

Meeting Minutes from the DDWG-2 telecons:

[DDWG Notes 2021-01-14](#)

[DDWG Notes 2021-01-28](#)

[DDWG Notes 2021-02-11](#)

[DDWG Notes 2021-02-25](#)

[DDWG Notes 2021-03-11](#)

[DDWG Notes 2021-03-25](#)

[DDWG Notes 2021-04-08](#)

[DDWG Notes 2021-04-22](#)

[DDWG Notes 2021-05-06](#)

[DDWG Notes 2021-05-20](#)

[DDWG Notes 2021-06-10](#)

[DDWG Notes 2021-06-24](#)

[DDWG Notes 2021-07-08](#)

[DDWG Notes 2021-07-22](#)

[DDWG Notes 2021-08-05](#)

[DDWG Notes 2021-08-19](#)

[DDWG Notes 2021-09-02](#)

[DDWG Notes 2021-09-16](#)

[DDWG Notes 2021-10-14](#)

[DDWG Notes 2021-10-28](#)

[DDWG Notes 2021-11-18](#)

[DDWG Notes 2021-12-09](#)

DDWG Notes 2021-01-14

title: DDWG Notes 2021-01-14

layout: default

date: 2021-01-14

January 14, 2021

Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees: M. Costa, M. Drum, E. Guinness, T. Hare, L. Huber, S. Hughes, R. Joyner, D. Kazden, T. Lim, J. Mafi, S. McLaughlin and R. Simpson

Known Observers: R. Alanis, M. Le and P Lawton

DDWG Agenda

(Included in email sent Jan. 13, from T. Hare, DDWG agenda for Jan 14, 2021)

0)Front-matter

- just a couple core items this week
- other issues from last week off to CCB
- EN releases new version!

I. Ready for a vote

1) CCB-321 Add MPEG-4 as an encoding standard id for Product Native (TA requested)

-- updates (small) to PDS4 video whitepaper coming soon (to be posted on SCR today)

(Discussed)

II. Status and New SCRs.

discussion:

0) more discussion time -- what to do with " (underscore) type"

CCB-204 - revisit? Define and enforce best practices for discipline and project dictionaries

CCB-324 - Create a data type for Type attributes that require a permissible value list

where are we with these:

1) CCB-314 Bundle type of "Supplemental" seems oddly defined. (Mitch and Dick provided new comments)

2) CCB-209 Correct Definitions of Tagged-*Object

(Discussed CCB-314)

Goal: These feel somewhat stalled - can we try to prioritize.

1) CCB-301 The attribute name in the DD Attribute and DD Class classes is not properly constrained. (Trent)

2) CCB-302 No reference type values defined in DD Attribute or DD Class contexts. (Mike D.)

- 3) CCB-303 The definition for skos relation name is not sufficient. (Lyle)
- 4) CCB-306 identifier reference in DD Association is not constrained. (Steve, Trent, others)
- 5) CCB-307 DD Attribute External and DD Class External rely on a lack of validation constraints as currently defined. (Steve, Trent, others)
- 6) CCB-310 Remove Unusable Elements in DD Rule by IM 2.0.0.0. (Steve, Trent, others)
- 7) not a bug CCB-311 Unused/unusable rule type permissible values should be deprecated and removed before IM 2.0.0.0. (Ron, Steve, Trent)
- 8) CCB-312 Idd version id does not appear to be constrained the way LDDTool expects. (Steve H., Mitch, Ed)
- 9) not a bug CCB-298 Missing permissible values for Target Identification/Internal Reference/reference type in Bundle and Collection. (need to assign, EN?)
- 10) not a bug CCB-288 Change Internal Reference reference type to 'guided' text
(Brief Discussion)

III. Discussions

parking lot

Next meeting, Thursday Jan. 28th, goal: grouped triage of "all" issues

DDWG Telecon

The SCRs that were passed last week have gone to the CCB.

Steve Joy had a comment on ODL. Tried to clarify for him. Told him to let us know if he needs the DDWG on a CCB telecon.

EN has released a new version.

I. Ready for a vote

CCB-321 - Add MPEG-4 as an encoding standard id for Product Native

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-321&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400427994%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjA wMDAiLCJQIjoIV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikh1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=L44eFsBXItPNcdcTf3Howh1hD8E27TEkyLx%2BepWgB2o%3D&reserved=0>

This is being worked. There's a lien on the TA. Should be removed before it goes to the CCB.

~ Someone thought all the liens were addressed. Will double check after this meeting. Didn't realize things needed to be updated in the TA. Haven't heard from other people.

~ Someone sent text clarifications for the ISO codes. Left extra material - used a new page. First one and a half pages should go with the SCR. Not the rest. This was Trent's first attempt to sell MP4.

Someone feels this might be a dead end. Has a question back to JPL. Needs to hear from people who are creating these for Mars2020. There's a concern the actual video won't align with our requirements. Even if we pass this they still might not be allowed to archive as product native. We can't just take the first frame and archive it. Edited our SCR. Unclear what frames might be okay for product native.

There was a Tuesday telecon with Bob. He said there were rumours that they might be MOV format.

~ That's a wrapper. Codex might be what we require. Unsure. There's a possibility MOV format is what we want. We need to check, but if not H2.64 it breaks the rules.

~ Bob wasn't sure what's actually being returned.

~ Was applying a literal definition to product native, thinking native to spacecraft, but there's no one to one product here. Not sure where we go with this. Not sure what will pass for now.

Question: Can you comment regarding how the hypothetical video compares to High Rise video? Don't think this is out of line with what we've been doing for 15 years, so why panic?

Answer: So, 1080 x 720 x 1800 frames raw in a single one minute video. Will have thousands. High Rise is usable in it's current form. That many raw frames can't be used without converting back to video.

~ Don't have to watch them in real time to see the fly by. Wondering about data volume and storage.

~ Could try to figure out the impact in file size. Videos will be getting larger soon too.

~ Someone agrees there's a problem. We shouldn't push this through now and be open to bigger problems down the road.

Question: Any comments? There is still the document option? Does allow for the Lasse to Lasse conversion.

Answer: If we store it as a document need to make 18,000 frames.

~ No data if it's called a document.

~ We would still have it, it's just how it's labeled.

~ Mislabeled.

~ Agreed. Storing the data as a document is squirrely.

~ Someone is thinking about geometry too.

~ We need to think about this. Manned spacecrafts will have lots of video.

Sounds like we can't solve Mars Mars2020's problem until we get their specific requirements. On the right track.

~ Someone is almost willing to swallow MPEG4 as a new format, like arrays, just doesn't want everyone's favorite video format. Maybe we should have requirements and allow it.

~ Someone feels pretty strong about this. The 2017 answer is still correct. Think if converting what's on spacecraft that there is a loss - extremely minimal.

~ We will need to determine a video format and have a standard. Need to be able to be transposed into newer formats in the future.

Question: Are we sure it won't be H2.64 MPEG format?

Answer: No. Trying to confirm. MOV is a wrapper. Could be what we want inside. Multiple streams. Hope they are using the same codec.

~ JAXA did HD video. Released it as internet movies. Not sure what they did for the archive.

~ Someone generally supports compromises, but would prefer to use a format they are using. If we are not sure of the native format we should wait.

~ We are at a dead end for now.

Question: Last comments? Mars2020 will have to wait, but we will do more research on this.

Answer: We need to ask Mars2020 what it is.

~ Trent will ask the engineers ****(Action Item)****

~ Once we have specific info we can figure out what to do.

~ Capturing video is very device dependent.

We will push this to the next build.

CCB-324 Create a data type for Type attributes that require a permissible value list and CCB-204 - Define and enforce best practices for discipline and project dictionaries

See [https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-324&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400427994%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=4D30Q8LIAWCxNVMGw0CQmbxy2X7%2FYIYbiQgelr6jksU%3D&reserved=0)

[324&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400427994%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=4D30Q8LIAWCxNVMGw0CQmbxy2X7%2FYIYbiQgelr6jksU%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-324&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400427994%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=4D30Q8LIAWCxNVMGw0CQmbxy2X7%2FYIYbiQgelr6jksU%3D&reserved=0)and [https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=htt](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-204&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400427994%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=wLYBc6pkZplbip9u4CzwvYi0LI0ohq3T3GJTAs3H%2B20%3D&reserved=0)

[ps%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-204&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400427994%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=wLYBc6pkZplbip9u4CzwvYi0LI0ohq3T3GJTAs3H%2B20%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-204&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400427994%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=wLYBc6pkZplbip9u4CzwvYi0LI0ohq3T3GJTAs3H%2B20%3D&reserved=0)

This is the underscore type one. Forgot where we are on that. Unsure if it's being worked out.

~ Yes. CCB-204 is not an issue anymore. CCB-324 has a TA now. Adding a new type could be very straight forward.

Question: Why is this better than enumeration = true?

Answer: There's an issue in the queue that passed with that type of enumeration. Not sure off the top of my head, seems like a data type issue. Seems cleaner, more model centric approach. Both are on the table.

~ This does have a heavy one time impact. Enumeration = true just floats on. Happy to make the change, but unsure what people think.

~ It would be a one time edit to all the dictionaries. Could be for all attributes. CCB-204 would say if it ends in type.

~ We could change it for everything with enumerations.

~ We could take out lists for things that will change in the future.

~ A lot of attributes. Underscore type issue is a forced enumeration.

~ Some lists are getting very long.

~ Had we had this in the first place we would not have had to go through the instrument type agony.

~ That was fun.

Question: Should we turn instrument type back to free text?

Answer: Need enumerated list for search.

~ Class of attributes - when you turn enumerated value on there are lists. Frequently changing case - case where you use where the term type is in the name, but it's not really a type. It almost seems like an enumeration flag might be better.

