|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FwdCltuTsProvider** | **Creator = CSS Area** | **Editor = Wolfgang** | **Reviewer = ??** |
| **Status: 20191104** | | | |

| **Issue Short Title** | **Issue Description/Discussion** | **Source** | **Status** | **O/C** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **resource status or production status?** | **Do TSes have a resource status?**  **190807 WH – If my memory serves me well, we originally used all over the term ‘production status’, but then realized that this does not make sense for individual FR types because the actual production as necessary for a given service instance will normally involve a number of FR types. From the service perspective the ‘production status’ will depend on the resource status of all FR instances involved in the service production. The TS FR instance will evaluate the resource status as reported by the FR instances involved in the service production and in that way determine the production status. Therefore I do not see a necessity to specify a resource status for TS FR types, but instead each such FR type will have a ‘production status’ parameter.**  **If we can agree on that approach, this item can be closed and no change of the FR specification is necessary in this respect.**  **191024 JP - Agreed** | **JP 190109** | **CLOSED on 191024** | **C** |
| **configures and reports** | **The descriptions of parameters for which Configured = true should begin "This parameter configures and reports"** | **correspondence between WH and JP** | **agreed/editor** | **C** |
| **network and ISP-1 parameters?** | **To complete the full communication profile, IP addresses, ports , and ISP-1 parameters must be configured. Should these be added to the FR configuration parameters? If not here, how should this be addressed (e.g., as a separate, protocol-specific "connection" FR type)?**  **190807 WH – The parameters addressed here are certainly required to make establishing of an association between user and provider possible. However, parameters such as IP addresses, encryption keys etc. are handled normally with the policy that they are only disclosed to those who absolutely need to know and not to anybody else. For certain it would not be accepted that such security relevant parameters be exchanged via the FR parameter mechanism. I would expect the relevant data be exchanged via a secure file exchange mechanism where the relevant file is identified by the service instance identifier. Given that I suggest to close this item here, but to address in the FR TN the fact that the parties need to agree on a secure exchange mechanism for handling of these service instance specific parameters. In the TN we could then list these parameters, but I doubt that CCSDS should get involved in defining a related file format.**  **191024 JP – We agreed that network, ISP-1, and transfer-service identification information (initiatorId, responderId, and responderPortId) would be maintained via some “other” mechanism and not be accessible via the FRs. However, the serviceInstanceId parameter is a configured parameter of the FR instance, and services the “key” into the “other” database that contains the aforementioned network, ISP-1, and transfer-service identification information. This concept needs to be addressed in the FR Reference Model MB.** | **JP 190109** | **CLOSED - 191024** | **C** |
| **fwdCltuReturnTimeoutPeriod** | **The F-CLTU service (as all other SLE services) does not include any confirmed operations that the service provider invokes. Therefore this parameter affects only the behavior of the service user and is not needed as configuration parameter of the service provider except that the F-CLTU service specifies that this parameter is gettable. I therefore suggest that we keep this configurable parameter although it looks strange to have such parameter not affecting the service provider behavior.**  **191104 JP – Agree.** | **WH 190807** | **CLOSED - 191104** | **O** |
| **fCltuRfAvailableRequired**  **fCltuBitLockRequired** | **I have deleted these parameters from the list of the service provider FR because this is controlled by the complex fwdTcPlopSyncClcwEvaluation parameter of the FwdTcPlopSyncAndChnlEncode FR. This might be confusing when reading the related annex of the F-CLTU Blue Book. Shall we keep this parameter as monitored parameters of the FwdCltuTsProvider FR?** | **WH 190807** |  | **O** |
| **ServiceInstanceIdentifier parameter should be configured** | **ServiceInstanceIdentifier should be a configured parameter but it is currently listed as not configured.** | **JP-191104** |  | **O** |