# CCSM Telecon/Webex, 09 Aug 2016

# Attendees

E. Barkley, L. Cacciatore, A. Crowson, C. Haddow, H. Kelliher, K. Tuttle

# Agenda (as adjusted at the Telecon)

1. Information Entities list -- check on the list of information entities defined and their management in SANA
	1. Looked at comparative charts – SANA already has a beta registry for the information entities defined in appendix B of the SOS book (see below)
	2. Agreed to keep SANA registry as “flat” – ie., “sub-entities” such as component of the provisional plan that can be delivered on their own will be given listed as separate entities (e.g., communication geometry)
	3. Meta-data can be supplied in the registry to indicate the “parent” information entity
		1. *Editorial note – Assigning OIDs which is what part of the RMP advocates might help with this*
	4. Agreed to work with organization as listed in the inter-recommendation tracking spreadsheet, but to factor in the different request types identified in the SMURF – action to E. Barkley



1. Update re CCSDS Time Code B definition
	1. E. Barkley has engaged CESG on a proposed update to make it clear that fractional seconds are not required
		1. This has a bearing on the SOS book – use of Time Code B is desired, but fractional seconds for when a scheduled set of services begins/ends makes no sense
	2. Appears that either a corrigendum and/or a pink sheet to be voted on will be forthcoming
2. AOB – Service Package development – progress review
	1. Reviewed latest inputs from J. Chamoun (see below)
	2. In general, this is going the right direction based on the conceptual diagram from the splinter session
	3. Discussion re list of services vs putting in the service data directly:
		1. noted that the list of service might be more flexible overall rather than having to adjust the underlying structure as new services emerge
	4. Some more work needs to be done with regard to connecting the scenarios to different set of services and alternate trajectories
		1. For the “simple” service package the implied single scenario is in good shape
	5. Noted that the notion of a configuration profile with a top-level “directory” of service level configurations (also indexed via carrier) would work well with the list of service approach



1. Review of Planning Information Format XML Schema – comments from WG members
	1. Relative to the version posted by U. Muller-Wilm, noted that the AOS type definition appear to be incorrectly assigned – A. Crowson to follow up with Uwe
	2. Larger schema management issues starting to emerge
		1. Noted that PIF Schema is using copy of the Time Code B definition
			1. Ultimately want common schema in fixed location; not copied
			2. Need to consider namespace assignments and document them, etc.
			3. H. Dreihahn identified as potential new schema master
2. Preliminary Rome meetings planning
	1. Agreed to have a session on schema management – goal will be to produce a proposed approach for input XSG
	2. Agreed to have a joint DDOR session on Thursday afternoon of meetings week
	3. Agreed to have a small joint meeting re event definition (MOIMS + CSS areas)
3. Action Items Status/Updates
	1. Several action items delayed to either Rome or San Antonio (Spring ’17) meetings
	2. Some actions still have “TBD” for actionee as a result of resource issues

# Next Telecon

Our next telecon is scheduled for August 13th

[end notes]