**26 August 2014 Teleconference Notes**

Attendees:

E. Barkley

D. Bittner

A. Crowson

C. Haddow

H. Kelliher

U. Müller-Wilm

P. Pechkam

J. Pietras

J. Reinert

K. Tuttle

Agenda

1. Action Items review
2. Comments on the schedule of services test report
3. Comment/Walk-Through on the latest planning information draft recommendation
4. Comment/Walk-Through on the latest generic file transfer concept
5. Comment/Walk-Through on event sequence extensibility write up (see email from P. Pechkam)
6. Follow-up re inter-recommendation discussion
7. “Backlog” re items that need follow-up
8. London meetings planning
9. Any other items you would like to address

Discussion Summary:

1. Action Items Review
   1. A request to the working group membership to check with their appropriate agency representatives with regard to security considerations for protocol selection for GFT
   2. E. Barkley to follow up with navigation working group chair as to possibility for expression of “layered” (i.e. multi-reference center) sets of trajectories/ephemerides
2. Comments on the schedule of services test report
   1. No substantial inputs – conclusion is that the test report is in good shape and unless there are significant RIDs that modify the schedule of services recommendation (as a result of the upcoming agency reviews) the document will essentially be used as is for blue book candidacy
3. Comment/Walk-Through on the latest planning information draft recommendation
   1. noted that it was possible to interpret the class diagram as putting the defined events prior to the additional events and also as freely mixing defined an additional events (which is the intent with the current class diagram definition). Agreed that additional statements can be made in the text to make it clear as to the intent.
   2. A question as to the need for uncertainty windows was raised
      1. Noted this may be in relation to the grade/accuracy of the trajectory input
   3. Discussion/comment about how best to structure this with regard to XML schema definition – for example, will there be defined event schema types?
   4. A request/action to the working group membership is to talk with appropriate agency representatives and provide inputs with respect to radio frequency interference (RFI), data volume/data rate estimation, and cost estimate data inputs for consideration in the draft recommendation
4. Comment/Walk-Through on the latest generic file transfer concept
   1. WebDAV -- clarified that WebDAV is mostly being considered from the protocol point of view for GFT (editorial note: more information for those not familiar with WebDAV can be found via <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/WebDAV>)
      1. Noted that ESA and JPL/DSN are currently exchanging files via WebDAV
   2. Colin requested feedback on good protocol candidates, especially from a security consideration “relatively soon”.
   3. Noted that the use of XFDU (an existing CCSDS recommendation) is the likely candidate for the packaging mechanism
5. Comment/Walk-Through on event sequence extensibility write up
   1. Noted that the functional resources, especially the space link facing functional resources are the basis for the event sequence
   2. Noted the (planned) SC-CSTS service will likely have much of the same information as the event sequence definition
   3. Two approaches identified
      1. Addition of new service data transport sub-states relative to the (current blue-1 oriented) data transport super-state
      2. Addition of new service data transport sub-states relative to the carrier available super state.
   4. Similarity to extensibility model noted with regard to the planning information draft recommendation (editorial note: especially for approach 1)
      1. a major extensibility point (i.e. definition of new event types)
      2. a minor extensibility point (i.e. definition of additional/new parameters relative to an event type)
6. Follow-up re inter-recommendation discussion
   1. a basic trial spreadsheet listing the “official” information entity names (per the concept book) was presented
   2. intention is to provide as an aid and the double check for proper names being utilized in describing information entities when referred to from various recommendations etc. (see table below)
7. “Backlog” re items that need follow-up – Not addressed/deferred
8. London meetings planning
   1. suggested that about one hour of time be put on the agenda for working on inter-recommendation tracking

The next telecon is schedule for 25 September.

Example table for reference in developing recommendations/cross checking (in this case a listing of the set of CSSM information entities)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Index** | **INFORMATION ENTITY NAME** |
| 1 | SERVICE CATALOG |
| 2 | PLANNING REQUEST |
| 3 | PROVISIONAL PLAN |
| 4 | SERVICE AGREEMENT |
| 5 | CONFIGURATION PROFILE |
| 6 | COMMUNICATIONS GEOMETRY |
| 7 | SUSTAINABLE DATA RATES & VOLUME ESTIMATES |
| 8 | RADIO FREQUENCY INTERFERENCE |
| 9 | RESOURCE CONFLICTS |
| 10 | COST ESTIMATES |
| 11 | SPACE LINK EVENT SEQUENCE |
| 12 | RESOURCE AVAILABILITY INFORMATION |
| 13 | TRAJECTORY PREDICTION SEGMENT |
| 14 | SERVICE PACKAGE REQUEST |
| 15 | SERVICE PACKAGE |
| 16 | SCHEDULE OF SERVICES |
| 17 | SERVICE PACKAGE EXECUTION EVENT NOTIFICATION |
| 18 | ACCOUNTING REPORT |
| 19 | INFORMATION ENTITY CROSS-REFERENCING FRAMEWORK |

[end notes]