~ An enumeration flag for new data flag.

~ Use it to determine if the value is a type.

So, everything stays the same. LDDtool modified to check if enumeration is on that it really is an enumeration.

~ Yes, but if type with values set later unclear what to do. Like you need a free state flag. Enumeration has value, enumerating will be assigned later or enumeration will never be assigned.

~ That would require a new ticket.

~ Yes, for enumeration flag with three states.

Question Any other comments? Do we want to vote on this?

Answer: People aren't ready.

~ There's no reason to push this through as an emergency. If it goes through there will be updates.

~ Currently trying to fix an issue to trigger an error if enumerated flag is not consistent with if values are there or not. Working on that now.

~ This has impacted Ed, Steve and Mitch the most.

~ Not overly urgent, but would like it addressed.

~ Could fix it to trigger a warning.

~ That would roll back functionality from the last build.

~ CCB-204 is from two builds ago.

~ It's only in the last six months that anyone cared if it was an error or a warning.

There are two issues - 1: Currently CCB-204 is triggering an error and should be a warning, and 2: If enumerated flag is not set there can't be enumerated values. Should all be warnings for now.

~ Yes.

~ Yes, but we already fixed everything.

~ But the issue is not going away. New values are always coming.

~ Then we should do a software warning.

Question: Does anyone disagree?

Answer: (Silence)

~ This is for version 1.g

~ 1.f is already released.

~ 1.g will be released soon.

III. Discussions

Question: Anything else?

Answer: CCB-314 (Bundle type of "Supplemental" seems oddly defined,

see <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds->

[jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-](https://pds.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-)

[314&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=OqM7Yd%2Bv7774PyxT2g7Im1ONM9jpLcwh%2Bk8C%2BNzyeZQ%3D&reserved=0](https://pds.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-314&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=OqM7Yd%2Bv7774PyxT2g7Im1ONM9jpLcwh%2Bk8C%2BNzyeZQ%3D&reserved=0)) but Mitch is not here.

~ We need him.

~ He is trying to redefine how the attribute is used. Think what he is doing - putting files in temporarily - is an abuse of the archive. Plans to use type supplemental for document bundles in future.

~ Someone disagrees because document bundles get archived.

~ Values are archive or supplemental. Archive has a data collection, supplemental has no data. The definitions

are clear.

~ The words don't go with the definitions.

~ Maybe we should change the attribute values.

~ These are wrong. Could change the names, but that is separate from what Mitch wants to do.

~ Originally wanted to be able to search for bundles that include data. Those are archived. These values and definitions have been there since version 1.0 of the IM.

~ Not everyone remembers.

~ Mitch wants Interim. Should probably submit a second SCR.

Question: If transitory, is it PDS?

Answer: It's operational stuff being done at Rings. Should have version numbers.

~ SPICE is the best analog I can think of. Originals shouldn't go away - should be versioned.

There was some low hanging fruit. CCB-311 (Value meanings for rule type permissible values should be rewritten, see <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-311&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7MIWIekNpvcicJ0tCXOF4cogxKN45yuvDo8aWS%2FAjGE%3D&reserved=0>) should be cleared up.

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-311&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7MIWIekNpvcicJ0tCXOF4cogxKN45yuvDo8aWS%2FAjGE%3D&reserved=0>

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-311&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7MIWIekNpvcicJ0tCXOF4cogxKN45yuvDo8aWS%2FAjGE%3D&reserved=0>

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-311&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7MIWIekNpvcicJ0tCXOF4cogxKN45yuvDo8aWS%2FAjGE%3D&reserved=0>

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-311&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7MIWIekNpvcicJ0tCXOF4cogxKN45yuvDo8aWS%2FAjGE%3D&reserved=0>

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-311&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7MIWIekNpvcicJ0tCXOF4cogxKN45yuvDo8aWS%2FAjGE%3D&reserved=0>

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-311&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7MIWIekNpvcicJ0tCXOF4cogxKN45yuvDo8aWS%2FAjGE%3D&reserved=0>

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-311&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7MIWIekNpvcicJ0tCXOF4cogxKN45yuvDo8aWS%2FAjGE%3D&reserved=0>

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-311&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7MIWIekNpvcicJ0tCXOF4cogxKN45yuvDo8aWS%2FAjGE%3D&reserved=0>

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-311&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7MIWIekNpvcicJ0tCXOF4cogxKN45yuvDo8aWS%2FAjGE%3D&reserved=0>

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-311&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7MIWIekNpvcicJ0tCXOF4cogxKN45yuvDo8aWS%2FAjGE%3D&reserved=0>

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-311&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7MIWIekNpvcicJ0tCXOF4cogxKN45yuvDo8aWS%2FAjGE%3D&reserved=0>

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-311&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7MIWIekNpvcicJ0tCXOF4cogxKN45yuvDo8aWS%2FAjGE%3D&reserved=0>

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-311&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7MIWIekNpvcicJ0tCXOF4cogxKN45yuvDo8aWS%2FAjGE%3D&reserved=0>

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-311&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7MIWIekNpvcicJ0tCXOF4cogxKN45yuvDo8aWS%2FAjGE%3D&reserved=0>

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-311&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7MIWIekNpvcicJ0tCXOF4cogxKN45yuvDo8aWS%2FAjGE%3D&reserved=0>

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-311&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7MIWIekNpvcicJ0tCXOF4cogxKN45yuvDo8aWS%2FAjGE%3D&reserved=0>

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-311&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7MIWIekNpvcicJ0tCXOF4cogxKN45yuvDo8aWS%2FAjGE%3D&reserved=0>

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-311&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7MIWIekNpvcicJ0tCXOF4cogxKN45yuvDo8aWS%2FAjGE%3D&reserved=0>

[https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-311&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7MIWIekNpvcicJ0tCXOF4cogxKN45](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-311&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7MIWIekNpvcicJ0tCXOF4cogxKN45yuvDo8aWS%2FAjGE%3D&reserved=0)

Question: Would it be optional?

Answer: Yes. All optional.

****Action Item - Trent**** - will send a call for e-votes for CCB-311 and CCB-302.

People can ask Steve questions if necessary. Enumeration change and a bug fix.

~ CCB-302 is a bug fix.

Last chance for open floor. Next week the geometry conversations will begin again.

Our next meeting will be in two weeks, on January 28. Interested to see what we can pull off. Will try to do some triage. Unsure they can all be group triaged.

~ There are three in the list (306, 307 and 310) that should be delayed until version 2. We could let them go for now. Park them somewhere.

~ Eventually we will vote.

~ CCB-310 is the solution for CCB-306 and CCB-307.

~ Version 2 is probably two years away.

DDWG Notes 2021-01-28

title: DDWG Notes 2021-01-28

layout: default

date: 2021-01-28

January 28, 2021

Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees: M. Drum, M. Gordon, E. Guinness, T. Hare, L. Huber, S. Hughes, R. Joyner, D. Kazden, T. Lim, J. Mafi, S. McLaughlin and R. Simpson

Known Observers: R. Alanis, M. Le and P Lawton

DDWG Agenda

(Included in email sent Jan. 26, from T. Hare, DDWG agenda for Jan 28, 2021)

0) Front-matter

- e-votes passed 302 and 311
- CCB-322 - (rejected by CCB) ODL to parsing standard id, Header
- mostly addressing parking lot this week

I. Ready for a vote

none

II. Status and New SCRs. from last time:

- 1) CCB-324 Create a data type for Type attributes that require a permissible value list
- 2) CCB-314 Bundle type of "Supplemental" seems oddly defined. (Mitch and Dick provided new comments)
- 3) CCB-209 Correct Definitions of Tagged-*Object
- 4) CCB-321 Add MPEG-4 as an encoding standard id for Product Native (TA requested)
(Discussed)

III. Discussions

parking lot

(Discussed)

IV. Passed for next implementation:

CCB-264 Make the Line Feed (LF)...

CCB-300 - Apparently deprecated units of measure are not actually deprecated.

CCB-302* - No reference type values defined in DD Attribute or DD Class contexts

CCB-304 - Clean up unused Vector classes in IM before 2.0.0.0

CCB-305 - Missing validation constraint on specified unit id

CCB-311* - Value meanings for rule type permissible values should be rewritten

CCB-313 - Definition of external source product identifier refers ...

CCB-315 - "PDS3" is an allowed parsing standard

CCB-319 - Add 'ns'

CCB-320 - Add 'W/m**2/sr/nm/(DN/s)'

* out for CCB to vote
(none)

Next meeting, Thursday Feb. 11th, 2021

DDWG Telecon

(Note taker missed first six minutes due to an issue with the WebEx Audio - came into discussion in progress)

CCB-321 - Add MPEG-4 as an encoding standard id for Product Native

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-321&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=5%2FG%2FCZGdx5emG9%2FJlobcDFnugR8E20ssAVhM1w0u8VQ%3D&reserved=0>

Product Native still requires a product observational. Need a long term solution, so will still try to figure out movies in product native.

Question: Any comments? The ticket will probably be withdrawn.

Answer: Good solution.

~ There might still be a benefit, but we can store as documents. We have a way forward.

CCB-314 - Bundle type of "Supplemental" seems oddly defined

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-314&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=OqM7Yd%2Bv7774PyxT2g7Im1ONM9jpLcwh%2Bk8C%2BNzyeZQ%3D&reserved=0>

We need to go back and note the questions in jira. The two questions are if we need to distinguish bundles being archived in PDS4 with data from those without data. Another question that we need a way to assign LIDs for things that are not archival. Bundle type at the beginning had place holder definitions. Need to hear from people on if we need to distinguish between archival and not archival.

Question: What is the impact on Rings for moving forward?

Answer: All Ring's bundles have data for now, but supplemental bundles won't be accessible through the registry.

