INTERNATIONAL STANDARD

ISO 22669

Fourth edition
2021-06

Space data and information transfer systems — Space link extension (SLE) — Return-all-frames service specification

Systèmes de transfert des données et informations spatiales — Extension de liaisons spatiales (SLE) — Service de retour par tout réseau

Reference number
ISO 22669:2021(E)

ISO copyright office
CP 401 • Ch. de Blandonnet 8
CH-1214 Vernier, Geneva
Phone: +41 22 749 01 11
Email: copyright@iso.org
Website: www.iso.org

Published in Switzerland

Foreword

ISO (the International Organization for Standardization) is a worldwide federation of national standards bodies (ISO member bodies). The work of preparing International Standards is normally carried out through ISO technical committees. Each member body interested in a subject for which a technical committee has been established has the right to be represented on that committee. International organizations, governmental and non-governmental, in liaison with ISO, also take part in the work. ISO collaborates closely with the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) on all matters of electrotechnical standardization.

The procedures used to develop this document and those intended for its further maintenance are described in the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 1. In particular, the different approval criteria needed for the different types of ISO documents should be noted (see www.iso.org/directives).

Attention is drawn to the possibility that some of the elements of this document may be the subject of patent rights. ISO shall not be held responsible for identifying any or all such patent rights. Details of any patent rights identified during the development of the document will be in the Introduction and/or on the ISO list of patent declarations received (see www.iso.org/patents).

Any trade name used in this document is information given for the convenience of users and does not constitute an endorsement.

For an explanation of the voluntary nature of standards, the meaning of ISO specific terms and expressions related to conformity assessment, as well as information about ISO's adherence to the World Trade Organization (WTO) principles in the Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) see www.iso.org/iso/foreword.html.

This document was prepared by the Consultative Committee for Space Data Systems (CCSDS) (as CCSDS 911.1-B-4, August 2016) and was adopted (without modifications) by Technical Committee ISO/TC 20, *Space vehicles,* Subcommittee SC 13, *Space data and information transfer systems*.

This fourth edition cancels and replaces the third edition (ISO 22669:2013), which has been technically revised.

The main changes compared to the previous edition are as follows:

— adds clarifications and corrections;

— adds production status annex;

— updates specifications to accommodate recent additions to the CCSDS Recommended Standards for coding and synchronization.

Any feedback or questions on this document should be directed to the user's national standards body. A complete listing of these bodies can be found at www.iso.org/members.html.

CONTENTS

CONTENTS (continued)

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE OF THIS RECOMMENDED STANDARD

The purpose of this Recommended Standard is to define the Space Link Extension (SLE) Return All Frames (RAF) service in conformance with the SLE Reference Model (reference [1]). The RAF service is an SLE transfer service that delivers to a mission user all telemetry frames from one space link physical channel.

1.2 SCOPE

This Recommended Standard defines, in an abstract manner, the RAF service in terms of:

a) the operations necessary to provide the service;

b) the parameter data associated with each operation;

c) the behaviors that result from the invocation of each operation; and

d) the relationship between, and the valid sequence of, the operations and resulting behaviors.

It does not specify:

a) individual implementations or products;

b) the implementation of entities or interfaces within real systems;

c) the methods or technologies required to acquire telemetry frames from signals received from a spacecraft;

d) the methods or technologies required to provide a suitable environment for communications; or

e) the management activities required to schedule, configure, and control the RAF service.

1.3 APPLICABILITY

1.3.1 APPLICABILITY OF THIS RECOMMENDED STANDARD

This Recommended Standard provides a basis for the development of real systems that implement the RAF service. Implementation of the RAF service in a real system additionally requires the availability of a communications service to convey invocations and returns of RAF service operations between RAF service users and providers. This Recommended Standard requires that such a communications service must ensure that invocations and returns of operations are transferred:

a) in sequence;

b) completely and with integrity;

c) without duplication;

d) with flow control that notifies the application layer in the event of congestion; and

e) with notification to the application layer in the event that communications between the RAF service user and the RAF service provider are disrupted, possibly resulting in a loss of data.

It is the specific intent of this Recommended Standard to define the RAF service in a manner that is independent of any particular communications services, protocols, or technologies.

1.3.2 LIMITS OF APPLICABILITY

1.3.2.1 Relationship to Real Systems

This Recommended Standard specifies the RAF service that may be provided by an SLE Complex for inter-Agency cross support. It is neither a specification of, nor a design for, real systems that may be implemented for the control and monitoring of existing or future missions.

