

From: Debra Kazden <dkazden@igpp.ucla.edu>

Sent: Friday, February 12, 2016 10:56 AM

To: pds4ddwg

Subject: Notes from PDS DDWG 2016 02 11

title: DDWG Notes 2016-02-11

layout: default

date: 2015-02-11

#February 11, 2016

Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees:

R. Chen, M. Gordon, E. Guinness, L. Huber, S. Hughes, C. Isbell, R. Joyner, D. Kazden, T. King, J. Mafi, S. McLaughlin, L. Neakrase, J. Padams, A. Raugh, B. Semenov, R. Simpson and J. Stone

##Meeting Agenda and Summary

1) CCB/SCR Statuses/Issues

-- CCB-139: Resolve Standards Inconsistency in Bundle 'Readme' File Format (R.Simpson)

-- 20160209: Queued_for_Implementation:

-- E-Vote PASSED: 6 Yes (ATM, GEO, IPDA, PPI, RMS, SBN), 1 Failed to vote (CIS)

(Very Brief Discussion)

2) Task Statuses - 5 Minutes each

(Quick Updates)

3) SCR Issues to discuss:

-- CCB-65: Need additional Target Identification/type values (A.Raugh)

- URGENT - enhancement / improvement
- Open:
 - (1) Needs Proposed Solution
 - (2) Needs Requested Changes
- 20150730: DDWG -- Anne to think about working the solution;
- 20150813: formed WG: J.Mafi, Ed.G, A.Raugh, RJ
- ** (Not Discussed) **
- CCB-77: Augment Product Update with File Area Update - S.Hughes
 - Open: under DDWG discussion
 - has been TA'd
 - 20141002: There is now a tiger to work Update in general that will start in a few months
 - 20150519: Waiting for M.Gordon ?
 - 20150922: DDWG discussion topic; SCR needs to be updated by Mitch
- ** (Not Discussed) **
- CCB-129: Implement PDS4 Query Models (S.Hughes)
 - 20150914: Open & Under DDWG review
- ** (Discussed - informal vote to make Primary Results Summary in collections of type Data - SCR with focus on schematron rule to be sent to the CCB) **
- CCB-132: Units of Map Scale Improperly includes pixel/deg as a unit (J. Padams)
 - 20151007: Open
 - 20151007: Email to Jordan to provide explicit changes to IM
 - 20151008: I updated SCR to include specific changes required; ready for Steve to TA
 - 20151012: TA'd; email to Emily and Dick to review
 - 20151013: Email from Jordan to pull back for further discussion / work
 - 20151022: Jordan to finalize new & improved proposal before next DDWG
 - 20151104: Jordan updated SCR as comment in JIRA
 - 20151105: DDWG agreed to send to CCB
 - 20151116: Needs TA; then ready for CCB per DDWG
 - 20151117: TA'd by Steve; Emily reviewed; Dick sent email with concerns

- 20151118: Set up telecon to discuss Dick's concerns
- 20151119: DDWG discussion; send to CCB if no comments
- 20151123: Needs TA; then ready for CCB per DDWG
- 20151202: Emily and Dick reviewed -- Ready
- 20151208: CCB e-vote; rejected
 - M. Showalter proposed name changes:
 - Units_of_Map_Pixel_Resolution
 - Units_of_Map_Pixel_Scale
 - CCB will have telecon to discuss
- 20151222: CCB sent back to WG / DDWG to re-work
- 20160204: MC on 2016-02-04, Jordan et al violently agreed on a workable solution
- ** (Brief Discussion) **
- CCB-133: Special_Constants class precludes the ability to specify multiple invalid/missing constants (J. Padams)
 - 20151012: Open
 - 20151021: Under DDWG review
 - 20151022: WG -- Jordan, Steve and RJ; sent email to WG with proposed changes
 - 20151105: Jordan -- <special constants> needs to be specified per "band" not per "axes"
- ** (Not Discussed) **
- CCB-138: Mismatch between context object types and values of <type> in <Observing System Component> class (A.Raugh)
 - 20151202: Open; under DDWG review
 - 20151203: WG: Anne, Steve, Dick, Jordan, and RJ
- ** (Not Discussed) **
- CCB-139: Resolve Standards Inconsistency in Bundle 'Readme' File Format (R.Simpson)
 - 20151207: Open; under DDWG review
- ** (Brief Discussion) **
- CCB-140: SR Section 6E.3 levies unnecessary requirements for attribute values (J.Padams)
 - 20151229: Open;

