# CCSM Telecon/Webex, 28 November 2017

# Attendees

E. Barkley, C. Ciocirlan, M. Gnat, W. Eddy, C. Haddow, H, Kelliher, H.Li, J. Pietras, K. Tuttle, Y. Wang

# Agenda/Notes

## General Announcements

* 1. The Area is in search of a new Deputy Area Directory given the departure of the current DAD to be CESG Chair

## Current Situation – Review of meeting notes (mostly for Erik’s benefits)

* 1. Clarified several of the comments from E. Barkley
	2. Noted that schema namespace (in reference to TGFT) has not really been identified
		1. C. Haddow to discuss with H. Dreihahn
	3. Mars Relay coordination use case for PIF to be checked re input for document updates
	4. Re PIF, also discussed and agreed, that in general, inclusion of events is at implementation discretion; ie, for the most part events are not mandated to be included (e.g, sun alignment angle may be output by one implementation only as a “warning” and output or periodic basis at another implementation – the data format does not really dictate these semantics)
	5. Agreed that the “provenance” of trajectory inputs may need revisiting – ie., to specifically identify all trajectories involved

## Teleconference Schedule 🡪 Spring 2018 meetings

* 1. See email with invitations (generated during the telecon)

## Action Item Status

* 1. Updated and assigned due dates as needed
	2. See updated spreadsheet (K. Tuttle email)

## Service Package Project formalization

* 1. Agreed with dates shown (but with update for CMC project approval date)
	2. Assumed that for the time being that J. Chamoun (to be confirmed) can take the lead in developing the schema

## AOB

## Update on TGFT on testing arrangements, WebEx

* + 1. A webex has been arranged for CNES/CNSA to coordinate prototyping
			1. 23 January 2018
			2. Contact C. Haddow if you wish to be added to the invitation

## Service package state machine updates

* + 1. Reviewed the updates to the service package state machine produced by M. Gnat
		2. Discussion about partial service packages and deep space use case
			1. Typically, in deep space, the service packages are scheduled well in advance and it is the scheduling that then determines the event sequence, which is essentially added to the service package after it has been created.
			2. If the state machine allows for a service package to be replaced then this is likely to be sufficient to address this use case
				1. There was also discussion as to whether or not the updated model adequately conveys the replace service package operation
			3. Related to this is what the data format requires – in this case, a null pointer for an event sequence could be considered is making the service package complete (the question tends to boil down to how much modeling you want in the formal state machine versus a less explicit model that is still functional/allows for the various use cases to be properly addressed)
			4. a general request for everyone to review the updated model and be prepared to further discuss this at the December 12 teleconference

# Next Telecon

The next teleconference is on 12 December 2017. Proposed items for the agenda include PIF and Mar Relay Coordination considerations, state machine model review .