~ Need to be in a catalog system so people will find it.

~ Also need LIDs to run in OPUS.

Question: What if people search and it's gone away?

Answer: We update and keep locally.

~ Feels like this is beyond what the DDWG can decide. That's why we presented this to the MC. They didn't really respond. People are trying to wrap their heads around this.

Question: Does it have to be in a PDS4 compliant bundle?

Answer: To be searchable.

~ So it has to have a LID. There are OPS bundles that don't go to the deep archive.

****Action Item - Mitch**** - will put more in jira and ****Trent**** will bring this up at the next MC telecon.

With EN being a bit scared of this we will go for a wider discussion. Feels like a policy.

Someone would like a description in jira that explains why this is continually overwritten and doesn't stay in PDS4.

~ The whole SCR was because the definitions were flawed.

~ We will get top this in the next two weeks.

CCB-302 - No reference type values defined in DD Attribute or DD Class context sand **CCB-324** - Create a data type for Type attributes that require a permissible value list.

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-302&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&reserved=0&sdata=XL2jGlmyGEa7cgMsyOB2640ZfpEkLIKcftwzVVdnDjM%3D&reserved=0> and <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-324&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&reserved=0&sdata=lerqtMKYrdzYvvZXoTLp2BzPLA%2BuJ1DR%2FPWlp6ALjKQ%3D&reserved=0>

Sounds like CCB-324 was almost eligible to be withdrawn.

~ Proposed a new data type and classification. (Speaker was very difficult to hear.) If going to specify attribute to classify...

~ So, a new type that specifies if underscore type gets enumerated or not. Under discussion still.

Question: Is there still an error or warning in LDDTool?

Answer: Still an error, plan to change it back to a warning if the team decides that.

CCB-209 - Correct Definitions of Tagged-*Object

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-209&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C32089c7c5e8d4a51959608d8c7d85e69%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637479079400437950%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&reserved=0&sdata=102zLXzZztkRgo2T1hf%2B64SniRtCUlep22TJnQgWshw%3D&reserved=0>

Question: CCB-209?

Answer: Need Steve for that.

The last build was pretty clean. This will take care of itself.

~ Not if the validator is checking all possible errors. It will explode. Errors not being flagged doesn't mean it's correct.

Steve plans to work on CCB-209 for this build.

Parking Lot

Trent showed a plot over time of the SCRs in Jira.

Didn't look at all 56 open tickets. Interesting to look at the plot over time with the jira tools. Shows individual tickets and when a bunch were done at the same time. Spikes. Open. Closed. Can see gradual increase. We are getting more in the parking lot to decide something about. Kinda interesting to see patterns of how SCRs come in.

~ Some of the orange ones on the plot should just be closed.

~ Yes, actually had Ron close some this week. Good to close a lot of the bugs we are finding. Turned one from 2017, marked in progress, to off. Many ways to look at the back log. 52. Some are ready for implementation. Also has a giant spreadsheet of 48 open tickets. Includes a field for best guess of how to lump these together. Like two that are about file names. Ones where if you fix one you fix the other.

~ They can be resolved together, but they are different subjects.

~ New DSN data can be created. That's something for RS and SBN to worry about.

~ Yes, but some of these are marked urgent and have been around for a long time. Need to figure out the impacts on tools etc. Trying to group things. Have ones that feel like they are software bugs, things that LDDTool needs to be updated to handle. Some to withdraw too. Some tagged for icebox or Version 2, like implementation of query models to do way more specific search. Some feel like they can be handled quick, like nillable and null results for product observational. That felt like the same kind of thing.

~ On that, from Bob Deen, the team is continuing discussions on virtual products, but the team wasn't too keen on null products.

~ Slightly different implementation. Sitting there cause there's not much appetite to do them, but we don't want to cancel them either.

~ Maybe we could vote.

~ Maybe we need to see which ones have an advocates for them. One problem is that there are not enough people to do all the work for 48 tickets.

~ Some we don't want to fall off the list.

Suggestion - Trent should send this to us and ask what's highest priority and who can do it, what's low hanging fruit and if a person is an advocate.

~ It's all in Git-hub, not public. Could share it as an accessed sheet.

~ Have a column per node and concatenate.

~ A lot of tickets are from Anne. Not sure she will be able to work on them. She's reporter on about half. Mike can discuss them with her to see what he might be able to take over. ****(Action Item - Mike)****

~ There are some others might take over too.

****Action Item - Trent**** will clean up the spreadsheet and send it out to people. It currently has about 100 columns. Understanding the impacts will help us move forward with some of these.

Priority never changes. People put it in when they open the SCR. Mainly they are marked urgent, but really

aren't.

~ Some that are marked urgent and are not will be worked eventually. A lot of Anne's issues I agree on, some I don't.

Back to the big group for software - a lot of them are OPS. The reason they are there is because they are issues that never really got attention from the DDWG. Unclear if some can go away or be implemented. CCB-204 showed us the problem - we can't always expect to do things and not have an impact.

Steve is working on CCB-209 for this build.

Question: Is CCB-324 resolved for now?

Answer: Thought we agreed to make it a warning. Need written documentation. Not just from memory. That's a quick fix. Question is if we need a new data type, enumerated flag etc. There are two aspects to CCB-324 - simple change to a warning and more discussion for future enumerations.

~ To change it back to a warning would be amazing, but really fixing it will impact every LDD.

~ It needs to be in the minutes - maybe a strawman vote.

~ A warning is a bandaid. Would be useful for now.

Question: Strawman - any objections?

Answer: Yes. RS would prefer to be listed as abstaining.

****Action Item - Trent**** - will do a record and send it around. 324 small change - one time fix - will make sure everyone knows.

****Action Item - Steve**** will describe the three options in the ticket.

Numbers 10-23 in the spreadsheet seemed more like best practices, like display setting should be required for images. Feels like a best practice that should be a rule.

~ History - display settings description - if array has many back planes it becomes awkward to describe all the linkings. This was discussed back in the dark ages. Need to think this through for data products with many embedded arrays. Can be very complicated.

~ Necessary for PDS4 viewer. Still feels like a best practice. Add modification to ingest LDD - review best practices in SR. A lot feel like they don't really need a vote. Some might be best practices or a policy. Some seem easy enough to just assign to someone to define.

CCB-316 ties to CCB-209.

~ Yes. A mishmash of tickets. Will clean up a bit and pass the spreadsheet around. Add columns for priorities, by what build, then concatenate responses.

~ Some should be gone from the parking lot. Also need a column for who the advocate is. And for who will work on it. There are some that I think are high priority, but I can't be the advocate.

****Action Item - Trent**** will send out one sheet per node to see where this goes.

~ Radio Science gets one too.

~ People with DDWG voting privileges will fill this out. It can be a discussion platform for next time. There were no new tickets in the last month.

Question: Any comments?

Answer: (Silence)

Next meeting is February 11.

DDWG Notes 2021-02-11

title: DDWG Notes 2021-02-11

layout: default

date: 2021-02-11

February 11, 2021

Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees: M. Drum, T. Hare, L. Huber, R. Joyner, D. Kazden, T. Lim, J. Mafi, S. McLaughlin and R. Simpson

Known Observers: R. Alanis, M. Le, P. Lawton and M. Costa Sitja

DDWG Agenda

(Included in email sent Feb. 9, from T. Hare, DDWG agenda for Feb 11, 2021)

0) Front-matter

- new Jira links for section IV

- Parking lot priority voting results

(Discussed)

I. Ready for a vote

none

II. Status and New SCRs. from last time:

1) CCB-324 Create a data type for Type attributes that require a permissible value list

2) CCB-314 Bundle type of "Supplemental" seems oddly defined. (Mitch and Dick provided new comments)

3) CCB-209 Correct Definitions of Tagged-*Object

4) CCB-321 Add MPEG-4 as an encoding standard id for Product Native (TA requested)

(Not Discussed)

III. Discussions

parking lot

Discussed)

IV. Passed for next build (new Jira links)

1) CCB-Approved: Implementation complete

2) CCB-Approved: Ready for Implementation

(Discussed)

Next meeting, Thursday, Feb. 25th, 2021

#DDWG Telecon

We do not have the entire group today.

~ Trent has not gotten all the spreadsheets back yet.

New Jira links for section IV

We now have links for two stages of SCRs passed by the CCB. There had been a few that the CCB had passed that got lost in the mix. This will keep track. The categories are ready for implementation or implementation complete. They are filters. You can also do a pull down on the main site to get the list. One issue - on the agenda, the links go to the same place, but people can go to the main page - under details to project shortcuts. Can see a list of what has been approved - see if the status is closed.

Parking lot priority voting results

Question: Any comments on the spreadsheet?

Answer: (Silence)

~ We can look at our priorities, sorted by the five nodes who responded so far - and Mitch who alerted us about what he wants. Mitch (not here today) really wants the SCR about unique label extensions (CCB-260). People like that RS and SBN are assigned to work on it. Another one Mitch reported was CCB-275, to make ingest-LDD file archivable. RS went ahead and assigned people to work on some of the SCRs. We have a pretty good top 20 list. There are some duplications. Some floated to the bottom.

If something is called a priority 1, but there is no one to work on it, it might be hard to get it moving. It's interesting to see some of the mid-tier ones, like CCB-259. That floated up for IMG because of the Clementine migration. They had millions of lunar images, but at least 200,000 products that are pointing to arrays that are all zeros. Mars 2020 is not looking at it that way. It's more a question of if you command something and nothing comes back for them. So, the nillable one, (CCB-281) floated more towards the top. We can probably get it out of the way soon. Probably the MPEG4 one (CCB-321) can also be voted on soon too. It doesn't need to sit in the parking lot forever.

