

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

Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 2:34 PM

To: pds4ddwg

Subject:DDWG Notes 2016-04-07

title: DDWG Notes 2016-04-07

layout: default

date: 2016-04-07

April 7, 2016

Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees:

R. Chen, M. Gordon, S. Hardman, L. Huber, S. Hughes, C. Isbell, D. Kazden, T. King, J. Mafi, L.

Nagdimunov, L. Neakrase, J. Padams, A. Raugh, R. Simpson, S. Slavney and J. Stone

Meeting Agenda and Summary

1) CCB/SCR Statuses

-- CCB--150: Add value "Balloon" to type list in Facility class (A.Raugh)

-- 20160309: Open & Under DDWG review

-- 20160310: DDWG proposed alternate solution for Balloon;

-- Steve is re-writing SCR today so CCB can discuss next week

-- 20160314: Ready -- sent email to Emily and T.Stein to send to CCB for review

-- 20160329: Queued for Implementation

-- CCB E-vote PASSED: 4 Yes (ATM, GEO, IPDA, PPI), 3 Failed to vote (IMG, RMS, SBN)

(Quickly Discussed)

2) Task Statuses - 5 Minutes each

****(Quick Updates)****

3) SCRs and Issues to Discuss:

-- CCB-154 - Promote a Mission Information class to Discipline Governance Level

****(Discussed)****

--CCB-156 - Inconsistent Discipline Dictionary Technique for Local Internal Reference, et al.

-- There are several issues and one possible quick fix for one of the issues

****(Discussed)****

--SETI Issues

a) Discipline Dictionary Versioning and Naming Guidelines

-- See attachment - DictionaryVersioning_160405.docx

****(Discussed)****

b) Reconciling Local Data Dictionary Versions with New System Builds

-- See attachment - Dictionaries_Re...ation_20160330.docx

****(Discussed)****

c) CCB-1xx: Remove Enumerated List from Instrument

-- See attachment - InstrumentClass...ionPlan_160407.docx. Additional material will be soon provided.

****(Briefly Discussed)****

DDWG Telecon

Ron is on Vacation. Ed is also not on the call.

CCB/SCR Statuses/Issues

CCB-150-Modify Product Context to accommodate Balloon

See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-150>

This will be in the next release, which will probably be ready soon. Steve will stage it on his own machine

soon - people can get changes to him.

Task Statuses

Geometry- Mitch

Not where he thought he would be - structural errors - clean up. Probably next week. Got comments regarding structure and schematron. Hopes next week.

NSSDC - Steph

Steph is not on the call. She sent the following update to Steve Hughes:

"I might not be able to attend the DDWG telecon today, so here are a few minor items about PNIWG:

1 - NSSDCA reviewed a minor change to Product SIP Deep Archive in PDS4 schema v1.6.0.0: PDS's internal AIP identifier and checksum were added.

2 - NSSDCA will probably push the start of PDS4 ingest testing from mid- to late-April. (Personnel are focused on testing existing software after recent, critical updates to Java and Oracle.)

It was reported to DDWG that EN and Steph are passing emails and making pretty good progress.

Document Updates- Dick

Only document progressing is the IPAG, an MC document. The most recent draft was sent to DDWG, MC and the PAG work group. The document is due in a week. Todd will roll together comments on Friday. In final stages. Last chance to comment is now. It goes to management on Monday.

Comments were received from four or five people, including Ray Walker. Coming together in a final version. Management will consider it on Monday.

Product Update - Mitch

No change.

Build 6b - Sean

In Process of being delivered to Richard. Will start integration next week.

SCRs and Issues to Discuss

CCB-154 - Promote a Mission Information class to Discipline Governance Level See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-154>

Santa Martinez is not on the call.

Speaking for Santa, the issue is several attributes she is using at the mission level should be promoted to the discipline level. Santa wrote the SCR - she updated to include start/stop orbit number.

Question: Do we need a team or can we resolve this an easier way? Opinions?

Answer: We discussed this. Decided not to put in the PDS space because each is unique to mission. Have to be defined by mission. All have unique syntax. Not predictable.

Santa wants this to not be in local mission, wants this at discipline level. It would not contain values - each mission could assign their own specific values.

Agrees that we already discussed this. These are attributes that should be defined in mission DD only. Cannot define across missions.

It's not as black and white as that. Santa wants terms like Mission Phase Name to be standard attribute

names.

Question: Why need interoperability for that?

Answer: Would provide interoperability by definition.

~ Someone doesn't accept that definition.

~ Mean different things in different missions.

~ Would be DD with term with several definitions.

We decided long ago these belong in mission DD. No point to interoperability. Who cares.

