

DLR Response to Action Item CMC-A-2014-04-05

In general DLR agrees with the approach and the views given in J.Miro's presentation.

The roadmap is based on the current planning of the CCSDS areas. Therefore only projects, which are already on the table are included. This includes MO-Services, CSS-SM, DTN and those which are triggered by the last IOP like optical, and ACM/VCM operations.

What we didn't do up to now is asking the areas for future ideas on standards. These ideas should be included as well, after a management evaluation.

Beside that, maybe based on what is provided, there has to be a clear decision on the areas, we want to include/exclude in our work. At least in the last reorganization of CCSDS we included SOIS, which was not part of CCSDS before.

These are only minor remarks, which should also state, that DLR in general very much supports the current approach, but at least for the presentations a solution has to be found to update them automatically or manually after the revision of the projects during the working group meetings by a volunteer.

Regards
Martin Pilgram

CNES answer to the action item CMC-A-2014-04-05

CMC-A-2014-04-05	<p>The CMC delegates were asked to provide comments regarding CCSDS strategic priorities, area goals implementation proposal by 2020, resources, CCSDS area structure, etc. using, among other references (e.g., CWE framework), the presentation of J. Miro. Submit comments (structured by area) to the Secretariat by 30 June 2014. For discussion by the next CMC mid-term telecon (July 9, 2014)</p> <p>Action: CMC Members Due Date: 30 June 2014</p>
------------------	---

Response:

1) GENERAL

a) Layering of Plans

CNES agrees with the approach to develop a presentation that makes a clear connection between the CCSDS Strategic Plan (SP) and the Work Plan (WP) conducted in the Areas.

Whether we call it roadmap (RMP), strategic, tactical or implementation plan is not critical, as long as it is agreed that this should be used to manage the activities and resources in the CCSDS, in addition to the CWE FrameWork (FW).

The extended version of the SP is based on the current planning of the activities in the CCSDS areas (the Operating Plan = OP) and the Future Plans (FP). OP and FP form the CCSDS WP. Of course, FP's in each area are not always identified with the same advance notice : however, to manage the CCSDS activities the CMC needs to rely on a uniform level of the FP, in order to anticipate future changes and to prepare for organization adaptations.

While the OP will be kept alive as the projects in the FP get approved and actually started, the FP itself is not fed by any existing process, which after some time may result in a lack of visibility of what CCSDS will do in the short / medium term.

SUGGESTION 1: the CSEG should be tasked to periodically revisit the FP items identified in the extended SP as “Future Work”, so making the FP a live management tool.

b) Future plans

It is not 100% clear how the Areas collected the requirements identified to propose the “Future Work” items this time. However, as most of the new requirements are driven by the evolution of the technology, it may be expected that the proposed “Future Work” items are coming from the Working Groups (WG) in a bottom up approach.

In the relationship of CCSDS with other international organizations, the requirements from other organizations, coming upside down, have always been difficult to accommodate in the CCSDS WP. However, CCSDS cannot pretend to serve the interests of such organizations if there is no process to integrate their requirements in the global picture.

In this context, the “Roadmap” (let’s use this one) could help verify if the new requirements fit within the list of the CCSDS high level objectives, which area(s) is (are) concerned and which reasonable time frame should be considered to develop the required standards.

Today, this difficulty exists with the IOAG but it could also come from the ISECG or similar organizations at a later stage. CNES supports the idea that CCSDS should be more credible if it would be more efficient in integrating the external requirements in its WP.

SUGGESTION 2: the process to integrate the external requirements in the CCSDS WP, as part of the FP, should be developed, so that schedules, priorities and resources for the added work may be discussed and arbitrations be made, in view of the other on-going or planned activities.

2) ROADMAP

a) RMP generation

It is a good idea that the RMP, as proposed by Juan Miro, is developed to serve for presentation within the member agencies or in international fora, as this gives a clear vision of what CCSDS is doing and why, w.r.t. the CCSDS Strategic Goals.

