MEETING

meeting date *date de la réunion*	26 January 00	ref./*réf.*	FIRST/FSC/MOM/0102	page/*page*	1 / 5
meeting place *lieu de la réunion*	Teleconf.		chairman *président*	SV	
minute's date *dates de minute*	31 January 2000		participants *participants*	see attached	
subject/*objet*	**FGSSE Tel#1 MoM**		copy/*copie*		

description/description	action/action	due date/date limite

ESOC (JD) being not available for the teleconf, it was agreed that the outcome of the teleconf. discussion will be wrapped up at the next FGSSE meeting (#3) on the 4th of February. SV will also report on the outcome to JD beforehand.

PE let the ICCs know that he has to step (temporarily) down from the FGSSE group. He has to be full time on the ITT preparation until mid this year. ICCs raised their concerns that project would not be represented in the FGSSE.

Objective

Revisit the objectives and the work plan of the FGSSE group.

Agenda

See attached

Introduction

SV summarised his view on the FGSSE group objectives and activities:

Starting point: the scenario document, which describes the different FIRST ground segment centres and their different responsibilities

Final objectives: the definition of the different ICDs between the different centres (sub-systems).

To get to this final objective, the FGSSE shall as its core activities:

1. Identify the interface requirements between the different centres, this is the object of the IRD. The IRD shall basically answer the following questions:
    -   What are the top level requirements on the MOC for the FSC and ICCs to be able to fulfil their mission
    -   What are the top level requirements on the FSC for the MOC and ICCs to be able to fulfil their mission
    -   What are the top level requirements on the ICC for the MOC and FSC to be able to fulfil their mission

2. Define the design of the interfaces to meet the interface requirements. This design shall in particular identify the different centres' sub-systems (e.g. FINDAS, DDS) which will support the interfaces and the different ICDs that will need to be developed.

3. Definition of each individual ICDs

ICCs agree to this presentation of the objectives and core activities of the FGSSE group. However, RH would see the FGSSE group having a larger scope with more emphasis given to the system design. RH gave the example of the EGSE. The EGSE functional analysis is currently taking place and the outputs of this analysis should be taken on board by the FGSSE, so as to make sure that this functional analysis and above all the follow-up design is compatible with the operational FIRST GS design in terms of smooth transition from one phase to another.
A status on the EGSE functional analysis will be presented at the next meeting (PR).

RH also mentions that the FGSSE shall rapidly take on board the common data model, the CUS and the FINDAS URD. PR agreed with RH.
SV pointed out that the data model will be taken care jointly by the FSC and the ICC development team (as agreed in the Oct99 VILSPA meeting by FSC and ICC managers) and not by the FGSSE group as such, the same with the CUS. RH and PR agreed but stressed the importance of a tight reporting between these developments and the FGSSE. SV agreed. The way it will be done in practise is TBD. It was agreed to discuss it again at the next meeting.
There were an overall agreement on the fact that one of the role of the FGSSE was to make sure that the individual design activities (e.g. ILT system, common data model, CUS) were compatible and allowed a smooth transition from one phase to another but was not to carry-out these individual designs.

PE prompted a discussion on the usage of SCOS-2000 for the EGSE. PR reported that on top of the SCOS-2000 delta URD for operation there will be a SCOS-2000 delta URD in the context of the EGSE. This is in line with PE expectation. RH also mentioned were also to make a trade-off cost wise between SCOS-2000 and an in-house development.

IRD:

It was agreed to review the document at the next meeting (2 hours?). This document should be owned by the group not just by SV. RH and PR stressed the importance of going forward with the design before we can finalise the IRD, as the need for some interfaces may only become apparent then. All agreed that the development of the IRD and the definition of the system design shall be considered an iterative process.

SV pointed out that as part of this review, the result on two pending actions from the last FGSSE meetings and due for the next meeting, one on CUS (AI#151199-2) and one on data queries (AI#211299-2) shall be taken into account (see respectively IRD sections 3.5.2 and 3.4).

System design

PR agreed that the existing interface requirements were mature enough to start with system design activities (which does not mean that the interfaces are complete). PR believes that the design scenario discussion started at the previous meeting can conclude at the next meeting.