Question: So, would we want all missions to use the same attribute name for things like Mission Phase Name?

Answer: Could.

Another Question: So, forget values, do we want all to use that particular element? If yes, then that makes a point.

Answer: Yes. All should use the same attribute name.

~ Ingest LDD is the way to do that- to force missions to use specific names or definitions is a structural thing.

Question: How we relate to internal references...(Interrupted)..?

Answer: Doesn't relate. This goes in ingest LDD and schematron. Doesn't require a discipline DD to do this.

The team will decide what they want. LDD tool is implementation. We're talking about terms with multiple definitions. This goes to local governance. At the common level we all have to agree, but missions can do what they want. This is a new wrinkle. Raising it to the discipline level allows terms and groupings - common definitions vary as necessary.

Question: Is there any way to ... (interrupted)

Very generic definitions for terms - meanings of values would be managed at mission level.

Question: How do you decide what definition applies?

Answer: Already doing it.

~ In local namespace. So, this is just a pattern - seems foreign to IM up to now.

~ It is. If want a generic definition, can do that in core. We don't need all this with discipline DD.

Unnecessary complication. We were trying to be completely explicit - things with same name and same definition go at common level. We don't do that at the discipline level. We want values to validate.

Just wanted to make sure we understood why this was proposed. Clearly haven't explained the purpose. You're right - better at common, reference at mission - then write own schematron. This would allow a common pattern.

~ Reasonable. Might be nice for things outside mission, like filter description - patterns in common.

Concerned about getting SCRs from PSA. They should be setting up their own system.

~ Take that off line.

Someone likes the pattern idea. Good for interoperability across missions.

~ Please explain what interoperability across missions is...

~ For search, term names - you know what you're getting. Can generically provide a search tool.

~ I see.

~ Someone can't imagine a search across missions.

~ For coding - vanilla code. Can use it for generic, lower level search coding. Potential utility for predictable names.

Great discussion. Not an easy one. Has some merit.

Question: Final comments?

Answer: My turn - haven't spoken yet - suggest breaking into two parts. 1, decide if sufficient merit to defining pattern template for DDs. Need to decide if we want to do this. It could be a best practice in the DPH. 2, we are mixing arguments here.

Question: Regarding interoperability... programming has fine arguments, but concerned we are not recognizing that this allows for fundamental interoperability. Hope it would be obvious that people might want to search separate missions for things that happened at the same time?

Answer: That's why we have start time in the core. Interoperability means this is okay for coding.

Someone likes and appreciated what's being said.

Question: For a long time, we had the principal that what goes in the mission or discipline level was up to them. Are we abandoning that? Seems like getting all those governance lines mixed up.

Question: Can we move to the SETI 3A and 3B topics now?

Answer: Not sure what that means, but sure.

SETI Issues

See email attachments - attached to meeting agenda - sent by Steve Hughes, April 6, 2016 11:52 AM.

Discipline Dictionary Versioning and Naming Guidelines

The email is a response to a question about what happens to LDD versions and names. This is what one person thinks - two cases - guidance for the LDD - send it to EN and it's posted or the other case, when it's ingested.

If you maintain your own LDD - version is what you specify. It can be overridden in the configuration file.

In terms of naming... (Interrupted) ~ The SR says that DDs have to use a four place version id.

~ Yes, will add that.

The 2nd LDD rule - namespace and version id - version id is version of LDD. Names can be overridden in the configuration file.

Assumes that what's posted for ingested ones - sudo-managed - guidance - version id is set to version id of IM. Can be changed by steward. Name default is the same and steward can request unique file name, within reason.

Question: What you're saying is that if I write a new LDD now, unless I specify request otherwise, it would start at 1.6?

Answered with a question: Who's maintaining it? If EN, it depends on what you tell us, but the default is the IM version.

These LDDs can be dependent on a version of the Core IM.

We're talking about who specifies name and version.

~ The creator of the LDD decides.

~ That's allowable.

Question: So the first version could be 1.7 instead of 1.0? Seems odd.

Answered with a question: Is it a problem? You can tell EN what version you want.

~ Can't believe you don't think this is odd.

~ When we began, had one model with different levels of governance. Everything was consistent. We decided at some point to keep LDDs separate. Not sure what's unreasonable.

~ It's odd.

So, if I have a simple DD that I want to go in to the IM, at 1.6, it should say that it is the first version and why. A more complicated issue is if I am making my own node LDD and get ahead of the IM version.

Then things go backwards - version shouldn't be higher than the IM.

~ There are two version numbers - both IM and LDD version have to be there.

~ If I'm at 2.0 of my node DD, but I want it ingested, it becomes version of IM - that's backwards.

~ It shouldn't be that way. It should have both versions.

