# CCSM Telecon/Webex, 4 February 2020

Getting Registered…

# Attendees

E. Barkley, C. Ciocirlan, W. Eddy, M. Gnat, C. Haddow, H. Kelliher, J. Pietras, P. Shames

# Agenda

## General Announcements

1. Information has been posted on the CCSDS Website re Spring meetings
2. CSTS WG will only be meeting M – Thu of the meetings week
3. TGFT & CPIF are in agency review, reviews closing March 6, 2020

## Review/Discussion re New and Improved SANA Procedures

1. Walked through some of the pages of section 3 of a copy of a draft of procedures for SANA registry specification
   1. A newer version is available and will be sent to the WG
   2. Some of the comments included
      1. “…3.2.1 Every CCSDS Area or Working Group that identifies a potential requirement for a new registry shall contact the SANA Operator at the earliest opportunity, well prior to final draft specification…” ---- “well prior” – can this be specified in terms of recognized CCSDS milestones?
         1. Also suggested to use language such as “earliest opportunity”
      2. “…3.2.17 Every Working Group that defines or modifies a registry shall use that registry during any interoperability testing that is required prior to publication of the standard.

NOTE – This does not necessarily require exercise of any programmatic interfaces as part of interoperability testing, but it does require the registry to exist, be populated with relevant data, and be used for its intended purpose during testing.” ---- a question was raised as to if there is some sort of standard part of a test plan required

Response is no changes in test plan required specifically for this

1. After walkthrough, the following comments emerged from general discussion:
   1. The proposed book is generally reasonable/good, but….
      1. Data governance may be more involved than anticipated
         1. For example, If party A starts working on registry B, but Party C, in the meantime, subsequently modifies key bits/structure/semantics that party A depends upon, on how is this all communicated/synchronized?
         2. Geo-political considerations may need further addressing (e.g, data protection laws varying by country vs the legal jurisdiction in which the SANA servers reside, etc.)

## TGFT Example Slides

1. Walked through the slides drafted by C. Ciocirlan
2. Agreed to develop a diagram based on slide 3 + 4 (in relation to Annex D of the TGFT book)

## Action Items Check

1. One action closed
2. Two actions with revised/extended due dates
3. A request to the WG to work on AI 2020-0114-02 (evaluation of SMURF basic constraints) for next telecon
4. See updated AI spreadsheet for details

## SMURF + SMURF Prototype Status

1. SMURF has been updated – see C. Haddow’s email of Jan 23 2020
   1. But no reviews yet
2. Prototyping between DLR/ESA is awaiting from trail/preliminary SMURFs to be sent from ESA to DLR to complete phase 1 of the activity

## AED (Abs Evt Defn) Status

1. Still waiting for input from SANA re request for posting of service management XML schemas
   1. Once this is completed, we can move ahead with resolution requesting publication

## CDE (Common Data Entities) Status

1. Also waiting upload o XML Schemas

## SPDF (Svc Pkg Data Format) Status

1. E. Barkley to attempt prioritizing this such that AD review is completed by next telecon

## CPIF Prototype Status

1. Status unchanged/no input available

## AOB (none)

# Next Telecon

Our next scheduled telecon is February 25, 2020.