1.3.2.2 RAF Service and Telemetry Channel Coding

Telemetry channel coding on the space link is specified by references [2], [3], and [4]. The provision of RAF service requires, as specified in reference [2], that, at any given time, the coding options must be the same for all frames on a physical channel.

Reference [F5] allowed multiplexing of coded Transfer Frames (encoded with the Reed-Solomon code) with non-coded Transfer Frames on a Physical Channel. This is not allowed anymore by recommendations in force.

1.4 RATIONALE

The goal of this Recommended Standard is to create a standard for interoperability between the tracking stations or ground data handling systems of various Agencies and the consumers of spacecraft telemetry.

1.5 DOCUMENT STRUCTURE

1.5.1 ORGANIZATION

This document is organized as follows:

a) section 0 presents the purpose, scope, applicability and rationale of this Recommended Standard and lists the definitions, conventions, and references used throughout the Recommended Standard;

b) section 2 provides an overview of the RAF service including a functional description, the service management context, and protocol considerations;

c) section 3 specifies the operations of the RAF service;

d) section 4 specifies the dynamic behavior of the RAF service in terms of the state transitions of the RAF service provider;

e) annex A provides a formal specification of RAF service data types using Abstract Syntax Notation One (ASN.1);

f) annex B specifies the relationship of the RAF service provision to the production status;

g) annex C provides a conformance matrix that defines what capabilities must be provided for an implementation to be considered compliant with this Recommended Standard;

h) annex D lists all terms used in this Recommended Standard and identifies where they are defined;

i) annex E lists all acronyms used within this document;

j) annex F provides a list of informative references.

1.5.2 SLE SERVICES DOCUMENTATION TREE

This Recommended Standard is based on the cross support model defined in the SLE Reference Model (reference [1]). It expands upon the concept of an SLE transfer service as an interaction between an SLE Mission User Entity (MUE) and an SLE transfer service provider for the purpose of providing the RAF transfer service.

This Recommended Standard is part of a suite of documents specifying the SLE services. The SLE services constitute one of the three types of Cross Support Services:

a) Part 1: SLE Services;

b) Part 2: Ground Domain Services;

c) Part 3: Ground Communications Services.

The basic organization of the SLE services documentation is shown in figure 1-1. The various documents are described in the following subsections.



Figure 1-1: SLE Services Documentation

a) *Cross Support Concept—Part 1: Space Link Extension Services* (reference [F2]): a Report introducing the concepts of cross support and the SLE services;

b) *Cross Support Reference Model—Part 1: Space Link Extension Services* (reference [1]): a Recommended Standard that defines the framework and terminology for the specification of SLE services;

c) *SLE Return Service Specifications*: a set of Recommended Standards that will provide specification of all return link SLE services (this Recommended Standard is one of the specifications in that set);

d) *SLE Forward Service Specifications*: a set of Recommended Standards that will provide specification of all forward link SLE services;

e) *SLE API for Transfer Services Specifications*: a set of Recommended Practices that provide specifications of an Application Program Interface; a set of Recommended Standards that provide specifications of an Application Program Interface and a mapping to TCP/IP as underlying communications service for SLE services;

f) *Internet Protocol for Transfer Services:* defines a protocol for transfer of SLE Protocol Data Units using TCP/IP as underlying communications service for SLE services;

g) *SLE Service Management Specifications*: a set of Recommended Standards that establish the basis of SLE service management.

1.6 DEFINITIONS, NOMENCLATURE, AND CONVENTIONS

1.6.1 DEFINITIONS

1.6.1.1 Definitions from Open Systems Interconnection (OSI) Basic Reference Model

This Recommended Standard makes use of a number of terms defined in reference [8]. The use of those terms in this Recommended Standard shall be understood in a generic sense, i.e., in the sense that those terms are generally applicable to technologies that provide for the exchange of information between real systems. Those terms are:

a) abstract syntax;

b) application entity;

c) application layer;

d) application process;

e) flow control;

f) Open Systems Interconnection (OSI);

g) real system;

h) Service Access Point (SAP).

1.6.1.2 Definitions from Abstract Syntax Notation One

This Recommended Standard makes use of the following terms defined in reference [9]:

a) Abstract Syntax Notation One (ASN.1);

b) object identifier;

c) (data) type;

d) (data) value.

NOTE – In annex A of this Recommended Standard, ASN.1 is used for specifying the abstract syntax of RAF service operation invocations and returns. The use of ASN.1 as a descriptive language is intended to support the specification of the abstract RAF service; it is not intended to constrain implementations. In particular, there is no requirement for implementations to employ ASN.1 encoding rules. ASN.1 is simply a convenient tool for formally describing the abstract syntax of RAF service operation invocations and returns.

