**02 June 2015 Teleconference Notes**

Attendees:

E. Barkley

C. Ciocirlan

K. Costello

J. Chamoun

A. Crowson

H. Dreihan

M. diGuilio

C. Haddow

W. Hell

H. Kelliher

J. Pietras

J. Reinert

K. Tuttle

Agenda

1. Quick check re CMC actions (E. Barkley + M. diGiulio)
2. CSTS Service Instances + Service Management (M. diGiulio + selected CSTS WG members)
3. Trajectory Prediction update questions (J. Reinert)
4. SoS Finalization (see latest update from C. Haddow) and SANA Registry policy updates (E. Barkley)
5. Planning data format prototyping considerations/test cases (M. Gnatt, if available)
6. Actions Items Review (K. Tuttle)
7. AOB

*Note: The telecon was not strictly a CSSM telecon as there were two (tangential) agenda items involving CSTS WG personnel.*

Discussion Summary:

1. Quick check re CMC actions:
   1. CMC-A-2015-05-04 (TGFT + CFDP “structure” to eliminate forward and return file services): TGFT taken as given; not clear what is being requested via remainder of action item; clarification to be requested
   2. CMC-A-2015-05-05 (TDM over TGFT): real issue appears to be definition of validated radiometric data; response to be provided as such
2. CSTS Service Instances
   1. Agreed to go with the approach of using the functional resource name (based on the FRIN) for the CSTS service instance identifier.
   2. See presentation below
3. Trajectory Prediction update questions
   1. Two main questions addressed (see presentation below)
      1. Semantics of start and end time – what is the distinction vs navigation standards
      2. Whether or not to allow multiplicity of trajectory segments (Blue-1 SM allows only one)
   2. Start/end time meaning may
      1. depend on whether or not multiple segments are allowed – in which case it could be the outer bound (earliest start time to latest end time) of the enclosed segments
      2. Be meta-data needed for management purposes of underlying navigation standards do not adequately identify this
         1. Action to J. Reinert to check the semantics of the Nav Stds in this case and report back
4. SoS Book Finalization (as concerns SANA Registry policy updates)
   1. Walked through analysis slides (see presentation below)
   2. Conclusion summary:
      1. Policies for updates re CCSDS points of contacts, etc do not properly belong in the SoS book; needs to be at a CCSDS-wide level
      2. Very desirable to see an overall information model
      3. An information model scoped only for the concerns of the SoS can be produced as input for a broader CCSDS-wide info model
      4. The call out of the GSCID registry for user data of the SoS implies that only S/C that fly CCSDS space link protocols can be carried in a standard schedule – this is seen as too constraining and an impediment to adopting SoS in contexts where it would otherwise still be acceptable
      5. A convention to indicate values that are not registered would be useful
      6. The current communications asset candidate registry can not be accessed and its therefore unknown as to how well this fits with the stations/antenna identifiers in the SoS book
      7. Agreed that whatever policies/registry management approach emerges, it must not place road blocks such that there is a lot of effort for SANA to implement, etc, thereby impacting standards adoption
5. Planning data format prototyping – ran out of time
6. Action Items review – ran out of time
7. AOB – none.

Our next telecon/WebEx is scheduled for Thursday June 18, 2015

[end notes – presentations follow]

































