# CCSM Telecon/Webex, 10 December 2019

# Attendees

E. Barkley, C. Ciocirlan, A. Crowson, W. Eddy, M. Gnat, C. Haddow, H. Kelliher, J. Pietras

# Agenda (as adjusted at the telecon)

## General Announcements

1. TGFT and CPIF have cleared CMC poll for agency reviews
	1. Expect reviews to begin mid-January 2020

## Follow-up re IOAG Svc Catalog 1 + TGFT

1. we walked through the response in the attached email below
2. noted that the Euclid mission is not a good example for demonstration of TGFT going into/out of a CFDP endpoint
3. with regard to the transfer of large files (DDOR use case) noted that the “lightweight” use of XFDU’s (to metadata only) essentially defeats the purpose of the TGFT and that you are really no longer transferring the file but only metadata
	1. this raises secondary concerns for going this route in that the service specification now must address the actual subsequent transfer, how long the subsequent file to be transferred can be “found” at the location (i.e. expiration policies), etc.
4. to help illustrate the packaging/use of the XFDU for TGFT, an action for C. Ciocirlan to provide a presentation (or other equivalent) material on the TGFT XFDU packaging done by CNES as part of the TGFT prototyping – essential examples of XFDU packaging given the TGFT restrictions XFDU



## Action Items Check

1. AI 2019-1008-01 was closed
2. Three new AI’s opened
3. See updated AI spreadsheet

## AD Review Status

1. AED: Publication Polling: Requested revised RID dispositions



1. In reference to email immediately above, agreed that no further revision is need re RID Biggerstaff #2
2. Common Data Entities: In AD Queue
3. SPDF: In AD Queue

## Follow-up re XML Schema organization “flattening”

1. In reference to email below, discussed “minus fixed” string and “abbreviation approaches”
2. Action to E. Barkley to
	1. Propose a set of abbreviations (for all the books that define schemas)
	2. Factor in CCSDS vs CSSM (in the case of AED – Abstract Event Definition – which has definitions available for CCSDS in general rather than just CSSM purposes)
	3. Provide examples of schema file names using this approach
3. C. Haddow noted that he has a strawman updated SSF schema revised to properly incorporate the approach via the common data entity definitions
	1. noted that a technical corrigendum will be needed to put the revised SSF schema into play (i.e. loaded into the SANA registry)
4. Question of what happens with “old” schemas was raised (e.g., if we issue a TC for the SSF book)
	1. Noted that the version numbers per schema file naming convention would still be in play
	2. Also noted that the SANA registry has status enumeration values, but these are not necessarily adequate for the purpose of tracking various schemas
		1. “Expired” is currently the only value that comes close, but “Deprecated” would be a better term
		2. Action to E. Barkley to see if SANA can define additional status values



## CPIF Prototyping Status Check

1. A. Crowson reports that he still needs to upload an ESA output to the prototyping CWE space for perusal by JPL prototype engineers
2. E. Barkley reports that he has not been able to make any progress with regard double checking status on whether or not any test case three runs have been done by the JPL prototype (test case three covers the off-Earth aperture use case).

## Follow-up re New and Improved SANA Procedures

1. Did an overview walk-through of the comments and updated registries procedure manual from the attached email below
2. Noted that for things like agency specific schemas there is a decent chance that this would be empty at initial publication time as agency specific considerations are not likely to occur until implementations are well underway
3. agreed to working group review with invitation to be extended to SE AD to participate at February 4 teleconference
	1. The intention is to have initial comment/remind everyone in the working group by the time of the January 14 teleconference to take a look



## AOB

1. we briefly went over the exchange with the CSTS working group with regard to responder ID, initiator ID, and poured ID etc. and the agreement that this will be in the FRM so that it is essentially “complete”

# Next Telecon

Our next scheduled telecon is January 14, 2020.