# CCSM Telecon/Webex, 20 November 2018

# Attendees

E. Barkley, T. Bui, C. Ciocirlan, W. Eddy, M. Gnatt, C. Haddow, M. Preuss, J. Pietras

# Agenda

## General Announcements

1. Appears to be some progress on registries

## Action Items Check

1. Several action items updated with new due dates
2. Please see latest spreadsheet

## Comments, inputs on Mtg Summary (if any)

1. No comments

## WG Comments, input re Schema management/organization proposed by C. Haddow

1. Walked through proposed plan – see email from C. Haddow
2. Agreed to go with directory structuring and file naming conventions, etc, starting with current PIF prototyping effort
3. Noted that a change to correct just the schema will cause a new schema file name which in turn will require a (minor) update to the book – this could just be a technical corrigendum
	1. As such, “c” rather than “p” is to be used in the schema naming convention in this case
		1. E.g., “902x01b1c1-SchemaCssmSimpleSchedule.xsd” rather than “902x01b1p1-SchemaCssmSimpleSchedule.xsd”
4. Agreed that if a particular book organizes local sub-schemas that these will be in the local sub-directory
	1. E.g., ../902x05 for all configuration profile related schemas and sub-schemas

## Common Data Entities "RID" noted by E. Barkley

1. Agreed that “schedule publisher” role will be removed from CDE SANA considerations

## Progress/updates re TGFT Prototyping

1. Splinter telecons have been held but still no conclusion on clarification of white book sections 4.2.7.1, 4.2.8.1, 4.5.2, and 4.5.3.
	1. C. Ciocirlan and/or C. Haddow to follow up with our NSSC colleagues

## PIF Prototype test plan walk through, potential update to PIF (as noted by E. Barkley)

1. Walked through draft test plan
2. E. Barkley to provide suggested verbiage re occultation types
3. General approach for the test plan deemed okay so far

## AOB

* 1. Service Package Data Format, Draft 2 for WG review
		1. W. Eddy raised the question of service package status vs state, where status currently has values of TEST, PROVISIONAL, and OPERATIONAL and state is seen as being those definitions of the state machine model (which is only in draft form at this time)
		2. Further discussion focused on intent vs state
			1. Intent 🡪 More along the lines of the desired outcome for the service package – as in this is only for testing the interface vs this is expected to result in telemetry from a spacecraft
			2. State 🡪 Where the service package is with regard to the states for the intent – at a minimum an intent of test restricts/forbids entries into certain states vs an intent of operational; there may in fact be different state models that are followed but this is to be worked as the state model develops
			3. Agreed to go with the notion of intent in the SPDF
				1. Check relative to the CDE (Common Data Entities) indicates this is “legal”, causes no issues
				2. “PROVISIONAL” will be removed from list of enumerated types for intent in the SPDF (this is more state related than intent related)

# Next Telecon

Our next teleconference is scheduled for December 11th.