Someone is confused that version of DD doesn't follow IM. Trying to look in real time at a schema page - Display DD that is ingested - has version 1.1.0 in 1600. Looks like it has three versions in the .xml label for the DD.

~ People trying to look.

Question: So, the xml label - line?

Answer: Version Id is 1.10

~ 1.1.0 is the version of the label, not the LDD. Two different objects - each with its own version. The 1.6.0.0 is another object.

~ Thinks there's a misunderstanding here. Xml, xsd and schema are one product.

We're off on a tangent.

If this is a document, at version 2 - if it's a first version - it's still the first version. Actual version is not tied to version number of data product.

~ If you open the .xsd, not .xml, the first line has version 1600 schema. Xml product should have version number for thing it's versioning.

~ The issues and thing people ... (Interrupted) ...in SR, there is a formation rule for product version Ids.

This is an SR issue.

Someone is sorry for having introduced confusion. We might want to have a description.

The ten is the tenth version of the model - it's an internal number for EN.

Nodes and stewards can control the version. In all cases, the only question is if it's ingested. All

generated automatically, but steward can change it.

Someone wants to get off this topic.

If we take all of the periods out of the version id it - ambiguity. Problem if there are more than nine digits.

Moving on...

Reconciling Local Data Dictionary Versions with New System Builds

Ron wrote the attachment to address SETI issues.

For each build, LDDs have to be validated against the new common DD. (First Bullet) Any reference LDD should also should also be validated for consistency. Also benefits EN to know they didn't screw things up. Pretty straight forward. Validation by LDD steward.

There is a table of types of validation being done.

Essentially, for a new build, you want to make sure your LDD is compatible.

Question: Is the ingest LDD for 1.6.0.0 available yet? Can also load into Oxygen, change to 1.6.0.0 and let editor tell you it's all valid.

Answer: Ingest LDD for 1.5.0.0 will work for 1.6.0.0

So, we have two options to make sure still compatible. But this says something new... email to EN... generate new LDD files.

~ If no change.

~ This requires - every time IM changes - that we have to change the version, even if nothing else has

changed. This is a new requirement on nodes.

~ Not sure we have enough information to resolve this.

Question: If no change, why is it being re-posted?

Answer: Isn't the same. Things throw up and break if different versions.

~ These bullets are new and have ramifications.

~ What came up at SETI, not resolved, if in a label you use more than one version of the common schema - it breaks. Need new compatible version of all LDDs.

There's another paper that addresses that. Think we should address that first, but it wasn't sent out yet.

Agree that these are new. Ramifications are indeterminate.

Another issue, in field 1, 2, 3 - basic rules for naming second one - name of files, second element is to what LDD is compliant.

This is too new to be an issue yet. Things have been cleaned up at EN. Last month all LDDs had same format of file name. The question is why file name was changed.

That's why he wrote his paper.

Question: Who wrote this?

Answer: Ron.

Question: Are we doing this by who yells the loudest?

Someone raised the issue that all of the LDDs had been renamed. Steve didn't do it. Thinks rule should be that nodes name their LDDs. Thinks this document has mistakes.

Someone is sorry for being loud, but the question is that he thought Steve wrote this. Was confused. Thought Steve wrote it, so Steve saying he didn't agree with it was weird. Agrees that field 2 is not good.

Someone has a problem with how this is going. IM and LDD version should be independent. Having to update every LDD for every build is make-work.

~ That's another topic.

Proposal: We should meet every week to deal with this and instrument type discussion. We need more telecons.

**** (Action Item) **** - Steve will tell normal coordinator about the request.

Someone is in favor of this for the short term. Also, has some sample schemas which might help with this discussion. Not ready yet. Would be useful to have a telecon next week.

There are two votes for telecons weekly.

~ Yes (another vote)

ING can't next week, but would like to push CCB-132 to the CCB. If people could comment...

Comments on CCB-155 and 156 were appreciated.

Mitch has to hang up. Will email his ideas on this to present next week **** (Action Item) ****

These are proof of concepts - need work.

Question: Am I too loud?

Answer: One of the best online.

~ We can hear you nice and clear.

CCB-1xx: Remove Enumerated List from Instrument

We need to decide what are the benefits and drawbacks of enumerated lists. This needs to be answered. ATMOS has made their own list

Question: Enumerated list for instrument type or in general?

Answer: Both.

Question: Can ATMOS share their list?

Answer: ***(Action Item)*** - Lyle will send something out.

~ People are interested in seeing the specific issues.

Question: Final comments?

Answered with a question: On what?

~ Another issue or continuing with this. We are overtime.

Dick will not be here next week.

(Action Item) Steve will tell Ron about request to meet next week.