# CCSM Telecon/Webex, 31 July 2018

# Attendees

E. Barkley, T. Bui, A. Crowson, M. Gnat, W. Eddy, C. Haddow, H. Kelliher, Yichuan Man, J. Pietras

# Agenda (as adjusted at the telecon)

## General Announcements

1. Room Allocation for Berlin okay for CSS Area
2. Registration will be opening “soon”
3. J. Border will not be at Berlin mtgs; sending a deputy – will have to figure out if/how we want a joint session
	1. Inclined to try
		1. Agreed that we should attempt to have a joint session – discussed aiming or Tuesday afternoon of the meetings week.

## Action Item Status/Project status checks

1. 3 actions closed
2. Several AI due dates updated
3. 2 new action opened; 32 actions currently open
4. See latest action item tracking spreadsheet

## TGFT Book and Prototype Status Updates

1. C. Haddow reports that CNES will be ready to start prototype interaction on 21 Aug 2018
2. A splinter webex has been arranged for 22 Aug to go over remain questions/comments in the TGFT book
3. Project to have the TGFT book ready for AD review by the time of the Berlin meetings

## Abstract Event + Common Entities projects schedule

1. Projects have been formally initiated and are slated to be completely fairly soon as the books are need to support the already published SSF.
2. C. Haddow has posted review requests
	1. Please review and provide comments by 28 Aug to support review at the next teleconference

## Mars Relay Coordination (MRC) vs PIF

1. Walked through presentation (see email of 25 July – “Mars relay coordination vs PIF – analysis”)
2. PIF vs MRC: primary spacecraft (MRC) vs PlanningInfoPosition (PIF): E. Barkley
3. to follow up re how “primary S/C” on mar position is determined
	1. For now agreed that current PIF is adequate
4. MRC: Rise before start and set after end attributes:
	1. Agreed that these can be additional events to be seen in association meta data only
		1. This is predicated on the summary form of MRC being for “viewperiod” type information – as such this is only needed for this type of reporting
5. PIF vs MRC: multiple trajectory references – E. Barkley to follow up re potential use of multiple trajectory information – is this really used in practice?
6. PIF vs MRC: range attribute (MFC) vs RTLT (round trip lighttime) (PIF) – agreed to stick with RTLT as the more general/useful attribute
	1. For prototyping purposes this can be converted (from range 🡪 RTLT)
7. PIF vs MRC: Range rate: agreed that this can be added as an additional, optional attribute for the PIF
8. PIF vs MRC: Nadir and Yaw Angle
	1. Noted that this could be added as part of the defined events
	2. Also noted that current “main” use case – earth to spacecraft assumes that the target spacecraft will solve nadir and yaw angle for its own purposes
	3. Therefore, this is to be just mapped as additional event for now
	4. E. Barkley to follow up on how often this is really used (as samples so far do not contain this information)

## Book Maintenance tracking

1. Reviewed proposed spreadsheet for tracking change requests for already published CSSM documents
2. No objections noted – new spreadsheet will be used to track requests/issue and will be mainted in CWE administrative folder

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

1. W. Eddy reported that the most significant outstanding issue is with regard to the Port Ids
	1. W. Eddy and J. Pietras to meet sometime on or shortly after 12 August to further resolve
2. Agreed to circulate partial update for WG cognizance

## Configuration Profile references vs Event Sequence

1. Walked presentation (see email of 30 July, “Response for AI 2018-0411-18”)
2. agreed to revisit the analysis taking the latest configuration profile technote into account
	1. Subsequent action item opened
3. in general, proposal to use a your and convention for nested naming was noted
	1. for example <aggregate configuration profile name>::<specific spacelink session name>

## 8. Work Plan Check (not addressed)

## AOB (none)

# Next Telecon

Our next teleconference is scheduled for August 28th.