Question: Anyone have any comments? What's working or not working?

Answer: This is fine, but we probably also need to talk about the ones to close, like CCB-202, which is essentially done, just not closed.

~ Good point. Probably CCB-186 too. If there's someone to help these along that's probably more important than the priority. We want to hear from the rest of the people and make assignments.

~ Some seem important and need to be dealt with, but I don't always know how to solve them. That's why I put EN for some. Need EN support for things the DDWG doesn't know how to move forward on. We need help.

~ That brings up a good question of if we should have them vote on this list. Maybe they could go over the prioritized list and see what can be done.

Question: Any other thoughts? Things to discuss? Will try to get the priorities from the rest of the nodes.

Answer: IPDA will get it done for the next meeting.

~ It's totally understood that people are busy and people are having trouble when they don't understand some of the SCRs.

~IPDA plans to share the list with their team. It's been a hectic few weeks.

Question: Anyone see any we really need to handle?

Answer: The data files with xml extension is high on IPDA's list.

~ Someone does see some problems with that one for tools, but doesn't see a horrible problem if the data and label files have slightly different names and both have an xml extension.

~ Some products have several components. There could be issues. Likes the hard and fast rule that they have the same name.

~ Someone already did some work on that one. Seems there is a bit of consensus for archiving xml and a problem with the extensions. Liked one suggested solution that was proposed - double extension. Something like .pds4.xml. Something like that could be unique but also read by software.

~ Hadn't thought of that. Thought people were leaning towards .lblx.

~ There are different possibilities. Part of why I was interested.

Question: So we might have .pds4.xml?

Answer: Could still have the same product name for the data and label. Can tell which is which.

~ Only LIDs have to be unique. Not much about file names in our standards.

~ Some tools might assume.

~ Mixed case in the archive is constantly biting me. Case matters in PDS4. Seems like we should be able to pull this off. Originally talked about Version 2, but Anne made the case that people need to get used to this. We can start as optional and mandate at Version 2. LF one too. G-DAL one too.

Someone is not sure they understand all we need for CCB-275. Also surprised that Mitch didn't say CCB-314 was on the top of his list, but it probably needs to be split up.

Question: Anything else?

Answer: (Silence)

~ People should continue to look at the list. The list will help us, especially as we get close to the next build deadline.

Next meeting will be in two weeks. We need to hit the ground running on the assigned SCRs soon. We will make concrete assignments next time. Due dates too.

DDWG Notes 2021-02-25

title: DDWG Notes 2021-02-25

layout: default

date: 2021-02-25

February 25, 2021

Notes by Debra Kazden (Audio was awful)

Known Attendees: M. Drum, M. Gordon, E. Guinness, T. Hare, L. Huber, R. Joyner, D. Kazden, T. Lim, J. Mafi, S. McLaughlin and R. Simpson

Known Observers: R. Alanis, M. Le, P. Lawton and M. Costa Sitja

DDWG Agenda

(Included in email sent Feb. 23, from T. Hare, DDWG agenda for Feb 25, 2021)

0) Front-matter

- new Jira links (updated) for section IV
- Parking lot priority voting results (part 2).
- Prepare to have tickets assigned

(Discussed)

I. Ready for a vote

none

II. Status and New SCRs. from last time:

1) CCB-324 - Create a data type for Type attributes that require a permissible value list

2) CCB-314 Bundle type of "Supplemental" seems oddly defined. (Mitch and Dick provided new comments)

3) CCB-209 Correct Definitions of Tagged-*Object

4) CCB-321 Add MPEG-4 as an encoding standard id for Product Native (TA requested)

(Discussed)

III. Discussions

parking lot - Prepare to have tickets assigned

(Discussed)

IV. Passed for next build (new Jira links)

1) CCB-Approved: Implementation complete

2) CCB-Approved: Ready for Implementation

(Discussed)

#DDWG

Where we look at status on jira has been updated again. After we have voted, and the CCB, it's a check list for EN to follow. We can keep track of what has been done after we vote yes.

We will be discussing the parking lot list in a minute. Tickets will be assigned.

Question: Can you send links after the meeting? Can't see them.

Answer: Yes, and they will always be at the end of the agenda (email) from now on. Will keep the links up to date.

Steve is not going to be here today. He is working on LDDTool for the geometry partitioning.

~ A ticket can be written. He's developing a development path for Anne to use for re-factoring so LDDTool can handle combined ingest files. Need to see where this goes. It's for testing before we put in an SCR.

~ Research. Won't hurt anything. He is currently working on CCB-209 too. Let him know if you have any thought on that. ****(Action Item - Everyone)****

Before we get to the tickets, there are several related tickets. Unclear how to tackle those. Goal is to tackle some of those - get rid of them.

CCBs 211 and 260 are a set. Should do 260 first. 210, 212 and 275 are related.

~ We talked about the PDS4 extension last time.

~ Not everyone was here last time.

Thanks to all for turning the spreadsheet in. Should focus less on priority numbers and more on who can move these forward. Some we might want to vote no on just to kill them. Will send this out after the meeting. Unable to sort on priority at this time for people to see on the screen... Trying. Not everyone was willing to assign things to themselves, but highest priorities tend to have multiple folks on it. Lower priority ones seem to have less. If we look at the top 20, we can decide if they have general interest. Get initial thoughts. See what makes sense. Not sure where to take this, but should try to figure out how we get these assigned and then they can be re-presented to the DDWG to move them forward. Some maybe should be withdrawn.

CCB-321, the MPEG-4 one, should be withdrawn.

~ The problem is that we don't want to see it as product native, but it's still important. Can't let it fall off the list.

~ Right, but someone is worrying as they see all these new Mars videos coming down. We can do what JAXA did, but we need a solution.

~ Might want to submit a problem for this and audio - archive video and audio for Mars 2020 - without a solution. Submit the problems and let a tiger team come up with a solution.

~ We have a good solution for Mars 2020 audio, but yes. Don't want to corrupt the SCR.

Question: Was this a good exercise?

Answer: Yes. Just need to march on. We've done this before.

~ The next meeting is in (two) weeks. Maybe we could all pick our top 2 and present them.

~ Okay. We can email with others about them too, but ones like CCB-183 need an update to the definition and we could vote next time. Low hanging fruit.

~ The Requested Changes has the definition. It needs a TA.

~ We should have the TA done.

~ Thought we pulled all the low hanging fruit, but if there is anything ready let Trent know. 183 is on RS's plate.

Question: Is it okay to withdraw 321 or do we need to vote?

Answer: Withdraw it. Bring it back as a problem statement.

Another Question: Any other low hanging fruit?

Answer: CCB-202 is finished. Can take it off. It is implemented. Everything is done. No reason to leave the SCR open.

~ It says we passed it. Looks like it fell through the cracks.

~ It's done. The changes were made.

~ The stewards team made the changes.

~ Someone agrees it should be closed.

~ It got lost, but it has been implemented.

~ It was unusual. The stewards team implemented it. It probably never went to Ron.

Some are listed as tens to get them out of the way. Steve's books say they are done. Maybe also already implemented.

~ There might have been a shuffle - some things seem to be on the wrong lines.

~ Working on that. Some of SBN and RMS's aren't correct. Trent has all the original sheets. Opening the one from EN to see what is marked as done. Looks like 202 and 265 are done.

Question: Why is 265 still open?

Answer: Think there's a question about what has international implications. Better to close it and open a new one if needed.

~ IPDA agrees. Working a few issues with Steve. Still a few issues with LDDs.

~ More of a software issue. Will recommend for closing by Steve and Ron. **(Action Item - Trent)**

The next one is 305. Steve thinks it's done and is queued for implementation. Maybe just needs to be off the list.

~ Unclear if it is implemented, but there's no more for us to do.

~ We're done.

~ And 300. We've done it. Already queued. That's four out of the way. Those were tens. On the EN spreadsheet they are marked done.

Question: We all know what we filled out. Going back to the original sheet now. Is it okay to go through them and make some homework assignments?

Answer: Steve's not here, but he didn't sign up for any.

~ The composite structure one, 316, is scary, but Trent will work with Minh and others on it. Assigning it to CIS.

~ Someone would like to get 209 out of the way first. Wouldn't do anything until that's done.

~ Steve is working on that one. Sounds like Steve also wants to get the PDS label (211) and 260. (Audio broke up)

ATMOS is down to do 293, but interest is low. Want it to go away, but if someone wants it. Would withdraw it.

~ Someone would leave it until we solve some other ones.

Question: Which two are ATMOS feeling?

Answer: 202 needs to be closed. 303 wouldn't take much. For 277, will support who ever is doing it, but won't be lead. Will help with ideas. Role will be advice.

~ But it is a priority.

~ SBN will present it in a more formal manner. It's SBN related.

Question: 314? RMS represent? Withdraw?

Answer: RMS will present it next time.

Question: So, 293 and 303 for ATMOS?

Answer: No. (Audio broke up.)

~ Can that one for now. (293)

RMS is already looking at 314. Will try to merge the 210 and 275 issue. (Audio broke up) ~ Will work on those. Will email people about it and try to make a work group. Will try to figure out if it's a problem to solve. Interested in 212. Regardless of if we preserve ingest LDD, what we do now is ad-hock. We need a real solution. Put RMS down for that. Would welcome help. Will also help with 260.

Question: 283?

Answer: We should vote on that and make it go away.

Question: Looking at the GEO sheet. The priorities have some overlap. How is GEO feeling about MPEG-4? Is it okay to withdraw it?

Answer: Yes, as long as something replaces it.

Another Question: 324?

Answer: Yes, GEO has a vested interest in that.

Another Question: Others?

Answer: GEO didn't put our name down. Didn't think anything was overly urgent. Hadn't thought about what to lead. Will help with 212.

