**07 October 2014 Teleconference Notes**

Attendees:

E. Barkley

D. Bittner

J. Chamoun

C. Ciocirlan

M. Gnat

C. Haddow

U. Müller-Wilm

P. Pechkam

J. Pietras

J. Reinert

K. Tuttle

Agenda (as adjusted at the teleconference)

1) Action items review

2) Updates, if any, with regard to agency reviews for simple schedule of services

3) Update re GFT Charter and review of GFT project definition

4) Follow up re GFT security considerations (especially re use of WebDav)

5) Trajectory predictions and their management (see today’s email from J. Reinert)

6) London meetings planning/draft proposed calendar review

7) Any other business you wish to address

 a) Svc Agreement/Config Profile walkthrough, introduction

Discussion Summary:

1. Action Items Review
	1. A request/reminder to the working group membership to provide any information possible on radio frequency interference (RFI) information for consideration in the planning data format book
2. Status update with regard to agency reviews for simple schedule of services
	1. No significant news to report
3. Update re GFT Charter and review of GFT project definition
	1. Charter – in response to a question about prior existing work known in the working group, no one indicated awareness of prior standardization with respect to ISO that has been done
	2. Project –
		1. in general project definition and dates are okay
		2. agreement to add prototypes to the project definition even though a magenta book does not require them
			1. initial idea is that this prototyping which is really of verification/validation of the recommended profile can be done via ESA and NASA resources
4. Follow up re GFT security considerations (especially re use of WebDav)
	1. NASA/JPL/DSN reports that response so far re security for WebDav is that there are no issues provided HTTPS is utilized
	2. CNES plans to have inputs for London meeting
5. Trajectory predictions and their management
	1. Use of trajectoryId, trajectoryRef (mutually exclusive vs trajectoryId and flag):
		1. Agreed to go with trajectoryId vs trajectoryRef as mutually exclusive parameters
			1. Rationale is that this is the same approach has taken for blue-1, and as such, the semantics are very clear
	2. Agreed to go with the text vs xml approach as to the essential data format extensions points (vs., each major format type –e.g, OPM text, OPM XML, EPM text, EPM XML, etc) being its own extension point
	3. Further work required for trajectory versioning meta data (for London meetings)
6. London meetings planning
	1. Agreed to reserve ~10 minutes in opening plenary for quick overview of document generation work that has been done (see telecon notes for 25 September 2015)
	2. Noted that Tuesday PM, 1530 -- 1730 which is currently blank/reserved on the agenda will likely be required for further extensibility discussions
7. Other Items –
	* 1. Svc Agreement/Config Profile walkthrough
			1. General concern noted about the generated document become large

The next telecon is schedule for 04 November.

[end notes]