

AERONAUTICAL TELECOMMUNICATION NETWORK PANEL (ATNP)

WG3
March 4-6, 1997 - Phuket (Thailand)

CCB Procedures Applied to WG3 SARPs

Summary

This document proposes procedures for managing defect reports related to the SARPs of WG3. These procedures should be followed in addition to the CCB procedures as defined in document [1]. The involvement of WG3 in these procedures is also described.

Revision B has been issued to incorporate comments from WG3 members.

References

[1] ATNP Configuration Control Board (CCB) Procedures Document - Output Phuket

Prepared by: Sub-Volume 2 and 3 SMEs
Presented by: F. Picard

1. Scope of this Document

1.1 During the second interim CCB (Configuration Control Board) meeting held in Phuket, the SMEs (Subject Matter Expert) have been tasked to define the processing of the Proposed Defect Report (PDR) by the SME team and to indicate the nature of the relationships of the CCB and the SME team with the ATNP Working Groups.

1.2 This working paper reviews the role of the SME as defined in the CCB procedures document [1]. It also proposes how the general mode of operation can be customised specifically to the management of sub-volume 2 to sub-volume 4 PDRs.

2. Background

2.1 Role of the SMEs

2.1.1 A SME is a technical expert for a sub-volume and acts as an interface between the CCB and an open group of technical experts wishing to be involved in the resolution of PDRs. The SMEs co-ordinates the technical debate among experts and reports the results to the CCB.

2.1.2 Three SMEs will be appointed for WG3 to cover:

- Sub-Volume 2 (Air-Ground Applications),
- Sub-Volume 3 (Ground Applications), and
- Sub-Volume 4 (Upper Layer Communication Service).

2.1.3 SMEs are involved in the CCB process as follows:

1. once the PDR has been accepted by the CCB, the CCB chairman designates one responsible SME for the PDR resolution (even if several sub-volumes are concerned),
2. the PDR is resolved under the responsibility of the designated SME, who with the help of his team of technical experts, produces a recommended action for CCB approval. The SME recommendation is submitted to the CCB mailing list (ccb_chair) in the form of a predefined format message.
3. in the event of the SME recommendation being rejected by the CCB, the SME shall attempt to develop an alternate SME recommendation (back to step 2).

2.1.4 Each SME shall determine the actual working methodology of the team. Generally this will consist of a discussion period electronically or face to face, followed by a consensus (or if necessary a vote) on the solution for the PDR.

2.1.5 One (or several if needed) e-mail distribution list is maintained by SME. This mailing list is used to progress the resolution of accepted PDRs.

3. CCB process for Sub-Volume 2/3/4 SARPs Defects

3.1 SME teams

3.1.1 The Sub-Volume 2 and 4 SME teams will include by default members of SG2 and SG3, respectively, plus any interested parties (IPs).

3.1.2 Two separate SME teams will be set up for Sub-Volume 3, one for ATSMHS and one for AIDC.

3.1.3 The SME team members shall subscribe to the SME email list either by contacting the appropriate SME directly or by sending a "please subscribe" message to the appropriate SME list.

3.1.4 They may quit the SME team at any time by contacting the SME directly or by sending a "please unsubscribe" message to the appropriate SME list.

3.1.5 Interested parties shall participate actively in the discussion on PDRs. They are requested to put forward their proposal for the resolution of the PDR as described later in this document. In the event they do not follow this rules for several consecutive PDRs, they will be automatically deleted from the appropriate SME list.

3.2 Resolution of a PDR inside the SV-2/3/4 SME teams

3.2.1 Once a defect raised against one part of Sub-Volume 2/3/4 is accepted by the CCB (PDR status is ACCEPTED), the SME sends the PDR to all members of the appropriate SME team (including when possible the editor of the SARPs).

3.2.2 The editor of the SARPs against which the PDR has been raised or the SME becomes the leader of the discussion for the PDR. He/She shall acknowledge explicitly the reception of the PDR (response time is <TBD> days):

- if a change to the SARPs to resolve the problem is included in the PDR, he shall indicate whether or not he/she accepts the solution. If he/she does not accept the solution, the reason for the rejection and a new proposal shall be enclosed with the reply.
- if no change is proposed, the reply shall contain one technical solution.

3.2.3 A period of <TBD> days is allocated for the e-mail discussion by the SME team members. The discussion moderator is the SARPs editor or the SME concerned with the PDR. If an sub-group meeting is held during this period, the result of the SG discussion shall be reflected in an e-mail message sent to all SME team members.

3.2.4 At the end of the discussion period, each SME team member are expected to express via email his/her resolution on the defect. This should allow the SME and/or the SARPs editor to write the final SME recommendation. If an insufficient level of input is obtained, the SME shall request an explicit opinion from each SME team member. The SME sends the updated PDR to the CCB chair through the appropriate mailing list.

3.2.5 Once the PDR status becomes RESOLVED (i.e. the CCB has accepted the SME resolution), the SME is ultimately responsible for updating the Engineering Version according to the SME resolution. He/She may make use of any resources available for the maintenance of the Engineering Version.

3.3 Dissemination of the Information

3.3.1 The CCB Procedures Document [1] recommends the use of the WG3 mailing list "atnp-wg3" for initial discussion about proposed PDRs. This list could be used for discussing proposals for defect report before official PDRs are sent to the CCB chairman. However, this procedure previously used by WG2 has never been seen as necessary by WG3 members. As any WG3 member can register the SME Team email list(s) in which he is interested, it seems useless to have two separate means of discussion.

3.3.2 PDRs related to SV-2/3/4 are available on the archive maintained by the CCB Chair.

3.4 Relationship SMEs and WG3

3.4.1 The SME, or a CCB representative (e.g. the CCB Chairman or an other SME), with the support of the SG Chairman and the SARPs editors, will inform each WG3 meeting the on-going CCB activities.

3.4.2 Defect resolutions approved by the SME team and the CCB can not be superseded by sub-group or WG3 discussions. If it so happens that a sub-group or WG3 does not agree with a CCB resolution, a new PDR shall be produced and shall enter the normal PDR resolution process.

4. Conclusions

4.1 Any person interested in participating in the resolution of PDRs for Sub-Volumes 2/3/4 is requested to provide the appropriate SME with its e-mail address as soon as possible.

4.2 The process drafted in this working paper shall be refined by WG3 SMEs and SME team members as necessary.