PR believes that the design scenario discussion started at the previous meeting is in ana advanced enough state to start the design activities.

 No consolidated outputs on the system design seem to be expected by any of the parties before mid-2000 (TBC).
SV pointed that the schedule for this activity (in fact for all FGSSE activities) shall be in line with the development schedule of the different ICCs and FSC development teams. The development teams schedule shall be discussed at the FSC development K.O. meeting to be held on the 23rd of February in ESTEC (date TBC).
PR pointed that name/purpose/scope for a document capturing the system design activity of the FGSSE is to be worked out soon so that we know what it is supposed to cover.

ICDs

The role of ICDs was clarified. ICDs are detailed interface definition between sub-systems (e.g. the ICD of a file based interface will include the detailed definition of the file record). The following example was provided by PE *(Pierre can you remind me which one you gave)*. With this understanding, it was agreed that the work on ICDs will have to wait for the consolidation of the IRD and the system design. SV pointed out that individual ICDs will have to be developed by ad-hoc working groups.

ILT

SV stated that FINDAS ILT URD work could not start before the system design was consolidated and the overall FINDAS data model was developed. PR and RH strongly disagreed with this statement. They

MEETING

| meeting date | 26 January 00 | ref/*réf* | FIRST/FSC/MOM/0102 | page/*page* | 4 / 6 |
| date de la réunion | | | | | |

believe they have enough information to produce a FINDAS ILT URD. They also pointed out that following SV's approach is, in their view, incompatible with developing FINDAS in time for ILT.
PE suggested that the ICCs could generate the FINDAS ILT URD. It was agreed to have it recorded as a formal action.

=> AI#260100-1: ICCs to generate the FINDAS ILT URD and present it to the FGSSE group: Date TBD.

Attendees:

Pierre Estaria (ESA - FIRST/PLANCK project)
Rik Huygen (KUL)
Peter Roelfsema (SRON)
Sunil Sidher (RAL)
Stephane Veillat (ESA – FSC)

Cc:

O. Bauer (MPE)
J. Brumfit (Aurora – FSC)
P. Claes (ESA – FSC)
T.G. Dimbylow (RAL)
John Dodsworth (ESA – ESOC)
K. Galloway (Aurora – FSC)
A. Heras (ESA-FSC)
S. Lord (IPAC)
J.J. Mathieu (ESA)
Nestor Peccia (ESA-ESOC)
G. Pilbratt (ESA – FSC)
J. Riedinger (ESA - FSC)

Agenda:

Email from SV dated 21/01/00:

The teleconf should be to discuss the FGSSE work plan which we had NO time to discuss at the FGSSE#2.

Several issues:

- FGS IRD: This document is officially part of the FIRST GS documentation tree (see last update of the operational scenario document). It will be used as an input at least to the FSC elaboration phase starting feb 00. As such, a draft should be completed as much as possible and rapidly reviewed (end of March time frame) by FSC, ICCs and MOC managers leading to a v1.0 of the document.
I have so far kept up to date the FIRST GS IRD with our FGSSE meeting discussion (see last draft 0.2) as well as with the last scenario meeting (VILSPA 11-14/01). In order to proceed, I propose that we make a (page/page) review of draft 0.2 in our next meeting (should take half a day only). Do you agree?

- System design: We have started at our last meeting to draft design scenarios for the FIRST ground segment. There is a pending action from last meeting to further investigate these options:
        - are the interface requirements mature enough to proceed?
        - do we proceed as is with the further assessments of these options?
        - what should this activity results in: a FIRST GS system design document which would later be supplemented by ICDs.?
        -what are the time requirement on your side to complete with this task?

- IILT related work: At this stage, I cannot see that we can make any progress on the ILT system design issues. We need in my view first to have clearer the FIRST GS system design (see point above) and the place of FINDAS in this design before we can proceed, In addition, we need to better understand the scope of FINDAS, which I do not think we will do before the FSC architecture has been elaborated. Consequently, I do not see that we can progress on this aspect before the second haf of this year. When proceeding , we should start with updating the FINDAS URD and making an ILT version of it.
Do you agree?

- ICDs: I do not see that we can start any work on ICDs before we are done (to some extent) with the system design. At some stage, ICDs will have to ve identified and prioritized.

- Any other points?