**10 Mar 2015 Teleconference Notes**

Attendees:

E. Barkley

D. Bittner

K. Costello

J. Chamoun

A. Crowson

M. Gnat

C. Haddow

U. Mueller-Wilm

J. Pietras

P. Pechkam

J. Reinert

K. Tuttle

M. Unal

Agenda (as adjusted at the telecon)

1. Action Items review
2. Request Engineering splinter group
   1. Read-out/status from splinter WG
   2. Service request component walk thru
3. Examples of recurrent requests (agency inputs)
4. ~~Generic file transfer status/updates (list of questions, etc.)~~
5. Communication geometry inputs (see revised spreadsheet)
6. Spring meetings planning
7. XML Schema namespace examples
8. AOB

Discussion Summary:

1. Action Items Review
   1. Actions relating to service request/planning request models are either done or overcome by events such that they will be addressed at Pasadena meetings.
2. Request Engineering splinter group
   1. Splinter group convened yesterday via telecon; net result is to proceed with development of planning (simple) request and service package (more flexible) request, keeping abstract service request model in mind and make decisions at upcoming Pasadena meetings
   2. Walked through draft service package request functional component write-up
      1. No significant comments; see email of 09-Mar-2015 for write-up
3. Examples of recurrent requests (agency inputs)
   1. C. Haddow reports that ESA inputs have been received but need to be uploaded to CWE
   2. Input still expected from CNES (C. Ciocirlan)
4. Communication geometry spreadsheet/inputs
   1. Potential further DLR inputs may be forthcoming
   2. Inputs for NASA-SN and NASA-NEN and NASA-DSN to be provided at Pasadena meetings
   3. Clarification/potential re-visiting of Coms-start/end events vs. AOS/LOS appears to be needed
      1. Appears to be TDRSS related in origin
         1. Coms-start/end a sub-set of visibility
         2. Need to keep “pure” geometry in mind vs logical event “overlays”
      2. Suggestion to all WG membership to re-read draft planning book prior to Pasadena meetings
5. Spring Meetings planning
   1. Will likely have to adjust re shared WG memberships – pending CSS area telecon tomorrow
   2. Lack of service accounting on agenda noted – will be added
6. XML Namespace Examples
   1. Walked through trial namespaces examples developed in accord with draft CCSDS URN RFC
   2. Noted that may be too much granularity – ie “stopping”at level of recommendation that “houses” multiple schemas vs a namespace pre information entity
   3. To be further discussed at Pasadena meetings
7. AOB – none.

Future telecons to be scheduled as part of Pasadena meetings.

[end notes]