Attendees: David Berry, Vitali Braun, Juan Crenshaw, Cheryl Gramling, Kiyoshi Hamada, Hideaki Hinagawa, Alain Lamy, Jose Miguel Lozano, Dan Oltrogge, Dianne Poster, Mehran Sarkarati, Brian Swinburne, Patrick Zimmerman

Notes	
0. Breaking News	Action
• David reported that he had heard in JPL's semi-weekly Standards meeting that Tom Gannett, CCSDS Editor for many years, had chosen to retire. It appears that little or no notice was given, so there's no replacement and consequently a big gap in CCSDS capability for an indefinite period of time.	None for Nav WG.
1. Re-Entry Data Message 5 Year Review	
 David reminded that we have a pending 5 Year Review for the RDM. Since we were not able to perform the review at the Fall 2024 Meetings, we had decided we would perform the review during a telecon. David reminded everyone of the options: "Reconfirm?, Retire?, Revise?" After some discussion of the ramifications of each option, here are the results of the solicitation of comments: 	To David: Submit "Reconfirm" request to Secretariat for CESG/CMC polling.
 Jose Miguel: Should not retire. Indicated that he had received some comments for improvement of the RDM from colleagues at GMV, but perhaps not sufficient for a vote to "Revise". Vitali: Should not retire. Indicated that there seems to be more and more 	
 interest in linking the RDM with airspace operations, basically to prepare warnings to operators of aircraft. No specific needs for changes were identified. Hideaki: Should not retire. IADC is using the standard. No specific 	
needs for changes from JAXA. • Dan: In SC14, if there's a standard that's published and out there we	
don't always have good statistics on who's using it, and to me it's a mistake to cancel it because the work's already done. In general we don't have good stats on the usage of NavWG standards, but we should not retire due to increasing importance being placed on satellite re-entry.	
• Cheryl: Inquired whether or not it is possible to make small revisions? David responded that "technical corrections" (corrigenda) require CESG/CMC polling and may require testing, "errors" of an editorial nature can be done by the Secretariat Editor without polling. But even small technical changes that would lead to a new version of the Blue	
Book would require an approved new project, Agency Review, testing, polling, etc. So it's non-trivial. We can do an update, but it will be a big project and we already have several in the queue. • David: Expressed that there doesn't seem to be sufficient interest or	
requirement for revising at this time. Indicated that if a need does arise in the future, the WG can propose an update to the CESG/CMC using the standard process. So there's no risk of having to wait 5 years to revise if we reconfirm now.	

