

**Scott, Keith L.**

---

**From:** chris.taylor@esa.int  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 27, 2010 5:31 AM  
**To:** Dai Stanton  
**Cc:** Scott, Keith L.  
**Subject:** Re: Green Book

I thought we had agreed to remove the figures anyway, If we do have a figure it should be the one provided by Shames for the SISG stuff. Jane's comment is out of order.

//ct

Dai Stanton  
<dstanton@keltik.co.uk>

27/05/2010 11:02

To  
"Scott, Keith L." <[kscott@mitre.org](mailto:kscott@mitre.org)>  
cc  
"[chris.taylor@esa.int](mailto:chris.taylor@esa.int)"  
<[chris.taylor@esa.int](mailto:chris.taylor@esa.int)>  
Subject  
Re: Green Book

Keith

The low level commanding section is still confusing but can be simply fixed by removing both the figures which don't add anything and aren't described in the text. Also add a statement that low level telemetry performs the inverse process of LLC with LLTM being collated at the relay for subsequent transfetr to the MMC.

This OK?

Dai

On 6 May 2010, at 04:00, Scott, Keith L. wrote:

OK, what I really, really hope is a final version is attached. The intended changes are:

I think we should leave the 'Low-Level Commanding / Telemetry' section as shown in the attached. I'd discussed with Dai today the option of simply removing the example (Jane Marquart had qualms about

recommending any particular approach to getting data to the last-hop proxy - e.g. the file transfer mechanism Chris suggested), but I think the example contains relevant and necessary text for the understanding of the intended services. Jane said she wasn't \*adamantly\* opposed to it, so I think we should keep it as is.

I did a scrub through the 'Rationales' for the requirement to try to address two of Tom Gannett's rather caustic comments:

Many of the "rationale" statements following numbered requirements do not state rationale, but are simply remarks of varying relevance, added no doubt for the purpose of having text there.

Rationale statements beginning with demonstrative pronoun "this" referring back to a preceding numbered requirement are grammatically indefensible.

I think that's pretty much it. Please have a look and let me know if the attached addresses the ESA comments Chris submitted during the CESG review.

Thanks for your help with this,

--keith

<734x0g0\_CESG\_Approval\_RID\_Closures.doc>