

## **Memorandum**

---

**To** :  
**From** : MED/C/SZ  
**Copy** :  
**Ref.** : EUM/OPS/DOC/12/681111, v1  
**Date** : 3 December 2012

---

**Subject** : **Comments (2) on PDGS-SAFE-GMV-TN-12-0171\_SimplDesign\_v1.0.pdf**

EUMETSAT has re-discussed the issue of externalisation the representation information according to the trade-off provided by GMV (PDGS-SAFE-GMV-TN-12-0171\_SimplDesign\_v1.0.pdf) and the email from Paulo Sacramento, “SAFE Consolidation: externalization of representation information”, 2012-11-30 17:18).

EUMETSAT cannot necessarily see that an externalisation approach would be a costly solution.

EUMETSAT as well likes to point out, that in our understanding SAFE is mainly about the AIP for LTDP, not necessarily the DIP (although this needs to be considered, eventually).

EUMETSAT believes that a re-transcription executed when migrating from one archive technology to the next might be an option but is not directly connected.

EUMETSAT likes to re-state that the topic of a registry is only marginally connected to the externalisation approach, and that it should be a topic of the archive (management) system to map logical and physical identifiers. This is a typical topic of an archive management system, and is usually solved by the implementation of a catalogue. It is, though, in our opinion not a question of the SAFE standard.

EUMETSAT is presently in favour to externalise the representation information.

EUMETSAT fears if externalisation would be dropped, that EUMETSAT might not reach a SAFE compliant implementation for (future) missions.

EUMETSAT would like, thus, to propose a two-fold approach as part of the standard:

To make (or not to make) externalisation of representation information a choice when implementing the standard, i.e. that the SAFE standard explicitly allows both. EUMETSAT would like to encourage a discussion of this proposal.