1.6.1.3 Definitions from TM Synchronization and Channel Coding

This Recommended Standard makes use of the following terms defined in reference [2]:

a) Attached Sync Marker;

b) codeblock;

c) convolutional code;

d) pseudo-randomization;

e) Reed-Solomon check symbols;

f) Reed-Solomon code;

g) turbo code.

1.6.1.4 Definitions from TM Space Data Link Protocol

This Recommended Standard makes use of the following term defined in reference [5]:

a) Frame Error Control Field (FECF);

b) TM Transfer Frame.

1.6.1.5 Definitions from AOS Space Data Link Protocol

This Recommended Standard makes use of the following terms defined in reference [6]:

a) Cyclic Redundancy Code (CRC);

b) AOS Transfer Frame;

c) Frame Error Control Field (FECF).

1.6.1.6 Definitions from SLE Reference Model

This Recommended Standard makes use of the following terms defined in reference [1]:

a) abstract binding;

b) abstract object;

c) abstract port;

d) abstract service;

e) invoker;

f) Mission Data Operation System (MDOS);

g) Mission User Entity (MUE);

h) offline delivery mode;

i) online delivery mode;

j) operation;

k) performer;

l) physical channel;

m) return data;

n) Return All Frames channel (RAF channel);

o) Return All Frames service (RAF service);

p) service agreement;

q) service provider (provider);

r) service user (user);

s) SLE Complex;

t) SLE Complex Management;

u) SLE data channel;

v) SLE Functional Group (SLE-FG);

w) SLE Protocol Data Unit (SLE-PDU);

x) SLE Service Data Unit (SLE-SDU);

y) SLE service package;

z) SLE transfer service instance;

aa) SLE transfer service production;

bb) SLE transfer service provision;

cc) SLE Utilization Management;

dd) space link;

ee) space link data channel;

ff) Space Link Data Unit (SL-DU);

gg) space link session.

1.6.1.7 Additional Definitions

1.6.1.7.1 Association

An association is a cooperative relationship between an SLE service-providing application entity and an SLE service-using application entity. An association is formed by the exchange of SLE protocol data units through the use of an underlying communications service.

1.6.1.7.2 Communications Service

A communications service is a capability that enables an SLE service-providing application entity and an SLE service-using application entity to exchange information.

NOTE – If an SLE service user and an SLE service provider are implemented using different communications services, then interoperability between them is possible only by means of a suitable gateway. Adherence to this Recommended Standard ensures, at least in principle, that it is possible to construct such a gateway.

1.6.1.7.3 Confirmed Operation

A confirmed operation is an operation that requires the performer to return a report of its outcome to the invoker.

1.6.1.7.4 Delivery Criteria

Delivery criteria are rules that determine whether a data unit acquired from the space link by an SLE service provider shall be delivered to a user.

NOTE – For RAF service, the delivery criteria are:

a) the Earth Receive Time (ERT) of the frame is within the period defined by the start and stop times specified in the RAF-START operation; and

b) the frame quality of the frame matches the requested frame quality specified in the RAF-START operation.

1.6.1.7.5 Frame Error Control Field

The Frame Error Control Field (FECF) of a frame is the FECF of a TM Transfer Frame (reference [5]), or the FECF of an AOS Transfer Frame (reference [6]), as applicable.

1.6.1.7.6 Initiator

The initiator is the object that issues the request to bind to another object (the responder).

NOTE – In other words, the initiator is always the invoker of the request to bind to another object. Therefore, in the context of the request to bind, the terms 'initiator' and 'invoker' refer to the same object and are synonyms.

1.6.1.7.7 Invocation

The invocation of an operation is the making of a request by an object (the invoker) to another object (the performer) to carry out the operation.

1.6.1.7.8 Parameter

A parameter of an operation is data that may accompany the operation's invocation or return.

NOTE – The term parameter is also used to refer to mission-dependent configuration information used in the production or provision of the service.

1.6.1.7.9 Performance

The performance of an operation is the carrying out of the operation by an object (the performer).

1.6.1.7.10 Port Identifier

A port identifier identifies a source or a destination in a communications system.

NOTE – See 2.6.4.5 for more information.

1.6.1.7.11 Responder

The responder is the object that receives a request to bind and completes the binding (if possible) with the initiator in order for a service association to exist between the two objects.

NOTE – In other words, the responder is always the performer of the binding. Therefore, in the context of binding, the terms 'responder' and 'performer' refer to the same object and are synonyms.