~ If there are no high priority ones, maybe GEO can help with something else.

~ GEO is on 324.

Question: For NAIF, there are some SPICE ones. Can you help with these, even if it's just to make them go away? 295, 269?

Answer: Yes. Will get more context on them.

~ Let us know if any issues come up.

Another Question: Any others?

Answer: Not really.

Our next meeting is going to be March 11.

~ RMS likes that date.

~ GEO can only be here for half the meeting that day.

RS doesn't remember what he thought was important.

~ RS signed up for a few.

~ 209 is in progress. Waiting for Steve.

~ Steve is crazy busy. We can push him a bit.

~ We really need him. Interested in 314, but it has morphed into a different issue. Need to address what Rings is doing with their transient bundles.

~ RMS might need to state how they plan to split it up. Maybe RS can help.

Question: Are there others that RS can work on? What's high on their list?

Answer: XML and data file extensions are important for RS. Haven't heard from Carol Neese on what the Japanese are doing. Haven't seen an example file yet, but international standard does allow XML now.

~ RS and SBN can communicate on that.

~ 280 somethings. 288 and 287.

~ 281 seems kind of easy.

~ That's awful. RS is happy to present on that. Will do 281.

~ That's tangible. The other 280s are harder.

~ And Clementine archived data with zeros and Lockheed wants to archive empty ones too. Will add comments.

~ It's good to be passionate about killing things.

Question: Others for RS?

Answer: In progress, waiting on others for solutions.

SBN is already signed up for some that haven't gone through our sheet. No strong priorities, but a few were low hanging fruit, very straight forward.

~ SBN has (?) (audio broke up) on their plate. Display settings is high on the list.

~ Trent will present 164. Will discuss it with Ed and Mike.

IPDA is interested in the XML label one. Could look at 261 and 263. They don't look too difficult. Will have a go at those.

Question: Any hot on the presses for PPI?

Answer: (Audio broke up)

~ People can't hear PPI's answer.

~ PPI should send a list.

~ PPI will look at the list. 222 for now. Will email after the meeting.

~ (PPI sent email after the meeting that said they would work on 222, 282 and 230)

March 3 and 4 are the MC F2F. March 11 will be our next meeting. Proposes that we use WebEx one more time and then maybe try something else after that. Maybe Teams or Zoom.

****Action Item - Everyone**** be prepared to present on your favorite tickets next time.

~ We're making progress.

DDWG Notes 2021-03-11

title: DDWG Notes 2021-03-11

layout: default

date: 2021-03-11

March 11, 2021

Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees: M. Drum, E. Guinness, T. Hare, L. Huber, S. Hughes, R. Joyner, D. Kazden, T. Lim, J. Mafi and R. Simpson

Known Observers: M. Le, P. Lawton, M. McAuley, M. Costa Sitja and M. Tiscareno (alternate for M. Gordon)

DDWG Agenda

(Included in email sent March 10, from T. Hare, DDWG agenda for March 11, 2021)

0) Front-matter

- Assignments for tickets were made last meeting (see below
 - Last week for WebEx? Double check next agenda for any updates.
 - CCB-202 closed (finally - just overlooked), 305, 300 completed, 321 withdrawn
 - I was hoping to get the informal priority sheet out (still on hold).
- **(Brief Discussion)**

I. Ready for a vote

1) CCB-283 - maybe ready

(Passed)

II. Status and New SCRs. from last time:

0) CCB-265 - tried to close but got stuck - next steps

1) CCB-325 - Support for video as product observational

(Discussed)

III. Discussions (order somewhat random, we will get to what we can and is ready to be presented)

GEO:324

RS:259/281 (see new attachment to CCB-281)

ATM: 303

NAIF: 295, 269

CIS/IMG: 209/316, 164

EN: status on 209 (Steve)

IPDA:261, 263

SBN: 211/260, 277

PPI: 222, 282, 230

RMS: 314, 210/275, 212

Mitch will not be able to make it, so I included some of his notes here. We can talk to them given the time.

CCB-314 Not "withdraw". I've removed item 3 from proposed solution/requested changes. We can add that later if someone identifies a need (I'm removing metadata bundles from the example set). I've updated the SCR and added a comment, ... [maybe] set it for a TA and vote...

If someone else perceives a need to distinguish between bundles with data and those without data they should submit a new SCR proposing a new attribute bundle content type or something similar.

CCB-210/275. I took an informal survey... At this point there is a slight majority for pursuing this effort...
(Discussed 324 and 259/281)

IV. Passed for next build (new Jira links)

1) CCB-Approved: Implementation complete

2) CCB-Approved: Ready for Implementation

Next meeting, Thursday March. 25th, 2021

#DDWG

Front Matter

WebEx - the main issue with switching is that it might be a problem having a phone number for people to call in to. Happy to try teams. Unsure if no call in is a showstopper.

~ Some people prefer to use their phone.

~ There are ways to connect with phone, but you might need a good browser and internet.

Unclear if things are getting worse or if it's a bandwidth issue. Seems to be getting worse for note-taker.

CCBs 303 and 305 have been resolved. CCB-321 has been withdrawn.

I. Ready for a vote

##CCB-283 - Add reference type value document to data

(See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-283&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C245288cf734e4be4d9c008d8ee56487c%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637521401644973852%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ij1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=h%2FnGf2PhvGZ5ejRE9OeoLmwIAA6yWoraypYFHHqw0NE%3D&reserved=0>)

A TA has been done.

~ Lien is this is for 1h, not 1g.

~ Can put the lien on Ron.

~ Yes.

Question: Any questions or comments?

Answer: (Silence)

****The Vote for CCB-283:**

ATMOS - Yes

IMG - Yes

EN - Yes

GEO - Yes

IPDA - Yes

NAIF - Abstain

PPI - Yes

RMS - Yes

RS - Yes

SBN- Yes**

Someone is curious about how many votes there were in the original DDWG.

~ Ten.

~ Pretty much the same as always.

We will get this to the CCB.

II. Status and New SCRs

CCB-265 - Complete internationalization for local dictionaries

See [https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-265&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C245288cf734e4be4d9c008d8ee56487c%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637521401644983806%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=mQAoGARs8MTT3TTiuRIhEfH8SPHYA80xCbf08smmFv0%3D&reserved=0)

[265&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C245288cf734e4be4d9c008d8ee56487c%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637521401644983806%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=mQAoGARs8MTT3TTiuRIhEfH8SPHYA80xCbf08smmFv0%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-265&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C245288cf734e4be4d9c008d8ee56487c%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637521401644983806%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=mQAoGARs8MTT3TTiuRIhEfH8SPHYA80xCbf08smmFv0%3D&reserved=0)

[265&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C245288cf734e4be4d9c008d8ee56487c%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637521401644983806%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=mQAoGARs8MTT3TTiuRIhEfH8SPHYA80xCbf08smmFv0%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-265&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C245288cf734e4be4d9c008d8ee56487c%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637521401644983806%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=mQAoGARs8MTT3TTiuRIhEfH8SPHYA80xCbf08smmFv0%3D&reserved=0)

Sent Anne a request to withdraw this, but she said it is not complete. Someone does feel this is complete and thinks that we either need to vote or convince Anne.

~ There were two views on this from the start. We are making good progress. Unsure what Anne is referring to. From an international perspective, it's okay. Maybe she found a problem with a new international mission.

****Action Item - Trent**** will check with Anne.

If she would be more specific it would be helpful.

CCB-325 - Support for video as product observational

See [https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-325&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C245288cf734e4be4d9c008d8ee56487c%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637521401644983806%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=F0cdv1rvxoXOGvI83ECWH%2BvR%2BQOtuRwP16rHpxXu1MJU%3D&reserved=0)

[325&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C245288cf734e4be4d9c008d8ee56487c%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637521401644983806%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=F0cdv1rvxoXOGvI83ECWH%2BvR%2BQOtuRwP16rHpxXu1MJU%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-325&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C245288cf734e4be4d9c008d8ee56487c%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637521401644983806%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=F0cdv1rvxoXOGvI83ECWH%2BvR%2BQOtuRwP16rHpxXu1MJU%3D&reserved=0)

[325&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C245288cf734e4be4d9c008d8ee56487c%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637521401644983806%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=F0cdv1rvxoXOGvI83ECWH%2BvR%2BQOtuRwP16rHpxXu1MJU%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-325&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C245288cf734e4be4d9c008d8ee56487c%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637521401644983806%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=F0cdv1rvxoXOGvI83ECWH%2BvR%2BQOtuRwP16rHpxXu1MJU%3D&reserved=0)

This was added. The biggest reason we can move forward is there's a lossless version that we can code in.

Question: Any quick comments?

Answer: The issue is policy.

~ It is. Understanding if we can have a five year task that would validate the encoding. Not sure how you put that in place.

CCB-324 - Create a data type for Type attributes that require a permissible value list

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-324&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C245288cf734e4be4d9c008d8ee56487c%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637521401644983806%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=qE%2FUn6kEedCWA040x%2FRApKOVr52skuSuN4AnAl6pJw%3D&reserved=0>

Ed looked at this SCR and the comments from January. This is a problem for dealing with the issue in CCB-204 (Define and enforce best practices for discipline and project dictionaries, see <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-204&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C245288cf734e4be4d9c008d8ee56487c%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637521401644983806%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=dcqH6Gz2FP4t5%2F5IWj0gAAfmM7RM9NeYEYbvJIKvauE%3D&reserved=0>), a rule that if ended in underscore type we should have an enumerated list. Caused problems. There were a lot that existed before this rule. There was also a problem with duplication as new missions and LDDs come in. A new attribute data type was proposed. Looked at three possible use cases - a true/false flag if data type is not an ASCII data type, or could say true - would handle cases that end in underscore type or not have an enumerated list, or could set to false. The ideas have merit. Should look into them. Unsure how this will work or how you validate.
~ LDDTool would validate the three combinations and say if valid.
~ It's unclear how LDDTool would validate that. Maybe it would issue warnings.
~ Yes, warnings or errors. Will add a comment to jira.

