REVIEW ITEM DISPOSITION (RID): RED BOOK RID INITIATION FORM

AGENCY RID NUMBER: JMS-10 SUBMITTING ORGANIZATION (Agency, Center): CNES

REVIEWER'S NAME: Jean-Marc Soula CODE: E-MAIL ADDRESS: Jean-Marc.Soula@cnes.fr TELEPHONE: +33 5 61 27 46 47

DOCUMENT NUMBER: CCSDS 901.1-R-1 Red Book, Issue 1 DOCUMENT NAME: SCCS Architecture Requirements Document DATE ISSUED: October 2014 PAGE NUMBER: 4.11 and 6-4 PARAGRAPH NUMBER: 4.4.2.4 and 6.1.2.3

RID SHORT TITLE: Need for Return Unframed Telemetry

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

Delete Ref. [45] or make it optional or make explicit the use cases of the RUFT service in the different views, throughout the document.

CATEGORY OF REQUESTED CHANGE:

Technical Fact ____ Recommended _x_ 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:

Deletion seems a better option as the IOAG is about to remove this service from its X-support service catalog # 1. This doesn't seem to be any longer a valid cross support case.

RUFT is only mentioned in the security requirements and the list of x-support protocols, while not mentioned in the service view, physical view or others... Obviously some more details were missing and should be added if the service were maintained in the recommendation.

DISPOSITION: Accept.

Review expected development of RUFT by the CCSDS. If it is to be defined retain it in Table 6-2, pg 6-4. Otherwise consider dropping it in its entirely from the document.

See also 4.4.2.4. It appears nowhere else in the document.

Check.