**SAWG Telecon Notes – Wednesday, 21 Sept 16, @ 0700 Pacific**

Attendees: Yonghui Huang, Ramon Krosley, Peter Shames, Roger Thompson

**Next meetings CCSDS Working Meeting in Rome, Tues-Wed, 18-19 Oct 16**

1. Agenda review, Tues AM
2. SOIS Materials focus – RK & YH, Tues AM
3. MOIMS Materials focus – RT, Tues PM
4. Integration session, explore common topics / integration points, Wed AM
5. Joint meeting with SM&C and MOIMS, Wed, 19 Oct, early afternoon
6. Wrap-up

Agenda for 21 Sept telecon:

* Agenda topic review – 5 mins
* Review updates to SOIS materials – 80 mins
* Review updates to MOIMS materials – 20 mins
* Discuss Working Meeting schedule and plans – 10 mins
* Wrap up – 5 mins

Meeting materials are in CWE folder:

http://cwe.ccsds.org/sea/docs/Forms/AllItems.aspx?RootFolder=%2fsea%2fdocs%2fSEA-SA%2fMeeting%20Materials%2f2016%2f2016%20Telecon%20Materials&FolderCTID=&View={50B434A7-BB62-4E03-A971-45271E7C0B86}

**SOIS Services - Ray Krosley & Yonghui Huang**

- Reviewed updates to SOIS materials and some open issues

- The Layered Functional View and the Data view (pgs 5 & 6) are really just two variants of a Functional View.

A data view would focus on the data objects, definitions, and contents

Another data view might be of an ontology, where the object relationships are also defined (containment, specialization, membership, etc)

- We spent a long time discussing pg 8 and the protocol stack diagrams. There is an on-going confusion (in lots of WG) vis-à-vis just what makes an interoperable protocol standard vs an abstract interface, or a API, or a process, or just a description.

- On pg 13 (and earlier), the sequence diagrams are quite useful. During discussion of this one there was an assertion made that the MAL (broker) and MTS/AMS (peer-peer) models were essentially the same. They are not and the distinction is important from an architectural as well as implementation point of view.

- We spent a long time discussing pg 16, which was simplified to the point of no longer being very meaningful. This is really a connectivity viewpoint and the fundamental message, I believe, is to describe how two different devices, which use different protocols, can communicate using the device access and virtualization functions.

- A new pg 17, which re-draws pg 16, is provided in the edited package SOIS\_Services.v7-ps. It shows the components and also the protocol stack elements. It also shows, explicitly, the Application PDU (A-PDU) to the Device PDU (D-PDU) translation.

- On pg 20 in the edited package we discussed the role that the EDS might have in defining, in an interoperable fashion, the MIB, devices, sub-net topology, etc. There is an important role that the EDS can play in tying this all together.

- The SOIS seems to want to drop all of the abstract services and to concentrate instead on specific implementations, documented in Orange Books. This is a strong step away from the fundamental purpose of CCSDS and needs to be carefully thought through.

- Recommend retaining the existing SOIS MBs, in there current form, while the full role of the EDS is worked out. Those several MB, each of which has somewhat slim content, may then be combined into one new abstract service MB that uses the EDS in a unifying role.

- Reviewed the updated Plug & Play diagram, pg 16 in v6.NSSC comments file. This makes the point that the EDS could serve as the MIB definition shared among the Device Enumeration, Virtualization, and Access functions.

***=> Review last note in MOIMS section, agree to adopt the common tabular format for Service view.***

**MOIMS Services - Roger**

- Quickly reviewed updates to previous materials and Draft B of the MOIMS Functional and Service views

- Agree that the “railroad” diagrams (pg 6) are rather useful in showing in a compact way all of the service providers and service users

- What is still the case is that we need some means of discriminating the standards that are draft, or referenced in a GB, from those that are full BB or MB standards

Agreed in later discussions that we can do that by marking the table of services appropriately

Use [Future] marking for those still in development

Use colors to indicate book status & type

Discussed using a “thin column” with color on the left to indicate which group any given service belongs in

Discussed the distinctions needed between service specs and data format specs, especially where there is no service

- Reviewed a cut at a Data Storage and Archiving chart, pg 13, needs additional work to sort out definitions of DAI functions, interfaces, and data objects.

- Reviewed the Service viewpoint using a tablular form. This now indicates standard status, Blue, Magenta, Green, and draft, which is a help in sorting out type of spec and maturity.

- The Services table also includes columns for Services, Functions, Operations, Data, Description, and related Standards.

***=> Agreed to use this same tabular format for the SOIS services as well, in order to provide a more complete representation***

**Future Meetings**

- Discussed the schedule for the working meetings in Rome

- See schedule at top of these minutes

***=> Next Meeting Rome, Tues-Wed, 18-19 Oct 16***