROM: This includes … and assisting in the registry approval and promotion process after the CESG and CMC give final approval to publish the standards.

TO:

This includes

* creating Candidate registries on a Beta site (https://beta.sanaregistry.org) prior to prototyping and interoperability testing of the standards that create them;
* assisting in the registry review and approval process; and
* performing the promotion process to Production status after the CESG and CMC give final approval to publish the standards.

.

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

CATEGORY OF REQUESTED CHANGE: **Technical Fact**

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

SUPPORTING ANALYSIS:

The existing sentence seems to say that there is a registry approval after book publication has been approved. I think that CESG & CMC approval for publication do include registry approval.

The bulleted list is intended to make the sentence clearer.

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

DISPOSITION: Accepted with identified changes

CESG POLL ITEM DISPOSITION (PID) INITIATION FORM

AREA PID NUMBER: **SLS-11**

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

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

REVIEWER'S NAME: Gian Paolo Calzolari

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

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

DOCUMENT NUMBER: CCSDS 313.0-Y-2.1

DOCUMENT NAME: SANA Role, Responsibilities, Policies, & Procedures

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: 3-5 PARAGRAPH NUMBER: 3.10

PID SHORT TITLE: Remove CESG items from WG Relationship section

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

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

Remove the following text:

The CESG is responsible for verifying that SANA and registry requirements are met, that the Candidate registry exists and is in appropriate form before approving the document for first Agency review. The CESG is also responsible for verifying that the registry is in production form prior to approving the final document defining the registry for publication.

CESG Responsibilities shall be removed from the section on WG Relationship.

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

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:

CESG Responsibilities shall be in the section on CESG Relationship.

Moreover, I am doubts about this formulation that seems to include checks outside the document under poll. CESG responsibility is within the check of the document under poll at poll time.

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

DISPOSITION: Reject. This aspect is included here as a reminder for the SANA operator, and the CESG, that there is a specific role that they play in the review of registries that the WG creates. As noted before, the WG aspects of this are fully documented in the revised *Procedures for SANA Registry Specification* (reference [8]) which are mention ed in this same section.

CESG POLL ITEM DISPOSITION (PID) INITIATION FORM

AREA PID NUMBER: **SLS-12**

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

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

REVIEWER'S NAME: Gian Paolo Calzolari

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

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

DOCUMENT NUMBER: CCSDS 313.0-Y-2.1

DOCUMENT NAME: SANA Role, Responsibilities, Policies, & Procedures

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: 3-6 PARAGRAPH NUMBER: 3.11

PID SHORT TITLE: Why informing CESG?

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

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

Remove the following text:

Once the Candidate registry has been created in the Beta site and approved by the WG, the SANA shall send an email to cesg@mailman.ccsds.org to notify the CESG of the registry status.

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

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:

What is the purpose of this mail? Is this requesting a CESG review of the registry before the poll for Agency review?

I do not see a need for this extra mail to CESG.

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

DISPOSITION: Accept with modifications. The intent of this was to signal the CESG that a new registry has been created as part of a standard development activity. The normal project creation process does not necessarily reference the creation of a registry, so this was added as a “Head’s Up” that a registry was being created for a standard. This could be the SSG instead of the CESG.

Sec 3.11, pg 3-6, From:

Once the Candidate registry has been created in the Beta site and approved by the WG, the SANA shall send an email to cesg@mailman.ccsds.org to notify the CESG of the registry status.

Sec 3.11, pg 3-6, To:

Once the Candidate registry has been created in the Beta site and approved by the WG, the SANA shall send an email to ssg@mailman.ccsds.org to notify the SSG of the registry status.

CESG POLL ITEM DISPOSITION (PID) INITIATION FORM

AREA PID NUMBER: **SLS-13**

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

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

REVIEWER'S NAME: Gian Paolo Calzolari

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

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

DOCUMENT NUMBER: CCSDS 313.0-Y-2.1

DOCUMENT NAME: SANA Role, Responsibilities, Policies, & Procedures

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: 3-6 PARAGRAPH NUMBER: 3.11

PID SHORT TITLE: Area Director responsibility

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

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

Remove the following text:

The Area Director for that WG shall review the registry on the SANA Beta site prior to requesting that the document be sent out for its first 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:

Ads and DADs do check the documents before issuing the Area resolution asking to start Agency Resolution.

