

IOAG-15 follow-on teleconference
Cross Support Service Management (CSSM)
27 March, 2012

Attendance:

Chair: Jean-Marc Soula
Secretariat: Barbara Adde, Stephanie Wan

Members:

CNES: Jean-Marc Soula
DLR: Martin Pilgram, Martin Gnat
ESA: Michael Schmidt, Gian-Paolo Calzolari, Wolfgang Hell
JAXA: Hiroshi Inoue
NASA: Phil Liebrecht, John Rush, Wallace Tai, Les Deutsch, Madeline Butler, Nate Wright

Observers:

KARI: Sangil Ahn

Liaison:

CCSDS: Mike Kearney

Agenda:

The only item on the agenda for this teleconference is Cross Support Service Management.

Discussion:

The Chairman opened the discussion with the stated goal of achieving consensus on an IOAG statement to the CCSDS regarding priorities for Cross Support Service Management. The chart he prepared based on the inputs from five member agencies was displayed on Webex for line-by-line review. (Chart attached).

- 1) Service Catalogue: Agreement that while important, the Service Catalogue is a lower priority.
- 2) Service Agreement Template (Technical Content): Agreement that this is a low priority.
- 3) Service Agreement Document (contract): Agreement that there is no need to develop the contract part of contract agreement.
- 4) Trajectory Prediction: Confirmed the need for trajectory prediction and all agencies use ODM, and need a solution with CSTS method.
- 5) Visibility Information: Agreement that it is a longer term requirement; will leave to the Working Groups to provide a solution whether predictions must be elaborated by user or provider of station services.

- 6) Network Resource Availability: Although there are different points of view, agreement that users need to know when resources are available. Considering low effort, IOAG puts a higher priority than the CCSDS WG.
- 7) Schedule Format: Extreme opposite views on this; IOAG will leave decision to CCSDS. NASA will continue working towards using standards internally within its capabilities.
- 8) Operational Scheduling: Only NASA cited this as a high priority; ESA does not want to put much effort in this area. There may be ways to cover the requirements with already existing SM tools.
- 9) Schedule Constraints: Originally citing this as a high priority, DLR agreed after discussion to the IOAG position that it is not urgent to do this as not much used for cross support.
- 10) Event Sequences: Agreement that Chair will formulate text regarding network control, citing that it is urgent and estimated a low effort to complete.
- 11) Planning Report: Agreement that this is a low priority; it is a long term requirement or can be removed from the Service Catalogue.
- 12) Configuration Profiles: NASA will submit a statement directly to CCSDS. Will be mentioned in the letter to CCSDS.
- 13) RFI Information: NASA will submit a statement directly to CCSDS. Will be mentioned in the letter to CCSDS.
- 14) Pre-launch Tests and Supports: NASA will submit a statement directly to CCSDS. Will be mentioned in the letter to CCSDS.
- 15) Monitoring and Network Control: Agreement with Working Group; recommendation that it is aligned as much as possible with CSTS methods.
- 16) Monitor Data: It is assumed that this is equivalent to Exec-Monitoring.
- 17) Control Directives: Due to extreme positions within the IOAG, agreement that it is not a first priority, and will leave it to the CCSDS delegates to come to a conclusion, independent of the IOAG.

- 18) Event Definition: Agreement that this is a low priority. However seems to be an evolution of existing features.
- 19) Accountability: Agreement with Working Group analysis that this is a long term, highly complex requirement.
- 20) Green Book: IOAG will not comment on this as it is strictly a CCSDS decision to define and produce this GB.

The Chairman will prepare a two-three page statement with regard to these decisions and will circulate it to the attendees for review and approval before he forwards it to the CCSDS Chairman.

On other matters, it was agreed that the IOAG and CCSDS will have a half-day joint meeting on Wednesday, 12 December, and then continue its IOAG-16 meeting on 13-14 December. The meeting will be hosted by NASA at the Kennedy Space Center.

It was also agreed that a meeting will be hosted by either ESA or CNES in the Q1 or Q2 2013, several months prior to IOP-3 (which has not been scheduled yet), to focus on IOP-3 preparation.

