# CCSM Telecon/Webex, 12 June 2018

# Attendees

# Agenda/Notes

## General Announcements

1. SSF publication now posted on CCSDS publications page
2. SANA registries (in general) issue at CMC S18 mtgs
3. Spring 19 meetings likely to be May 6 – 9 (four day mtg) at or near AMES (NASA facility, about 1 hour south of San Francisco)
4. Abstract Event/Common Header project creations currently in CMC polling

## Action Item Status/Project status checks

1. A new action added for taking steps toward development of XML Schema management
2. See spreadsheet for latest updates

## Proposed prioritization of information for Sites and Apertures registry

1. Walked through spreadsheet taking Registry Management Policy conceptual map to more concrete prioritized lists of information (see Annex A for a copy of information below)
2. Agreed that information listed as first priority is the minimum set needed for service management data format exchanges
	1. noted that there may be further work with regard to coordinate systems and specification/precision
3. Noted that this work intersects and can be harmonized with the service catalog work (eventually)

## TGFT XFDU latest update

1. agreed that we are okay with the latest updates to the XFDU schema

## TGFT prototype plan check

1. Some minor updates need, but agreed that test plan is ready to go

## PIF Prototype test planning

1. Revisited proposed steps/test plan outline for PIF prototype
2. Splinter telecon scheduled for 26 June

## Service Package Book Comments/1st WG draft review conclusion

1. Discussion on “verbose” vs “terse” - framed as a question as to whether terminology is that of an attribute vs capture of functionality
	1. Noted that with current class diagram that verbose and terse forms intersect with regard the “re-specification” functionality (override of configuration parameters of particular service package instance)
		1. Question of whether this can be or should be captured as “simple” or “core” service package vs a more “extended” or “detailed” service package – somewhat similar to the approach taken for the SSF
	2. also noted that some of the original thinking was that the user will be able to select which level of service package to receive
	3. agreed to remove the OIDs (OID parameter class) and preference for the functional resource nicknames
	4. noted that the provider port ID is insufficient for dynamically assigned SLE/CSTS binding information – further information is required
		1. this also brings up the issue of how dynamic versus how dynamic versus static service management is to be with regard to management of SLE and CSTS parameters
		2. further analysis is warranted
2. review essentially is incomplete at this time
3. W. Eddy and J. Pietras agreed to meet to work on some of the observations discussed so far and
4. working group is requested to provide any further comments on the service package first draft by no later than 15 June

## Configuration Profile Technote comments/review conclusion (deferred to next telecon)

## Updated document diagram quick check (deferred to next telecon)

## Scenario IDs

1. Walked through presentation from M. Gnat
	1. Conclusion is that there is some further work needed with regard to identify scenarios and carrying scenarios as separate service packages

## Work plan check (differed to next telecon)

## AOB (none)

# Next Telecon

Our next teleconference is scheduled for July 10th.

Annex A: Prioritized Sites and Apertures Registry