- 20160126: Under DDWG review
 - ** (Not Discussed) **
- CCB-141: ASCII Numeric Base16 is inconsistent with xs:hexBinary definition (J.Padams)
 - 20151229: Open;
 - 20160126: Under DDWG review
 - ** (Not Discussed) **
- CCB-142: Create Data Quality Flags to hold metadata on Quality Flags (E.Shaya)
 - 20151229: Open;
 - 20160126: Under DDWG review
 - ** (Not Discussed) **
- CCB-143: Validate field format via regex (Lev Nagdimunov)
 - 20160210: Open
 - ** (Not Discussed) **
- CCB-144: Some examples in Examples collection are incorrect or out of-date (Lev Nagdimunov)
 - 20160210: Open
 - ** (Not Discussed) **
- CCB-145: Improve statement of when a new version ID must be used (M.Gordon)
 - 20160210: Open
 - ** (Brief Discussion) **
- CCB-146: URN Prefix for the Russian Space Agency (S.Hughes)
 - 20160210: Open
 - ** (Discussed) **
- 4) Topics for Discussion
 - SETI Issues (R.Simpson etal)
 - Status
 - ** (Not Discussed) **
 - Query Model - Rules for Collections of type Data (Steve)
 - CCB-129: Implement PDS4 Query Models (S.Hughes)
 - validated via schematron rules

-- cardinality of processing_level

-- documentation of constraints

(Discussed under SCR issues)

##DDWG Telecon

##CCB/SCR Statuses/Issues

##CCB-139 - Resolve Standards Inconsistency in Bundle 'Readme' File Format See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-139>

This has been queued for implementation.

CCB voted to get rid of CIS - they want to continue being called Imaging.

##Task Statuses

##Geometry - Mitch

Still working on the DD. Hopes to have an updated version next week.

##NSSDC - Steph

Regarding the minutes two weeks ago - Tested the LADEE NMS SIP that EN produced, did not formally ingest.

It was just a test. It worked well.

##Document Updates- Ron

Nothing is getting done. Ron is the team for now - everything is on hold.

Maybe the DPH will be out soon - depends on background negotiations.

##Product Update - Mitch

No update.

##Simulation & Model WG and Software Archive WG - Todd

Still meeting - working on policies etc. Not much yet.

##SCRs -

We are so close to things needing to be ready. Only want to talk about CCB-146, unless others want to discuss certain ones.

~ Someone wants to talk about query model.

~ Someone wants to talk about the map scale stuff.

~ Yes, there has been tons of updates.

##CCB-132 - Units of Map Scale is Badly Defined See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-132>

Several interested parties sat down and talked about this at the MC. Talked about a solution they think is reasonable - for IM and cartography specific units for the LDD.

Question: Re pixel scales for Deep Impact migration - will this be in 1.6?

Answer: Someone seriously doubts this will be in 1.6.

~ Will run the Deep Impact labels by IMG if not in 1.6.

Jordan appears to have accidentally hung up.

##CCB-146 - URN Prefix for the Russian Space Agency See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-146>

This is the Russian Space agency thing. Santa Martinez says that this was requested by Oleg Batanov and Dave Heather. She will get more information from them.

Will get this resolved.

Question: Does anyone have issues or concerns over this?

Another Question: Is there a real rush?

Answer: Just trying to figure out what can be done for 1.6. Thought this was a bug fix, but didn't want to submit it that way.

Question: Is submitting URNs every time a big deal?

Answer: Let's not set off an international conflict in IPDA by trying to meet a deadline.

Someone wants to have a vote.

Question: Who is the actual steward?

Answer: The registration authority is PDS.

Question: This is URN:ROS:RSSA - doesn't make us the steward?

Answer: With our IM and namespaces - PDS manages.

~ No. That's a convention. PDS as an organization is saying we have established namespaces. But this is not a CCB decision, it should be an MC decision.

Question: Are we really saying this has to go to the MC?

Answer: Would expect a set procedure for prefixes for international.

The reality is if the Russians want PDS4 they have to be consistent with the rules, but independent of us. It's a separate question if PDS will recognize them. That would be an MC question. The only question here for the Russians is if this gives them global uniqueness. Checking should be their responsibility. We shouldn't be delaying them, but want to make sure this is what the Russian space agency wants.

Question: So is this for the DDWG or the MC? Are we holding this?

Answer: Well, we were asked to review it.

Someone hopes this will be a process in future - what will be an efficient process.

