**10 Feb 2015 Teleconference Notes**

Attendees:

E. Barkley

K. Costello

C. Ciocirlan

A. Crowson

J. Chamoun

M. Gnat

C. Haddow

H. Kelliher

U. Mueller-Wilm

J. Pietras

P. Pechkam

K. Tuttle

Agenda (as adjusted at the telecon)

1. Action items review
2. SOS Book finalization – co-constraints re activityStatus vs prototyping
3. Abstract request common type (for Svc Pkg and Planning Data)
4. Common svc management header parameters analysis
5. Planning data communication geometry
6. Status check re config profile/svc agreement “bake-off” study
7. ~~Status check in re preliminary draft and question for GFT~~
8. Re-scheduling Feb 24 telecon to Feb 23
9. ~~AOB~~

Discussion Summary:

1. Action Items Review
	1. To help with closing the planning book inputs, especially with regard to communications geometry, a spreadsheet will be developed and circulated for recording various agency inputs
2. SOS Book finalization – co-constraints re activityStatus vs prototyping
	1. reviewed the presentation outlining the potential issues with regard to co-constraints definitions for various parameter values (see diagrams below)
	2. agreed that in general it is desired to keep the simple schedule format as simple and as straightforward as possible
	3. accordingly, agreed that if the overall (header level) status is “provisional” then the only legal values for activityStatus is “tentative”
	4. accordingly, agreed that if the overall (header level) status is “operational” then either “tentative” or “committed” is allowed
		1. rationale: the schedule being published may represent several weeks into the future and there may be tentative bookings even for the operational schedule if enough future time is included
			1. note: implementations can further restrict this via ICD if necessary (i.e, an operational schedule containing only committed activities)
	5. agreed that if the user of a scheduled service package is “unallocated” that the activityStatus can only be one of “available” or “unavailable”
		1. rationale: this is only to be used for expressing antenna free time
	6. agreed that further analysis/crosscheck is to be done with the various values that are potentially (co-)constraining to ensure that all combinations are reasonable
	7. agreed that if straightforward reasonable combinations/restrictions can be written for the various parameters involved then supplemental prototyping is not required
	8. action to C. Haddow provide co-constraint composition rules (for next telecon)
3. Abstract request common type (for Svc Pkg and Planning Data)
	1. Agreed that in general there are potential similarities between a request for planning data and a request for services (in terms of stating constraints, flexibilities)
	2. Agreed to course of action
		1. EB: complete action on diagramming planning request for the green book
		2. EB: complete action on service components write up
		3. Reference C. Haddow’s proposed common request definition
		4. Subteam to disuss and provide inputs at Spring meetings (sub-team is C. Haddow, JP Chamoun, J. Pietras, E. Barkley)
4. Common svc management header parameters analysis
	1. J. Pietras walked us through his analysis of the earlier spreadsheet produced by E. Barkley
	2. a distinction noted between (future) messages and persistent data objects
	3. spreadsheet will be updated with analysis produced to date and circulated to the working group for comment at next teleconference
5. Planning data communication geometry
	1. Some initial inputs received from DSN and subsequent discussion:
		1. Overflight geometry for Mars use case likely not to be included (*editorial note: further investigation may still occur)*
		2. In response to “solar “illumination angle close” a subsequent question about a generic separation angle event being needed was raised (to report on arbitrary celestial bodies/spacecraft vs earth-sun-spacecraft)
		3. Occultation
			1. there may be a need for partial occultation to be expressed
			2. noted that this may be similar to expressions of a umbra and penumbra events produced by the DSN
			3. noted that there is a need for determining what type of identification scheme should be used for celestial bodies
				1. assumption is that there are already sufficiently recognized international naming schemes etc.
	2. Further communication geometry event inputs continues to be requested
6. Status check re config profile/svc agreement “bake-off” study
	1. J. Pietras provided a walk-through of analysis done so far
	2. preliminary results indicate that a service component model is needed but that the “cookie-cutter” set of configuration profiles still seems like a good approach for the configuration profile/service agreement book
	3. further analysis still pending
7. Re-scheduling Feb 24 telecon to Feb 23
	1. Okay

The next telecon is schedule for 23 February 2015.

[end notes; diagrams follow]

[SOS co-constraint issues diagrams]