At the CMC level, as already mentioned before, it must also be a useful tool to manage the CCSDS.

To be efficient, the RMP should be kept up to date, for projects and schedules, and the effort to produce it should be kept to the minimum. The main issue today, to generate the RMP from the CWE is that, while the FW may be used to supply the latest status on the OP, the items belonging to the FP are not (all) available in the CCSDS IT system. Today, only the extended SP contains the items for the FP...

SUGGESTION 3: a solution must be found to generate the RMP automatically after the revisions of the FW or SP are made.

b) Mapping of technical goals per area

Initially, the six Technical Goals in the SP were supposed to primarily correspond to objectives per each of the six Areas:

Technical Goal#1 = SLS

Technical Goal#2 = CSS

Technical Goal#3 = MOIMS

Technical Goal#4 = SIS
 Technical Goal#5 = SOIS
 Technical Goal#6 = SEA

While reading the “Technical Goals - Mapping per Area” section of Juan Miro’s RMP, it becomes clear that some of the objectives are shared and several goals from different Areas may contribute to the overall goal. In addition, this highlights some degree of interdependency between activities in different Areas: the overall goal will be met only when all Area goals are completed ; when delaying one item in one Area, other items contributing to the same goal run the risk to become stand-alone standards not integrated in the global solution proposed by CCSDS to its users. Therefore, it is desirable that this mapping is accurate and agreed by all.

SUGGESTION 4: it would be helpful if the mapping presented by Juan is double checked by the AD’s and validated at CESG level, when instrumented as per suggestion 3.

3) Analysis per Area

The presentation per Area is very useful but it could be improved by:

- Making clear which Area Goals are already approved and which ones are just future plans (non-approved WG’s or projects) ; a color code could be used ;
- Adapting the length of the future project boxes to the expected duration of development : as all aligned to 3 years, it could give some bad impressions that new projects should have already started or that some complex standards may be produced in a short timeframe.

The following sections provide first level comments on the situation per Area, as could be derived from the analysis of the RMP as is.

a) SEA

SANA should be taken out of the RMP, consistently with the last change in the RMP.

Security: key management BB is behind schedule and should terminate 2017. Is this an issue for other WGs (e.g.: interdependency with SLS / SDLS)?

XML SIG is still a SIG while standards should be produced within 2 years: is there an issue as the WG(s) is (are) still to be created?

Only Security and DDOR are approved WGs/Projects; Timelines and XML SIG could / should start soon, while not yet present in the FW.

In this context, is it wise to authorize the new Architecture activities (goals 3 and 7) which, in the past have always suffered a lack of resources, in the proposed schedule?

How is the urgency justified?

Where are the priorities?

Is there a risk to delay or interfere with one or the other of the approved / engaged activities?

Security and DDOR WGs have no activities identified as part of FP beyond 2016. Should the groups be disbanded then?

SUGGESTION 5: questions to be discussed between CESG and CMC, in order to come to a common understanding and an agreement on needs, schedule and resources.

b) MOIMS

NHM project appears twice, under SSA and NAV goals. To be fixed.

NAV and DAI WGs have no activities identified as part of FP beyond 2016. Should the groups be disbanded then?

Most of the MO services BB's in the CWE are not started and/or are behind schedule. What is the strategy proposed to progress these projects? Will the IOAG / MOSSG inputs on service priorities be considered to reschedule the parallel tasks?

SUGGESTION 6: questions to be discussed between CESG and CMC, in order to come to a common understanding and an agreement on needs, schedule and resources.

c) CSS

GFT is shown as part of CSS goals 2 and 4; to be fixed.

All activities in the FW are behind schedule for the CSTS WG. Nevertheless, this group still shows a long list of parallel activities to be conducted. What is the strategy proposed to progress these projects or, preferably, to prioritize a few of them so that at least some CSTS standards may be proposed to users?

