

From: secretariat-bounces@mailman.ccsds.org on behalf of [Kearney, Mike W. \(MSFC-EO01\)](#)
To: cmc@mailman.ccsds.org
Cc: Secretariat@mailman.ccsds.org
Subject: [Secretariat] (no subject)
Date: Thursday, March 03, 2011 4:50:47 PM
Attachments: [Proposed Patent Policy text for CCSDS Procedures.doc](#)
[ATT00001..c](#)

Dear CMC members: As you know we have two important polls on CCSDS Patent Policy. For one of them, Jean-Marc submitted this as a provision:

It should be clarified at which stage of the production process the patent statement and licensing declaration form should be completed. The wording "before any CCSDS document can be submitted to the CMC for potential approval on the Standards Track" potentially places this requirement quite late and possibly just before CMC approval. It was CNES understanding that this should be handled much earlier or even at the time of chartering a working group or adding a new project/document to a WG charter. Alternately it could be one of the first objectives of a just created WG or Project. The background idea is not to spend resources and discover difficulties at a late stage.

We did indeed discuss in the last telecon that it must be done as early as possible in the CCSDS process. However, some situations may not be discovered until late in the process. I did not want to write up a policy statement in the resolution that excluded the ability to work out issues that are discovered late, and would automatically disapprove those documents. So in the statement of when a document would have "stop work" orders, I left that to be only for final approval of the document.

However, in the ***procedures document*** draft that I sent out, I did include the statement "Procedurally, this shall be addressed in the development and approval of charters for CCSDS teams (WGs and SIGs), and in the approval process for adding standards documentation projects to WG charters." This means that WGs are required to make a statement about Patent encumbrances (1) when they submit a new working group charter, and (2) when they add a new document project to their plan of work in the framework. I believe that procedurally, that will answer Jean-Marc's provision. I planned to discuss this more, with more concrete examples, in our telecon #2 on Patent Policy, on Monday.

Jean, Marc, in that case, is it OK to proceed with the resolution? Is it OK to handle your provisional concern with the procedures document text?

-- Mike

Mike Kearney
NASA MSFC EO-01
256-544-2029

The message was checked by ESET NOD32 Antivirus.

<http://www.eset.com>