Question: Have we thought about phasing in an error? Starting as a warning and transitioning to an error?

Answer: It's possible.

~ A lot of times there needs to be more discussion on if it's a warning or error. Make an assumption based on wording.
~ We should have been more careful with CCB-204.

Question: Any comments?

Answer: (Silence)

~ Steve did a TA.
~ This is how we should have done this in the first place.
~ If we can get comments about how LDDTool will work with this, maybe we could vote next time.
~ Someone would like to see that.

****Action Item - Steve**** will add comments to jira.

We are close to knocking this off.

CCB-259 - Need a "Null Result" option for Product Observational

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-259&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C245288cf734e4be4d9c008d8ee56487c%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637521401644983806%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Iik1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=uNCdDVWs5oRj7zk1PJ0nGoX8yBaeVAXHyEvspXV5k%3D&reserved=0>

Dick has prepared slides for this. Originally, was going to present CCB-281 (Make File Area Observational nillable in Product Observational, see <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-281&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C245288cf734e4be4d9c008d8ee56487c%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637521401644983806%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Iik1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=3c7k%2BNm9RK0XaHjM1bPVFFJ8BqzIDFZ2Pz%2FfC%2By4iKA%3D&reserved=0>), but realized CCB-259 preceded that. More general. Sets the stage for CCB-281. Slides present examples with arguments for and against.

~ Someone is unclear where the examples came from.

~ From Jira (and DDWG notes.)

~ Maybe someone made scenarios up.

Question: So there were never products created for this non-data? (referring to example 3)

Answer: There was never non data.

If there's no observation there's nothing to archive. We have the tools in PDS for creating these non-products.

~ Someone strongly agrees these proposals would be a major change to PDS4. There are other approaches.

Would definitely vote against these.

~ CCB-259 is really just a question.

~ In PDS3, for Shoemaker Levy, included a text file that said there was no result. Got to say why there are no results.

~ Someone spoke to Mark about this. Tending to agree that if there's no observation it doesn't belong in the archive. Could have a command book and log where the commands are sent.

~ Someone has some ideas on this.

~ Just taking a feeling of the room - this won't pass. Maybe a command log.

Question: Someone says, for Bob, not so much arguing, Dick did a good job, but the concept of the information object, it does not have to have a data object, agree?

Answer: Not sure.

~ So, we are saying context products are digital objects when the data object is not in the archive. Subtle argument. What bothers me most is example 3a - so going to digital object for more information. That's a violation. If saying you have to go to a digital object to say there's nothing there, that violates logic.

Another Question: What?

Answer: If there's no data and user needs to go to a digital object to find there's no data - that's a violation.

~ Not sure how else you find out nothing is there. If there's a start/stop time, instrument, and nothing to show, seems legit to go to the digital object to find out why.

~ The digital object is a string of bits.

~ Someone is not following.

- ~ Definition of information object. Got to read the description.
- ~ Someone disagrees.
- ~ Someone is not following, obviously you are going to look at the digital object.
- ~ Shouldn't have to. Nothing there, so the label needs to be very clear, but our policy for product observational is that it's fine to put a file there, but we shouldn't force people to read it. This is a philosophical debate. Seems like what Bob proposed is logical. It's useful to describe results.

In the Clementine example - if you put them in as digital objects, not nil, an automated program would have to sort and discover there's nothing there. Could instead have a way to skip those.

- ~ Yes, why have to open file to find out nothing there.
- ~ Someone agrees. It would be nice if the label said it's null rather than have to look at the data object to know it's null. The question is why we archive it in the first place.
- ~ That's the point.
- ~ If you use the description don't need to open the file.
- ~ Sometimes it's useful to know.

Bad example. Could have added a quick way for people to know there's nothing there. The ticket is really talking to the idea that something was commanded and it never happened.

- ~ Provenance. Should be in the descriptive object. If always require a digital object, could say in the label why it won't be looked at. Took the devils advocate position.
- ~ This brought someone back to the middle.
- ~ Could argue that some things should be noted in another way. Complicated.

Question: Do people know how they are going to vote? We could discuss this a lot. Feeling like we can vote.

Answer: Someone is willing to vote, would be open to a best practices proposal for documenting failed observations.

- ~ We should do what we did in PDS3 - have a text file that says this failed because of X, Y, Z.
- ~ Array or table.
- ~ Information would also have to be in the label. If not, then violating a fundamental principal. Fine to have duplication.

Question: How does that work?

Answer: You have a string text file. Says no observation because and gives a reason, like an error log.

- ~ Text file.
- ~ Missing the point. Asking if that is also in the label.
- ~ The label describes the digital object.
- ~ Label needs the information. If you have to go to a digital object to get the information it's a violation. The label needs to describe what's in the image - digital object - text file. That information in that file needs to be in the descriptive part of the label.

Question: What if one pixel image - do I have to say that in the label?

Answer: Yes.

- ~ If a million pixels, one is a one, the rest are zeros - I have to put that in the label, that it's so badly under exposed.
- ~ That's a judgement call. Most users won't want to look at that digital object, but if putting it in the archive, it needs to say in the label why it's useless.
- ~ Never had this before. Don't know where this is coming from.
- ~ From null results. If a digital object is not useful, put it in the label.

Question: Doesn't nillable mean it doesn't exist? Not if it's useful?

Answer: The target here is for nothing there. Shutting this down for now.

****Action Item - Trent and Mike**** will talk to Bob. Maybe ****Steve**** can help. Will try to refresh this for next time.

~ We won't vote next time, but do hope to get it out of the way soon.

We will do more presentations next time.

DDWG Notes 2021-03-25

title: DDWG Notes 2021-03-25

layout: default

date: 2021-03-25

March 25, 2021

Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees: M. Drum, M. Gordon, E. Guinness, T. Hare, L. Huber, S. Hughes, R. Joyner, D. Kazden, J. Mafi, S. McLaughlin and R. Simpson

Known Observers: R. Alanis, M. Le, P. Lawton and M. Costa Sitja

DDWG Agenda

(Included in email sent March 23, from T. Hare, DDWG agenda for March 25, 2021)

0) Front-matter

- Still using WebEx for phone support

- CCB-283(link)passed DDWG

(Discussed)

I. Ready for a vote

CCB-324 (maybe) -- Request -- Steve can we have comments about how LDDTool will work with this, maybe we could vote.

(Discussed)

II. Status and New SCRs. from last time:

1) new CCB-327 - Require PDS4 labels to reference the PDS core schematron and validate accordingly

2) new CCB-326 - Inconsistent Direction on How to Use Discipline Facets

3) CCB-325 - Support for video as product observational

4) CCB-265 - email sent to Anne, thanks to Mark B. for added comments

(Discussed)

III. Discussions (order somewhat random, we will get to what we can and is ready to be presented)

Lyle - would like to introduce "empty field" to see if we can tamp down conflicting interpretations

RS: 259/281 (see new attachment to CCB-281) - presented last time, still need to talk to Bob (hold)

ATM: 303

NAIF: 295, 269

CIS/IMG: 209/316, 164

EN: status on 209 (Steve)

IPDA:261, 263

SBN: 211/260, 277
PPI: 222, 282, 230
RMS: 314, 210/275, 212

Mitch notes from last time:

CCB-314 Not "withdraw". I've removed item 3 from proposed solution/requested changes. We can add that later if someone identifies a need (I'm removing metadata bundles from the example set). I've updated the SCR and added a comment, ... [maybe] set it for a TA and vote...

If someone else perceives a need to distinguish between bundles with data and those without data they should submit a new SCR proposing a new attribute bundle content type or something similar.

CCB-210/275. I took an informal survey... At this point there is a slight majority for pursuing this effort...
(Discussed Empty Field)

IV. Passed for next build (new Jira links)

1) CCB-Approved: Implementation complete

2) CCB-Approved: Ready for Implementation

Next meeting, Thursday, April 8th, 2021

DDWG

Front Matter

We will be continuing with WebEx. The issue is that we need a call-in number.

We passed CCB-283 last time.

I. Ready for a vote

CCB-324 - Create a data type for Type attributes that require a permissible value list.

See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-324>

Comments have been added in jira.

Someone understood that they were supposed to clarify what LDDTool will do. There are two parts to this - legacy part and going forward. Might not have been clear. Parts 3 and 4 in jira would be used going forward.

~ That is what someone understood.

~ In practical terms, if we do nothing now, then LDDTOOL looks at the attribute name. If it has underscore type in it it checks for true for enumerated values. That's the part that is breaking the IM guidelines. We need something that looks at the type.

~ Right. From now on. LDDTool will check type and see if enumerated values are there. Old code will stay because of legacy.

Question: How do you check going forward? Is something going to force you to use type?

Answer: No way for LDDTool to determine the intent of the designer.

~ We can't get rid of the legacy part.

~ We should have done this at the beginning. Anne saw the problem back in CCB-204, I think, that forced us into the typing. Even enumerated flag is rough moving forward. Proposed using enumerated type as a second check. Could give a warning or error if inconsistent.

~ Someone thought we could use types and have an enumerated list. Could have been hard to do. Not sure how you have enumerated values without type.

~ If you don't mind getting an error going forward, we could use type in the attribute name. Will get an error or warning.

~ Looking at enumerated values that are not type variants that are still on enumerated value list. Could make it UTF8 enumerated instead of ASCII data type.

~ Including enumerated in the type name is no problem.

~ It could be UTF8 enumerated. That might help.