CSS CS-SM projects have target dates in the SP, as part of the FP. Nothing similar exists in the FW where status and target dates are blank. When will a tentative schedule be confirmed?

SUGGESTION 7: questions to be discussed between CESG and CMC, in order to come to a common understanding and an agreement on needs, schedule and resources.

d) SOIS

Device virtualization is an existing MB. To be fixed.

Local Area Network WG shows a target date of 2015 in the SP / RMP and end 2017 in the FW. Which one is valid?

Appl. Support WGs has no activities identified as part of FP beyond 2015. Should the group be disbanded then?

The SOIS Area has only one WG (Wireless) and no activities identified as part of FP beyond 2017. . Should the group be disbanded then? Should the group be disbanded earlier and the WG be re-allocated to another area (Wireless ⇔ SLS)?

SUGGESTION 8: questions to be discussed between CESG and CMC, in order to come to a common understanding and an agreement on needs, schedule and resources.

e) SLS

All WGs have a schedule which minimize the parallel activities. Prioritization seems to be made upfront.

Data compression and SDLS WGs have no activities identified in the RMP as part of FP beyond 2015 / 2016. However, the FW shows target dates beyond those (2017 / 2016). Then the question to disband or not those groups will become valid.

SUGGESTION 9: questions to be discussed between CESG and CMC, in order to come to a common understanding and an agreement on needs, schedule and resources.

f) SIS

CFDP over encapsulation is no longer in the FW. To be fixed.

The FW reflects projects behind schedule and target dates quite earlier than those in the RMP/SP. An alignment is required.

Contact graph and Bundle security projects have target dates in the RMP/SP, as part of the FP. Nothing similar exists in the FW where status and target dates are blank. When will a tentative schedule be confirmed?

SUGGESTION 10: questions to be discussed between CESG and CMC, in order to come to a common understanding and an agreement on needs, schedule and resources.

JAXA response to the action item CMC-A-2014-04-05

Dear CMC Members,

This is to provide JAXA response to the Action CMC-A-2014-04-05.

Regarding the Roadmap created by Miro-san, JAXA agree with the approach to develop the Roadmap and keep updating it as appropriate. We consider that Roadmap would benefit us in the following points:

- * Facilitates understanding the whole CCSDS activities, which is also effective when making reports to IOAG and to other stakeholders.
- * Facilitates timeline management which is not expressly covered by the Strategic Plan or by the CESG reports.
- * Grouping/mapping of projects (existing and those in production), under each Area goal, gives us (and to external entities) sense of priority in regard to time management and resource allocation.
- * Since the draft is already in place, upgrading/updating the draft at each CMC meeting would not be a too heavy workload but would improve our (CMC members') awareness on the latest status at general.

As for the Strategic Plan, I have tried to understand the whole structure of it, while I am still not clear on the following points;

**** Where those projects in red came from?**

Are those projects in red listed on a specific document or a collection of inputs from each Area Director/WG? I would like to know how those "Future Work" projects were picked. (while the some of the projects listed on Service Catalogs are not yet in the Strategic Plan)

**** How or where is "milestone ID" such as "MIL-MOIMS-205" managed?**

Is there a table where those IDs and projects are both listed?

Just a minor correction: on page 23, under SOIS-Goal 2, Informational Reports in Production CWE Doc. 880.0-G-1 would probably 880.0-G-"2"??

If these have been clarified earlier, let me feel sorry.

Regards --- Shigeta

NASA response to the action item CMC-A-2014-04-05

Hi All,

NASA agrees with concept and approach of the CCSDS strategic roadmap as presented by J.Miro. There are two comments:

- On Page 9, Technical Goal 5, we recommend clarifying the first bullet as follow:
 - Standardized avionics data and communication architectures
- On Page 43, Conclusion, we recommend the the road map also address the overlaps and duplications among CCSDS projects and working groups.

Thank you,

James