# CCSM Telecon/Webex, 02 February 2016

# Attendees

E. Barkley, J. Chamoun, C. Ciocirlan, A. Crowson, C. Haddow, M. Gnat, H. Kelliher, P. Pechkam, J. Reinert

# Agenda and Notes

1. Action items status
   1. See updated spreadsheet; of note – all WG membership requested to provide inputs, if any, on the Enhanced Constraints of the SMURF book
2. General updates/announcements
   1. SOS Registry Status
      1. Still in progress re SANA registry creation (request has been modified to conform with new RMP book)
   2. SOS NASA/DSN, ESA/ESTRACK implementation status
      1. The two organizations may have input for us to consider at Rome (fall) meeting
   3. Updated SLE books soon to be in CESG poll
3. SMURF and Trajectory prediction close out (AI-2015-1208-1)
   1. No objections to AI response
   2. Trajectory prediction project book termination confirmed
4. Planning Data white book review (insufficient time)
5. SMURF white book (follow-up from last month)
   1. Further clarification needed re request that results in return of several package vs individual service package
   2. Closely related to the above is the clarification that the planning request is just for return of planning data and that the request to go from planning data to committed service packages is intended to be addressed by the service package classes; again, clarification needed
   3. Discussion as the main organizing principal of the SMURF given what can be considered as “unequal” treatment of the various request types (e.,g event sequence submission is done via dedicated recommendation vs. service package request which is done via the SMURF)
      1. Conclusion was to that “solving” for the most widely spread/least complicated use cases (for the SMURF) and but allowing for the more involved use cases via dedicated recommendation is sufficiently compelling organizing principal
   4. The notion of what “provisional” status (re service management header) means for the SMURF needs further analysis (“it’s a request but only kind of” does not make a lot of sense)
   5. The notion of chained requests needs clarification
      1. Action to JP Chamoun to supply material – this might actually be more of an updated for the concept book
   6. The list of services need some “squaring” re IOAG service catalog; ultimately the list of services could be in a registry
      1. Action to E. Barkley to follow up
   7. The types of reports that can be returned could be subject to a registry
6. Darmstadt work plan check (insufficient time)
7. AOB
   1. CNES prototype start re TGFT projected for October 2016
      1. Not seen as an issue re current TGFT production plan
   2. Presentation on DDOR (JPC action item)

# Next Telecon

Our next telecon is February 16th. Preliminary proposed agenda includes:

1. Planning Data white book review
2. Conclusion of SMURF white book review
3. DDOR service request/package presentation
4. Darmstadt work plan check

[end notes]