~ That's no problem. It clarifies to the designer what's going on.

Question: Not sure if this has been covered, but in the case where data type is not specified and enumerated flag is true, what happens? Just ASCII string with true.

Another Question: Are values provided?

Answer: Yes.

~ So the outcome is valid regardless of if the attribute name has a type in it.

~ Because it has the enumerated flag equals true. That's better than changing all the dictionaries.

~ That's 1 to 2 in jira. It's what we are doing now. Evolving because of ambiguity.

~ Changed to be 100% backwards compatible.

Question: Does that represent the best practices for LDD?

Answer: Before CCB-204 we were getting along with 1 or 2, now warnings. It's consistent with what we've always done.

~ Not consistent, just grandfathered in.

~ What we thought was a best practice wasn't.

~ Yes, it's unclear what the best practice was. Going to declarative approach removes that problem.

~ The best practice is being grandfathered in and the model is more complicated.

It would be best if all the LDDs were updated. Unsure if that's a difficult thing to do since they are all based on old versions. Probably wouldn't break anything. Think the SCR will need info for the DPH with notes to stewards on when to use this.

~ We don't have an LDD user's guide. It's been a problem. Unclear if instructions go in the DPH or if it should be a stand alone document.

~ We do have a document. It could go in the DPH. It's very out of date. Didn't address this issue.

~ We need to explain how to use the attributes. An LDD user guide is a different topic.

Not a huge burden to update. Good to have a user guide. Good examples are even better.

~ Anne has captured a lot of information for the SBN wiki.

~ Mitch, Trent and Ed can look at a user guide. Maybe in the future.

~ Mitch and Ed aren't sure they agreed to that.

~ GEO has lots of archiving work. LRO is going ahead now. Lots to migrate. IMG too.

~ Someone is happy to have people committed.

Question: How are people feeling about this?

Answer: Someone would like to see two updates in the SCR - change name of the attribute to UTF8 enumerated and a paragraph for LDD users guide. That should be part of this SCR.

~ Decision tree is a big part of it.

~ Problem Statement should include what is wrong with this according to modeling principal and what's inconsistent.

~ The principal is to declare something. Shouldn't have to parse.

~ The correct way to fix this is to declare.

****Action Item - Mitch**** will send a draft document to Steve and Trent by next Friday. If they don't receive it by then they should ask where it is... Unless Lyle wants to do it.

~ (He doesn't)

People are looking forward to seeing the new comments.

~ Someone will not be ready to vote in two weeks.

~ That's fine. We just want to make progress.

II. Status and New SCRs

CCB-327 - Require PDS4 labels to reference the PDS core (common) schema and schematron and validate accordingly

See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-327>

New SCR from NSSDCA. They brought the subject up to Jordan, Ed and Steve. Issue was that while ingesting LADEE bundles they found two collection labels that did not reference the PDS4 core schema at the top. They need to make sure they are ingesting complete labels. Went to Jordan. He investigated. Validation tool does warn you. Want to change that to being an error.

Question: Is this a large impact?

Answer: Basing any change on LADEE, which was version 1.1, isn't a good idea. It won't stand up to the current standards. LADEE will eventually be updated.

~ LADEE was a first case, but it would still be good for validate to check that valid labels have the PDS4 core schema and schematron and are based on the PDS4 model.

~ Yes, but LADEE has to be validated against the early schema.

~ Still want to validate.

NSSDCA agrees with this. They did validate against the correct schema for LADEE. They have ingested several bundles. This was the first error. But agrees that we should validate core schema is included in the label.

~ That should be an error going forward. Validate should know what the associated schematron file is. It has to be in the label.

This seems very clear cut. We could vote next time.

~ If we update the SR, that wording should be in the SCR.

~ We need that first.

~ The SR is kind of ambiguous. Chapter 6 maybe.

Question: Who writes this?

Answer: ****Action Item - Stef**** will write it and contact Ed if she has any questions.

~ It's just implied in the SR.

CCB-326 - Inconsistent Direction on How to Use Discipline Facets

See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-326>

This was implemented in version 1.2. The issue is that we originally had sections under Primary Results Summary for science facets and discipline facets. We changed that, but the IM specification still shows that to be the case, but schema was revised. Was tripped up by this while reviewing a product. There's some text in the IM specification - class description - that explains the history, but the specification still shows discipline facets inside science facets. Seems like we should clean that up so the IM specification reflects what we are validating.

Oxygen gives you a green light, but it shouldn't.

~ People will look at this. This is probably the most difficult period of the model. If you look at 10.9, it's discussed. It was insisted that this be flattened. One of those difficult areas. Impossible to model. Think we are seeing the result of the flattening. Will look and respond.

~ This doesn't make sense for someone new to it.

Good Introduction.

We will not discuss CCBs 325 or 265 now. Some comments have been added in jira.

Discussions

Introduce "empty field"

There is no ticket for this yet. Unsure if it requires one. Slides have been prepared for today. Issue is with empty field. Problem is what's being treated as empty or ignored. SR specifies it's application dependent. Validate is throwing an error. ATMOS thinks EN needs to be instructed that it's empty or there can be an SCR. Another option is that ATM could "fix" the data. Last option is that they could not validate the data.

~ Someone who helped write the SR says the assumption was if comma space comma it was not expected to be an empty field.

~ Double quotes is interpreted as empty.

~ But double quotes are to protect what is in that field.

~ No reasonable interpretation that it's anything other than empty.

~ Leading or trailing spaces are supposed to be ignored. If all you have is spaces, it seems reasonable to count that as empty.

The question is what direction EN should have for validate tool.

Question: Validation fails? How about a warning?

Answer: Could live with a warning.

~ Useful, if not what you intended.

Question: The issue then is validate tool checking a data file. It will find and list the issue 5,000 times. Concern is in delimited files, comma separated space is currently an error. Should it be treated as an error?

Answer: These are numeric.

~ This throws in a character rather than a real. That's the error.

Another Question: But leading and trailing spaces are ignored. Without one digit it's an error?

Answer: Yes.

~ That's the question.

Validate knows it's a numeric. Blank is an error. If there was an A there it would be an error.

~ We need space in numeric field to be valid.

This is a software fix. Doesn't require an SCR, just a github request.

~ Submit a ticket.

Question: Does anyone object?

Answer: Not ready to let this one go.

~ So, do a github request and we can review it next time. ****(Action Item - Lyle)****

Question: Is this just for numeric?

Answer: Yes. White space doesn't matter for text fields.

~ Good question. Need to look at the rules for text.

~ Quotes aren't required. This is for numeric, but the question gets bigger.

~ Someone should check text field in validate. Blanks should be okay in text.

Let's see how this rolls out with github.

Open Floor

Question: Any emergencies we need to work on?

Answer: (Silence)

Next time we will have presentations from Mitch and Mike.

~ Mike prepared slides - will put them in jira.

~ We should continue with CCB-324 and the no schematron in labels issue. That is urgent. Stunned by that one.

Next meeting April 8

DDWG Notes 2021-04-08

title: DDWG Notes 2021-04-08

layout: default

date: 2021-04-08

April 8, 2021

Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees: M. Drum, M. Gordon, E. Guinness, T. Hare, L. Huber, S. Hughes, R. Joyner, D. Kazden, T. Lim, J. Mafi, S. McLaughlin and R. Simpson

Known Observers: P. Lawton and M. Costa Sitja

DDWG Agenda

(Included in email sent April 6, from T. Hare, DDWG agenda for April 8, 2021)

0) Front-matter

- Still using WebEx for phone support

- empty field issue on github, any more comments for the

page? https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Furldefense.us%2Fv3%2F_https%3A%2F%2Fgithub.com%2FNASA-PDS%2Fvalidate%2Fissues%2F314_%3B!!PvBDto6Hs4WbVuu7!eabDsQYiep5lbw7S_yADuXIdQgRtH4_X_QWdT0daPg4vXyWfVnCtlMu085UpV3BUQ3l0ICsFlog%24&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C3bc38eb307894a8d6c3f08d9044bdd6e%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637545546166956442%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=bXUHM01xzCn1stWBLV1TJLDNQoZhAU4l1f%2B1tQNhYg%3D&reserved=0

- Plan for Mike Drum to present (below)

(Brief Discussion)

I. Ready for a vote

CCB-324 (maybe) -- still might need some support from DDWG members before vote (review current status).

(No Vote Yet)

II. Status and New SCRs. from last time:

1) CCB-327 - Require PDS4 labels to reference the PDS core schematron and validate accordingly

-- Do we need updates to SR before voting on? I have not requested a TA yet.

2) CCB-326 - Inconsistent Direction on How to Use Discipline Facets

-- Please review or comment

4) CCB-265 - need to ping Anne again.

(Discussed)

III. Discussions (order somewhat random, we will get to what we can and is ready to be presented)

Trent - quick question for Cassini archive, "In a PDS4 migration, do PDS3 labels need a PDS4 label reference?"

~ Someone is not sure what is meant by how widely it would be implemented. It will be a new data type.

~ Discussion has been written for LDDs, but think it would also apply to common. Thought it would have to be defined in common and percolate to the LDDs. Not clear from how it's written.
~ We can add something.

A chart and comment were added to jira. Seems like an enumeration flag and new data type are redundant. Not sure we need both. Also not sure warnings are appropriate.

~ Someone agrees. Would like a discussion on warnings versus errors. The team needs to agree so we can make it consistent.

Not sure how to move this forward.

~ Someone suggests a small team to work on error versus warning. Maybe Steve and Dick.

~ The real problem is when we assume underscore type in attribute name we thought it would be defined and we assumed enumerated value list would be there. Defining the type seems clean. New type will have a list and will define a type. If we don't use this, and stick to what we have, then we need a warning because it's not always wrong. If this isn't included in the IM than it becomes an error. Not sure if this helps.