We should get headquarters involved in this. This is an MOU with a foreign agency.

~ This is not a DDWG issue. It does not affect the IM.

~ It would be a schematron rule. Maybe we need to update the DPH too.

Question: So, no technical assessment?

Answer: Yes.

~ Impact on DPH, IM - need to update schematron - make sure the format is valid. But we need to confirm what the Russians want - but we don't know if we okay this this or not. The Russians are part of IPDA.

It is unwise to call this the Russian space agency when this is the Russian space research institute.

Different parts of the government. Depends where funded from. It's up to the Russians to tell us what to call this.

So, DDWG okay - really a matter of policy. Will send the SCR for an email vote, but it's really up to Santa and that group. Maybe this can be ready by the 25th.

The MC needs to be in it too. We need to define a real process for this for other international space agencies.

##CCB-129 - Implement PDS4 Query Models See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-129>

Everyone has seen the spreadsheet. Green is pretty obvious for collections. Processing level and discipline name are open. GEO wants the values for names worked. The question is on processing level. Someone's position is that as currently modelled, it would work. The question is if one or more is allowed. That's open, but if required is a different issue. We could make it required and then decide how many later. Would like an up or down vote.

Processing level is already required for collections.

~ No, it's not. Well, primary results summary isn't.

~But in primary results summary processing level is. Since we miss some things if there's only one value...

~ So, if processing level is a required attribute is the question.

Primary results summary is not required, but processing level is.

~ So, if Primary results summary is required then processing level will be there.

At least half of what's in the query model is in primary results summary so writing schematron rules to make optional things required in order to support the query model. For that subset primary results summary is required. One of the criterion is that we need a schematron rule that makes primary results summary required for mission science data collections.

There's a circular thing.

Question: Can we assume no node will allow people to skip the primary results summary in science data collections?

Answer: Thought we wanted primary results summary required for bundles and collections - optional for basic products...

~ True. But also saying for mission science it has to be there.

~ It's not useful for all collections.

~ Thought we decided this already. May be mistaken.

It's not required in the IM.

Some collections wouldn't have primary results summary.

Someone thought we decided to require it.

~ Some one else doesn't see how we can. We can require it for science collections, but need something outside it.

~ Collection type Data. Could require primary results for that, but for some it's a waste of space.

Question: Example of where it's a waste of space?

Answer: (Silence)

****(Unofficial vote)****

That's a way to identify that it's a data collection - could say if it's a data collection then it needs primary results summary.

SBN, ATMOS, RMS, GEO and PPI all think this sounds reasonable. IMG says it sounds good. RS asks for it to be restated.

In product collection, if collection type is Data, then primary results is required.

Question: How do you deal with the mission distinction?

Answer: We're talking about something more fundamental.

RS is not sure they understand. Pass.

~ NAIF - Pass.

Enough nodes agree to make this part of CCB-129

Question: If more fundamental than query model - should this be a separate SCR?

Answer: It's a chicken and egg problem.

The SCR has been modified, but this would preclude these collections getting in without primary results summary for a reasonable search. Query model in SCR has more detail. We could do another SCR, but this one primarily focuses on the schematron rule. So, it's okay to send it to the CCB.

Question: Any suggestions for modifications?

Answer: (Silence)

~Back to CCB-132

Jordan is back on the call.

Several people worked to refine the definitions based on the last set of comments. They have beat it to death. All of the experts are on the same page.

Yes, this has been beaten to death.

~ It's a zombie SCR now.

It will require a bit of work to put the units in the Cartography DD.

##CCB-145 - Improve statement of when a new version ID must be used See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-145>

Paragraph for SR for when we need to increment the version ID.

Has received no comments. If still no comments in two weeks will send to the CCB.

~ People will look at it.

Question: Anything else?

Answer: (Silence)

Question: Meet again in two weeks?

Answer: Feb 25 is the closing date for SCRs for 1.6 ~ SBN will have something for target list before then - wants to get it into the process.

Looming deadline.

Ed will not be available on the 25th.

Question: Why is CCB-139 still under DDWG review?

Answer: No, it's queued for implementation.

~ Need to get it off the agenda - under topic 3.

~ Someone only has pages 1 and 3 of the agenda.

So, it's resolved. It's listed wrong on the agenda.

This is how we streamline the meetings.

Add primary processing level issue as a new topic. One to many as a topic. ****(Action Item - Ron)**** ~

This needs to be considered.

~ Someone is worried it will hamper search results.