# CCSM Telecon/Webex, 11 January 2022

# Attendees

E. Barkley, D. Bliss, A. Crowson, W. Eddy, M. Gnat, C. Haddow, H. Kelliher, M. Unal

# Agenda and notes (as adjusted during the meeting)

## General Announcements

1. [un-announcement]: No significant input for CSS Area from CMC virtual meetings of December 7 – 9th
2. CPIF has made it into CESG (publication) polling – poll closes Jan 14th
3. FRM currently in AD review; expect agency review resolution soon
4. IOAG meeting on December 9th apparently touched on cloud computing
5. John Pietras retirement effective at the end of January
6. David Bliss (NASA/JPL) is joining the WG to work on event sequencing
7. Will be sending out a subscription verification email later this week to help trim the email distribution list

## Action Items Check

1. 0 action items closed
2. 2 actions postponed to February telecon
3. 1 new actions added
4. See updated spreadsheet for details

## SPDF ICS

1. Discussed what it means for optional vs mandatory content for message formats
2. Noted that the UML class diagram is in fact the governing aspect
	1. For example, with regard to type1 vs type2 service packages, the UML class diagram indicates that there is one derived class from the abstract service package class
3. E. Barkley to take a look a the SPDF ICS and suggest some changes as part of the AD review

## SPDF Test Cases

1. Walked through the new SPDF Test Cases (which are being added to the SMURF test plan)
	1. This includes steps for returning type1 service package without optional parameters and with optional parameters, repeated for type 2 service package [*editorial note: this adds importance to getting the SPDF ICS correctly stated*]
2. Noted that with the current SMURF there is no way to indicate that a type1 versus a type2 service packages desired as output
	1. Some discussion as to whether or not this should be subject to a service agreement and/or ICD versus adding to the SMURF
	2. preliminary thinking seems to be that it may make sense to have this as part of the service agreement or ICD or other ”out-of-band” information as the SMURF is more about requesting service rather than indicating data format variation(s)
		1. May also be the case, that a provider only returns one type of service package
3. noted that there is no provision for returning an error indication
	1. agreed that this in fact should be part of management service

## Event Sequence Discussion

1. Walked through comments provided by E. Barkley on the ESA Events Catalog document provided by M. Unal
2. E. Barkley noted that several of the events correspond to the start or end of communication states in the current CCSDS approach being explored
3. M. Unal clarified that DS-BOT-EOT-Activities Template was a way of a mission to state configuration information as an event at the start of the tracking pass
4. M. Unal clarified that the “Re-Config” is a “deep configuration” option applied to the processing equipment but is not currently used by missions
	1. Noted that there is still potential usage for future missions
5. M. Unal clarified that the U/L frequency plan was of controlling uplink frequency ramping vs selecting an average uplink frequency (with respect to Doppler shift during the tracking pass)

## AWS Ground Station APIs

1. Noted that this is part of keeping management services on the agenda as a standing item
2. E. Barkley brought up the documentation page with regard to AWS Ground Station APIs
	1. See <https://docs.aws.amazon.com/ground-station/latest/APIReference/Welcome.html>
3. Noted that several of the APIs had analogues in the CCSDS Silver (retired) book on service management
4. W. Eddy noted that multiple commercial providers all tend to use REST APIs but in fact there is no common approach with regard to the style of REST APIs
5. Also noted that commercial providers use JSON rather than XML
	1. E. Barkley noted that in general JSON is something that we should be thinking about in CCSDS
	2. JSON Schema does exists; E. Barkley to see if popular tools like XmlSpy and Oxygen support JSON schema

## Service Agreement Parameter Discussion

1. Walked through the presentation provide by M. Gnat re service agreement and related information at DLR
2. after some discussion we agreed that we are really looking for the common core of service level agreement parameters

## Latest SACP XML Schema (from FRM) – not addressed

## AOB (none)

# Next Telecon

Our next telecon date will be on February 1.