# CCSM Telecon/Webex, 17 March 2020

# Attendees

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

# Agenda (as adjusted at the telecon)

## General Announcements

1. TGFT & CPIF are in agency review have concluded; any straggling RIDs?
   1. Agreed that we can accept a few late RIDs if needed; in particular E. Barkley know there maybe a few pending from NASA/JPL
2. Resolutions let for publication polling for AED and CDE MBs

## Spring Meetings Planning – Virtual Workshop Only

1. Discussed the possibility of having a daily teleconference of approximately 90 minutes at the same time as the current working group’s regularly scheduled teleconferences; this would likely be Monday through Thursday of the meetings week
2. Noted that a joint teleconference with regard to the CSTS working group would be highly desirable
   1. topics here will likely include such items as the FRM (Functional Resource Model), SACP book, SANA, SC\_CSTS concept, etc.

## Action Items Check

1. Two AI’s closed (2019-1023-02, 2019-1210-01)
2. One AI extended to next telecon date (2019-1023-02)
3. See updated spreadsheet for details

## SMURF Basic Constraints Follow UP

1. Email sent from NASA DSN raised a few questions….(see email text copied below)
2. Re point a) of email:
   1. noted that indeed the basic constraints can support a standing order but that the standing order would have to be indicated in the enhanced constraints
   2. noted that not all possible combinations of the SMURF data classes are valid
   3. agreed to include in Annex to the SMURF book that illustrates various SMURF construction techniques/examples to achieve specific use case goals
3. Re point b) of email:
   1. agreed not to embark on the notion of a request profile until prototyping or other developments demonstrate a real need for this

## SMURF + SMURF Prototype Status

1. The SMURF is essential stable at this time – no updates expected in the near future
2. Prototyping has surfaced some (so far minor) concerns re current implemented systems such as what to use for a trajectory reference (maybe some sort of meta-data such as “latest”?) to use and that there are not necessarily analogs for producing a complete SMURF for current implementations

## CPIF Prototype Status

1. Verification receipt still pending for NASA 🡪 ESA submission for a couple of Test Case 2 items
2. Generally agreed that Test Case 2 items are essentially well enough represented/completed
3. Test Case 3 items are still pending

## SACP Schema Development

1. Walked through presentation from M. Gnat
2. Summary: a question of to “cook-cutter” or not, and if not, to “half-cookie-cutter” or not meaning a very generic schema with the cookie-cutter being in the Blue Book
   1. Noted that trade factors include complexity of schema development vs software implementation vs how much “error potential” the standard is to eliminate
3. Also noted that some of the assumptions re SANA and FRM, may not necessarily hold and further coordination re CSTS WG and H. Dreihahn as the CSS Area Schema Master can be beneficial
4. A general request to the WG: please study the material from M. Gnat, and be prepared for further discussion at the next telecon

## TGFT RIDS

1. Surveyed several of the RIDs, but no dispositions yet
2. C. Haddow to draft dispositions to the extent possible to be available for discussion at the next teleconference

## CPIF RIDS (not addressed)

## AOB (none)

# Next Telecon

Our next scheduled telecon is April 21st, 2020. (Per working group agreement, this was moved from April 14)

# Annex

Email on SMURF Basic Constraints

**From:** Barkley, Erik J (US 3970)   
**Sent:** Thursday, March 5, 2020 17:54  
**To:** Colin.Haddow@esa.int; CCSDS Service Mgmt WG <smwg@mailman.ccsds.org>  
**Subject:** Resonse to AI 2020-0114-02 - Indicate if basic constraints are something that your TTC network handles/processes

Hello Colin,

Attached please find a parameter-by-parameter check with regard to the basic constraints in the latest SMURF and whether or not they can be mapped to the current DSN implementation. The short answer is yes they can. However, there are considerations in the comments.

In going through the parameters, I was able to convince myself that the SMURF, for on-line service package requests is able to support both a specific instance and standing orders types use cases, but I think we may need to do a bit of checking re

1. For some sort of clear indication that this is a one-time request vs standing order (e.g, its not clear that basic constraints are for one-time request or to be used for standing orders – yes, there is standing orders in the enhanced constraints – but that does not rule out basic constraints being used on their own with the expectation of standing order, I think)
2. Perhaps some sort of request profile – I am not sure about this – but if someone creates some rather interesting set of constraints perhaps this can be given a name for reference when submitting standing orders for different epochs.  I can appreciate that this may bring more complexity than it's worth, hence the “not sure” bit.
3. Related to a) and b) perhaps some refinement of the use cases re requesting service packages.

In terms of overall responses for this AI I think we have something like the following

DLR – Okay with the BCs (Basic Constraints)

ESA – Okay with the BCs

NASA/NEN – Okay with the BCs

NASA/SN – Okay with the BCs (assuming siteRef can be a spacecraft which we agreed to)

NASA/DSN – Okay with BCs, but some considerations – let’s discuss at next telecon

CSSM Colleagues,

If omitted your inputs and/or you have corrections to the overall summary above please do not hesitate to reply.

Best regards,

-Erik