# CCSM Telecon/Webex, 19 November 2019

# Attendees

E. Barkley, A. Crowson, W. Eddy, C. Haddow, J. Pietras

# Agenda

## General Announcements

1. From CESG and CMC Mtgs
   1. Use of TGFT for other services/recommendations
      1. A tutorial on how to use TGFT, particularly re use of XFDUs/packaging
   2. New and improved registry guidelines are on the way
   3. Use of GitHub – issues introduced
      1. Issue of establishing CCSDS account(s) being looked at
         1. Recommended that CCSDS consider team level account
   4. CMC resolutions of interest
      1. CMC-A-2019-10-01
         1. The CMC asks that Agency Representatives review the contents of the Service Sites and Apertures Registry that they are responsible for and make any necessary updates or corrections. This Action should be accomplished after the SANA operator has created a webpage to allow Agency Representatives to correct this information themselves.
         2. Due Date: 16 June 2020
      2. CMC-A-2019-10-07
         1. The CMC asks that all CMC members whose agencies are participating in Lunar exploration engage with their Lunar projects management in advocating Simple Schedule Format and Communications Planning Information Format and report to the CMC.
         2. Due Date: 16 June 2020
2. TGFT and CPIF are now in CMC polling for agency review – polls close November 28th

## Comments on Darmstadt Meeting Summary

1. No comments on the meeting notes per se
2. A question as to initiation of the magenta book project at CMC meeting and noted that resources not yet identified

## Action Items Check

1. One minor/clerical correction action item closed
2. See updated spreadsheet in CWE

## RID Disposition Check

1. Abstract Event Definition
   1. No objections to RID closures stated; RID dispositions now “final”
2. Common Data Entities
   1. No objections to RID closures stated; RID dispositions now “final”
3. Excel output format for publication polling
   1. Noted that the trail excel format output from the Access database is still in progress
   2. In particular, “source file” column will be removed as this an internal processing artefact

## XML Schemas and publication in SANA Registries

1. we have our prototype scheme for 902x12 subdir capturing all the common type definitions
2. Good for prototypes, implementations
3. But a bit clumsy when staged in SANA registries
4. After some discussion we agreed to “flatten” the schema organization scheme such that all the XML schema files can be found and internally referenced within a single directory
   1. this has the benefit of organizing the XML schemas in the same way for prototyping versus SANA registry
   2. note that the versioning in the naming of the schemas remains the same
   3. Action to EB to update the schema organization convention in the inter-recommendation tracking spreadsheet

## CPIF Prototyping Status Check

1. E. Barkley noted that he still has some checking to do re Test Case 3 CPIF outputs
2. A. Crowson noted progress on ESA prototype
3. A. Crowson noted that there are some odd aspects of the CPIF in that there is a RANGE\_RATE event which allows for RANGE\_RATE attribute
   1. Also discussed Range vs Light time, but noted that, especially for near earth, kilometers vs fractions of a second is more useful
   2. Agreed that a RID or RIDs should be raised for “cleaner” event definitions in this regard

## New and Improved SANA Procedures

1. Walked through the currently-in-progress for update/statement of revised WG procedures re SANA registries (see attachments to notes below)
2. Comments/questions
   1. Can a “beta registry” be essentially a “correct” structure with garbage values?
   2. Does a “candidate registry” mean at least some “real” values are present?
   3. Does “approved registry” mean only “real” values are present?
   4. Could these also be considered to be the equivalent of a white registry versus a red registry versus a blue registry?
   5. Suggested that agency reviews should emphasize more reviewing of the registry structure and content
   6. noted that the procedures discussed in the presentation did not really address checking a bigger picture information model for reuse and/or augmentation of existing registries rather than creation of new registries

## AOB (none)

# Next Telecon

Our next scheduled telecon is December 10th.

# SANA Registries Presentation