Attachment

	CCSDS CS-SM WG	CNES	DLR	ESA	JAXA	NASA
SC - Service Catalog	Urgent (phase 1)	Usefull / Magenta books	Usefull / But low priority	Usefull if up to date / Low priority/ Not part of SM	Important: Usefull if up to date	Low priority
SA - Service Agreement template (technical content)	Urgent / Additional services / Processing / Automation	Urgent / Additional services (phase 1)	Helpfull if simple	Helpfull if complete	Important: Usefull	Low priority
SA - Service Agreement Document (contract)	Long term (phase 3)	No need	No need	No need	Usefull	
UP&S - Trajectory prediction	Urgent (phase 1)	Urgent (NAV ODM; CSTS transfer method TBD)	Urgent (NAV ODM; CSTS transfer method TBD)	Urgent (NAV ODM; CSTS transfer method TBD)	Important :with orbit file or prediction file	Urgent (NAV ODM; CSTS transfer method TBD)
UP&S - Visibility information	Urgent (phase 1)	Long term (phase 2)	Moderate (XML Orbit Event files in phase 2)	Moderate : format of antenna information (coordinates, masks, etc.)	Usefull: Matching is important between user and provider	High priority : format of view periods
UP&S - Network resource availability	Long term (phase 2)	Long term (phase 2)	Potentially usefull (phase 2)	Urgent (phase 1)	Usefull: for long range scheduling	High priority: unused times
UP&S - Schedule format	Urgent (phase 1)	Urgent (phase 1)	Urgent (phase 1)	Not mandatory / not urgent	Usefull if aggregated service packages	High priority: schedules and requests
UP&S - Operational scheduling	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	High priority: flexibility for schedule optimization in SP
UP&S - Schedule constraints	Moderate (simple phase 1 // complex phase 3)	Moderate (simple phase 1)	Urgent (phase 1)	Not justified	Not justified: to be clarified if scheduling to User or utilization constraints	Low priority: other means possible
UP&S - Event sequences	Urgent (phase 1)	Urgent (phase 1)	Long term	To be clarified	To be clarified if satellite or ground events	High priority for SOE (similar to SL event profiles)
UP&S - Planning report	Long term (phase 3)	No need	Long term	Very low priority / long term	To be clarified plan status or ops result	Low priority
UP&S - Configuration profiles	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	High priority: modify and query configuration profiles
UP&S - RFI information	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	High priority: interference info via SM
UP&S - Pre-launch tests and supports	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	High priority: simulation services
Exec. - Monitoring	Urgent (phase 1)	Urgent (phase 1)	Urgent (phase 1)	Urgent (phase 1)	Low priority as voice may be used	High priority
Exec. - Network Control	Moderate (simple phase 2)	Long term / No need	Long term	Low priority / long term	Low priority: To be analyzed if infringement of security	High priority
Exec. - Monitor data	Urgent (phase 1)	Urgent (phase 1)	Urgent (phase 1)	Urgent (phase 1)	Difficult to implement ;	High priority
Exec. - Control directives	Moderate (phase 2)	Long term / No need	Long term	Low priority / long term	See Ntwk control	High priority
Exec. - Event definition	Moderate (phase 2)	Long term / No need	Long term	To be clarified	To be clarified if satellite or ground events	Low priority
Acc. - Accountability	Long term (phase 3)	No need	Long term	Very low priority / long term	Low priority	Moderate priority
SM Characterisation		Simplified SM - No automation - in 2 phases - in two BB's ?	Framework with easy extensions	Simplified SM - No automation	Simplified SM	Simplified SM: UP&S and Exec.
Green Book		NA	NA	NA	NA	Moderate
	IOAG Agency requirements are higher than those of the CCSDS WG					LP: 2019 - MP: 2017 - HP: 2015
	IOAG Agency requirements are lower than those of the CCSDS WG					
	IOAG Agency requirements are equal / similar to those of the CCSDS WG					
	To be clarified / To be discussed					