I do not see a need for this level of details.

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

DISPOSITION: Reject. Please see response to **SLS-06**. This just makes this AD responsibility for checking the registry explicit. This is to avoid ambiguity and the sort of thing that has already occurred where documents were sent to be approved for publication and registries did not even exist.

CESG POLL ITEM DISPOSITION (PID) INITIATION FORM

AREA PID NUMBER: **SLS-14**

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

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

REVIEWER'S NAME: Gian Paolo Calzolari

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

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

DOCUMENT NUMBER: CCSDS 313.0-Y-2.1

DOCUMENT NAME: SANA Role, Responsibilities, Policies, & Procedures

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: 3-7 PARAGRAPH NUMBER: 3.14

PID SHORT TITLE: CESG or SSG consent?

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

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

The following sentence is ambiguous:

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.

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

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 it CESG or SSG to give consent?

Is the CESG consent the one given with CESG Polls for Agency Review and publication or something else?

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

DISPOSITION: Accepted. Same response as for Mario Merri 3)

**<<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.>>**

CESG POLL ITEM DISPOSITION (PID) INITIATION FORM

AREA PID NUMBER: **SLS-15**

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

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

REVIEWER'S NAME: Gian Paolo Calzolari

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

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

DOCUMENT NUMBER: CCSDS 313.0-Y-2.1

DOCUMENT NAME: SANA Role, Responsibilities, Policies, & Procedures

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: 3-7 + 3-8 PARAGRAPH NUMBER: 3.14

PID SHORT TITLE: If a registry space is full

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

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

The following sentence is ambiguous:

This structural change requires an engineering review and should be done using the normal CCSDS engineering process, such as review by the appropriate WG and approval by the CESG and CMC.

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

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:

Make clear if this CESG and CMC approval refers to CESG/CMC Polls for Agency Review and publication or something else.

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

DISPOSITION: Accept.

Sec 3.14, pg 3-7, From:

This structural change requires an engineering review and should be done using the normal CCSDS engineering process, such as review by the appropriate WG and approval by the CESG and CMC.

Sec 3.14, pg 3-7, To:

This structural change requires an engineering review and should be done using the normal CCSDS engineering process, including review by the appropriate WG and the SSG, and approval by the CESG and CMC using the normal polling process.

CESG POLL ITEM DISPOSITION (PID) INITIATION FORM

AREA PID NUMBER: **SLS-16**

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

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

REVIEWER'S NAME: Gian Paolo Calzolari

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

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

DOCUMENT NUMBER: CCSDS 313.0-Y-2.1

DOCUMENT NAME: SANA Role, Responsibilities, Policies, & Procedures

DATE ISSUED: February 2020

PAGE NUMBER: 3-10 PARAGRAPH NUMBER: 3.19

PID SHORT TITLE: EXPERT GROUP POLICY

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

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

This section seems to propose a procedure relevant for the Org & Proc Yellow Book (CCSDS A02.1-Y) but that book does not have any specification for creating an expert group.

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

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:

Procedure for creation of an Expert Group shall be added to Org & Proc Yellow Book (CCSDS A02.1-Y) upon CESG agreement and just referenced in this document (e.g. replacing bullets a & b & e & f etc.).

With respect to bullet c, why is only long term envisaged?

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

DISPOSITION: Reject. This definition of “Expert Group” is defined to be unique to the SANA and it has been in the document since 2016. It is not new to this version. We have had, to my knowledge, only one instance of such an Expert Group and that was the XML Standards and Guidelines (XSG) expert group. I see no significant value in modifying the Org & Proc Yellow Book (CCSDS A02.1-Y)to add this since it is well specified here.