reconfirmation. David will subto the Area Directory Mehran 2. Document Status The status of selected document are sorted below in alphabetic. ADM: Not discussed in this m CDM P-1.2: Brian indicate document to be reviewed.		To David: Report "simple" doc status to MOIMS AD. None To David: Review draft Test Plan, complete XML Schemas. To David: NCM White Book 1.0 To David: NCM White
reconfirmation. David will subto the Area Directory Mehran 2. Document Status The status of selected documer are sorted below in alphabetic ADM: Not discussed in this m CDM P-1.2: Brian indicate document to be reviewed.	omit the reconfirmation recommendation Sarkarati to request the reconfirmation. Into in progress was reviewed. Documents all order. Interesting. Interesting of the was waiting for Test Plan is waiting for progress on the NCM. In the was waiting for Dan is waiting for progress on the NCM.	doc status to MOIMS AD. None To David: Review draft Test Plan, complete XML Schemas. To David: NCM White Book 1.0 To David: NCM White
 to the Area Directory Mehran 2. Document Status The status of selected document are sorted below in alphabetic ADM: Not discussed in this m CDM P-1.2: Brian indicate document to be reviewed. 	Sarkarati to request the reconfirmation. Into in progress was reviewed. Documents all order. Interesting. Interesting is a second of the se	doc status to MOIMS AD. None To David: Review draft Test Plan, complete XML Schemas. To David: NCM White Book 1.0 To David: NCM White
 Document Status The status of selected document are sorted below in alphabetic. ADM: Not discussed in this material of the comment o	nts in progress was reviewed. Documents al order. neeting. d that he was waiting for Test Plan is waiting for progress on the NCM.	doc status to MOIMS AD. None To David: Review draft Test Plan, complete XML Schemas. To David: NCM White Book 1.0 To David: NCM White
 The status of selected document are sorted below in alphabetic ADM: Not discussed in this m CDM P-1.2: Brian indicate document to be reviewed. 	al order. neeting. d that he was waiting for Test Plan is waiting for progress on the NCM. s waiting for progress on the NCM. Dan	doc status to MOIMS AD. None To David: Review draft Test Plan, complete XML Schemas. To David: NCM White Book 1.0 To David: NCM White
 are sorted below in alphabetic ADM: Not discussed in this m CDM P-1.2: Brian indicate document to be reviewed. 	al order. neeting. d that he was waiting for Test Plan is waiting for progress on the NCM. s waiting for progress on the NCM. Dan	doc status to MOIMS AD. None To David: Review draft Test Plan, complete XML Schemas. To David: NCM White Book 1.0 To David: NCM White
ADM: Not discussed in this m CDM P-1.2: Brian indicate document to be reviewed.	d that he was waiting for Test Plan is waiting for progress on the NCM.	None To David: Review draft Test Plan, complete XML Schemas. To David: NCM White Book 1.0 To David: NCM White
CDM P-1.2: Brian indicate document to be reviewed.	d that he was waiting for Test Plan is waiting for progress on the NCM.	To David: Review draft Test Plan, complete XML Schemas. To David: NCM White Book 1.0 To David: NCM White
document to be reviewed.	is waiting for progress on the NCM. s waiting for progress on the NCM. Dan	Test Plan, complete XML Schemas. To David: NCM White Book 1.0 To David: NCM White
	s waiting for progress on the NCM. Dan	Schemas. To David: NCM White Book 1.0 To David: NCM White
• FDM: Vitali indicated that he	s waiting for progress on the NCM. Dan	To David: NCM White Book 1.0 To David: NCM White
• FDM: Vitali indicated that he	s waiting for progress on the NCM. Dan	Book 1.0 To David: NCM White
		To David: NCM White
• LDM: Dan indicated that he i		D 1 1 0
	ii to mideado iron to mane joint progress	Book 1.0
on the FDM and LDM	, , ,	
Navigation Data - Definition	s and Conventions (NDDC): Julie was	To Julie: Resume transition
	it reported via email that she has not had	work.
recent opportunity to continue	progress on the Green Book transition to	
SANA. She plans to resume w	orking on it.	
Navigation Data Messages O	verview (NDMO): Not discussed in this	None
meeting.		
NCM (Navigation Composit	e Message): No direct discussion in this	To David: Produce NCM
`	nat Dan had done a brief presentation on	White Book 1.0
the NCM concept for a recent	TraCSS meeting. There was a request to	
share the presentation.	It's now on the CWE at	To David: Share the NCM
https://spacecomm.sharepoint.	com/:b:/r/sites/MOIMS/Shared%20Doc	presentation.
uments/MOIMS-		
NAV/Draft%20Documents/Na	avigation%20Composite%20Message%	
20(NCM)/20250116_NCM_C	CSDS_Oltrogge.pdf?csf=1&web=1	
NDM/XML 4.0 Specification	: David indicated that he has essentially	To David: Complete Test
finished revisions to the docur	ment, and is working on the Test Report,	Report and submit to Area
which will contain an argum	ent that further testing is not necessary	Director.
because the applicable schema	as were tested by 3 parties as part of the	
ADM 2.0 testing, and the sche	emas are in operations now on the SANA	
Registry.		
NEM: Alain reported that the	ere is nothing new, but Frank is working	To Alain & Frank:
on some consistency issues in		Continue fleshing out NEM
		White Book.
• ODM: Not discussed in this m	neeting.	None
• PRM: Not discussed in this m	eeting.	None
• RDM: See above (agenda iten	n #1).	To David: Submit
)		"Reconfirm" action to
		Secretariat for polling.
• SANA: Not discussed in this i	neeting	None
	as been working other priorities; also that	To Juan: Continue work on
he anticipates heightened non-	Q A	P-2.0.3 based on internal
	•	review of 2.0.2
• TraCSS: Dan and David had	d attended a recent TraCSS Meeting to	Proceed with TraCSS
discuss NavSol and the NCM.		support as requested.

Notes	
2. Action Item Update	Action
• Due to time constraints, Action Items were not reviewed in this	To All: Work on action
meeting.	items as time permits.
3. Spring/Fall 2025 Meeting Info	Action
 David stated that the Spring 2025 Meetings will be hosted by APL at Laurel Maryland, 09-Jun-2025 through 13-Jun-2025. Cheryl suggested that people try to book accommodations early. She also suggested that there's very little actually in Laurel, Maryland, but that Columbia, Maryland has some good places as well. In response to a question, Mehran indicated that the Fall 2025 Meetings 	To David: Share more information as it becomes available.
would be held in Hamburg, Germany, at the University of Hamburg. 4. Any Other Business	Action
V	
 Juan commented a bit on the LNIS activity. There is a lot of activity with Augmented Forward Signal. There's been an addition of people to the task. Is it the right path? Meeting recording is available on the Nav CWE until next meeting (we only keep a small number of these large recording files) https://spacecomm.sharepoint.com/:v:/r/sites/MOIMS/Shared%20Doc uments/MOIMS-NAV/CWE%20Private/Telecon%20Recording/CCSDS%20Nav%20WG%20Telecon-19-Feb-2025_061406-Meeting%20Recording.mp4?csf=1&web=1 	• None
5. Next Telecons/Meetings	Action
 Upcoming Meetings: 02-Apr-2025 1300-1400 UTC 07-May-2025 1300-1400 UTC 09-Jun-2025 thru 13-Jun-2025: Spring Meetings: will be sponsored by Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Lab (JHU/APL) in Laurel, Maryland, USA 	To David: Send invites as applicable