~ Pointing out new type of enumerated flag solves problems of DD associate value in a different namespace. If false it says this is a type and enumerated values will be provided elsewhere. Defining attributes as data type reduces the assumptions that have to be made. Types are sub-classes. Really, a modeling concept that carries a lot of information. We can get into long winded discussions about what is a type and what isn't.

Cutting this off here.

****Action Item - Dick and Steve**** will work this off-line.

~ No vote for now.

II. Status and New SCRs

CCB-327 - Require PDS4 labels to reference the PDS core (common) schema and schematron and validate accordingly

See [https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-327&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C3bc38eb307894a8d6c3f08d9044bdd6e%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637545546166956442%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=cEeINWYrUk%2Bwlqn6h6Q5SfUKKerVcXSK4oUGEbTbfq8%3D&reserved=0)

[327&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C3bc38eb307894a8d6c3f08d9044bdd6e%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637545546166956442%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=cEeINWYrUk%2Bwlqn6h6Q5SfUKKerVcXSK4oUGEbTbfq8%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-327&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C3bc38eb307894a8d6c3f08d9044bdd6e%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637545546166956442%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=cEeINWYrUk%2Bwlqn6h6Q5SfUKKerVcXSK4oUGEbTbfq8%3D&reserved=0)

Question: Do we need updates to this SCR before we can vote?

Answer: Thought wording was going to be provided for the SR.

Answer and Another Question: Yes. Do we need that before voting?

Answer: Yes.

Text was provided for the SR. People should review that. See SR section 3 in Proposed Solution.

~ It needs to be in the Requested Changes.

****Action Item - Stef**** will copy it there and than ****Everyone**** review it. Maybe we can get a TA for next time.

CCB-326 - Inconsistent Direction on How to Use Discipline Facets

See [https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-326&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C3bc38eb307894a8d6c3f08d9044bdd6e%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637545546166956442%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=cEeINWYrUk%2Bwlqn6h6Q5SfUKKerVcXSK4oUGEbTbfq8%3D&reserved=0)

[jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-326&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C3bc38eb307894a8d6c3f08d9044bdd6e%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637545546166956442%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=JDd6vCo1%2FSmckqsWqillVLZKfm2c1kVyKTeg%2FadFWs%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-326&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C3bc38eb307894a8d6c3f08d9044bdd6e%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637545546166956442%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=JDd6vCo1%2FSmckqsWqillVLZKfm2c1kVyKTeg%2FadFWs%3D&reserved=0)

There's still a bit of gray area.

Question: Any quick comments?

Answer: (Silence)

****Action Item - Everyone**** look at this for next time.

Someone would be happy if the inconsistency could be explained.

~ Not everyone is sure what the quirkiness is. Seems like want to simplify by removing the middle level. Does see something to discuss, but simplification would be a huge change. Need to discuss this very carefully.

~ The schema shows everything flat. The schema specification doesn't.

~ Some interdependencies. Had to deal with them by having a hierarchy. Flattened it. Think that's the confusion.

****Action Item - Steve and Dick**** will discuss this and see if they can move it forward or clarify it.

CCB-265 - Complete internationalization for local dictionaries

See [https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-265&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C3bc38eb307894a8d6c3f08d9044bdd6e%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637545546166956442%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=uPoVld79ppX8A0AvCimLIVXe1FacgizVZ%2F7kdbKuRU%3D&reserved=0)

[jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-265&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C3bc38eb307894a8d6c3f08d9044bdd6e%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637545546166956442%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=uPoVld79ppX8A0AvCimLIVXe1FacgizVZ%2F7kdbKuRU%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-265&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C3bc38eb307894a8d6c3f08d9044bdd6e%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637545546166956442%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=uPoVld79ppX8A0AvCimLIVXe1FacgizVZ%2F7kdbKuRU%3D&reserved=0)

Anne was pinged.

~ She is super busy.

~ This was one we tried to clear out, but she's concerned we might still need it.

III. Discussions

Cassini PDS3 labels Discussion

Someone has Cassini PDS3 detached labels and wants to point to them in PDS4.

~ ATMOS includes PDS3 labels for completeness. Not sure what users want. They use the product observational supplemental.

~ GEO uses that too.

~ CIS is trying to figure out if they want to include them.

It can give certainty that everything is there.

~ Some users will want the PDS3 labels for their software. RMS doesn't include PDS3 labels because they had to reformat the data. Use the external source product reference. Don't think there's a one size fits all solution.

Question: How do you include PDS3 as an external or internal reference? What's the best practice for denoting a PDS3 product?

Answer: External reference. DSID:Product ID

Cutting this off here.

Presentation: SBN DDWG Issues (with slides)

There are a few issues that SBN and other nodes are also interested in. This is SBN's ideas for XML as archival data. See CCB-211 (XML/schema based files as archival data, see <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-211&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C3bc38eb307894a8d6c3f08d9044bdd6e%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637545546166956442%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=FhgeGLITI%2FDHWUics49jsebzbzBSSvPrLloH6hwZfc%3D&reserved=0>). For CCB-211, people came up with a data type for archiving XML text - JSON and YAML too. Could add additional standards. Structured text data file, indicate parsing standard and schema. Includes an example. Uploaded to jira for people to look at.

On CCB-260 (PDS4 label files do not have a unique file extension, see <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-260&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C3bc38eb307894a8d6c3f08d9044bdd6e%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637545546166956442%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=u%2FuStUdLjIRHnBChNEtdioqE%2FidGml6VNi10dnTBA%3D&reserved=0>), the issue would be conflict if product and label are using the same source file extension. Already support for a new extension, like LBLX. Unique. Would need a new MIME type. Would require label files to use that after version 2.0. Another option would be to add a double extension, like .LBL.XML. It would work with XML tools. Option 3 solves the problem in another way.

Someone likes option 1. We need an extra condition to enforce that if .XML file is not a label we need to use .LBLX

~ Someone is trying to figure out how to validate. If a .XML data file, you have to use. LBL.

Question: Do we know what .LBLX is going to break?

Another Question: Why not .LBL?

Answer: There's a lot of precedence to use .LBLX.

~ There might also be labels from PDS3. Don't want confusion.

~ LBLX is more unique.

Question: Will validation tool break?

Answer: It will probably need a revision. Maybe a switch to know what to look for.

~ Will require software updates going forward. Needs to work for version 1 and version 2.

If X is part of the extension and all data in the archive goes through some sort of processing, maybe option 3 makes more sense.

~ A change to data products where changing the file names. Adds complications.

~ Someone hadn't thought of changing the data files.

Question: For ASCII tables - is there an extension we could use, like TABX?

Answer: Table isn't XML.

~ We could call data TABX. Wouldn't matter if it was a table.

~ For InSight, GEO made an extension like SXML.

It's not nice to rename the data instead of our labels.

~ Relative to a small number of files. Implications of a new label extension versus a new extension on data files - smaller number of files.

~ Someone likes option 1. It's clear that what you are looking at is a label.

Question: Why was XML used in the first place?

Answer: Not sure we thought it through.

~ IPDA has thousands of files archived as XML. Introducing LBLX will confuse our users.

~ That's a very good point, along with breaking software, we will break our users.

~ Going to version 2 will break a lot of stuff.

~ We have discussed not implementing this until version 2.

Going back to the slide on CCB-260 - Bullet 2 - used to be the solution to determining content in files. Entire stack will be affected. Bullet 2 - not sure that's still an option.

~ Someone thought the current software could be told labels are either .xml or .lblx - and that we could only use one per bundle. It will be different in the transition, but XML could be used for data in the future. We will be seeing more of that going forward. We need to do what makes the most sense for the future.

~ Someone agrees. There will be impacts on the system.

~ Jordan knows we will sometimes have XML for data and sometimes labels. We need a flag.

Regarding the version 2 option - breaking changes implies major updates. Could roll this out very slowly. Afraid of complications.

~ Someone agrees. We shouldn't wait for version 2.

~ Software will have standards hard coded. Need to think about that and the move from version 1 to version 2 could be a very major thing.

~ Going forward - problem of files on a disk will lessen, even a server. Browse sees file content type, which can be set to anything.

~ This will be dealt with around the world. Could have a major impact. Changing label extensions needs to really be discussed.

~ Will also greatly impact NSSDCA and the ingest of PDS4.

We could take this up to a higher level and consider access to products by LIDVID - maybe an API. Maybe something to consider.

~ XML is just a representation of the data. Most programmers immediately convert to JSON - the flavor of the day. XML won't last forever.

~ Thought we locate files based on the LIDVIDs. Thought there was a label to file translator.

~ That's the registry.

~ Most individual products aren't in a registry yet.

~ That's the point. We can also consider in a collection, with an inventory, which includes a list of labels.

~ Sounds like a Utopian world.

~ We deliver products to the archive, not collections. Would like to discuss this with IPDA and see how it will effect everyone.

~ We all should ask around and see what might break. We might just have to vote eventually.

Next Meeting April 22.

~ Lyle won't be available. Will have Lynn come.

~ Probably one vote next time.

DDWG Notes 2021-04-22

title: DDWG Notes 2021-04-22

layout: default

date: 2021-04-22

April 22, 2021

Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees: M. Drum, M. Gordon, E. Guinness, T. Hare, S. Hughes, D. Kazden, T. Lim, S. McLaughlin and R. Simpson

Known Observers: P. Lawton, L Neakrase (alternate for L. Huber), M McAuley and M. Costa Sitja

DDWG Agenda

(Included in email sent April 20, from T. Hare, DDWG agenda for April 22, 2021)

0) Front-matter

- empty field issue on github, closed
 - CCB-277 (withdrawn by author, Anne) - Design and implement needed support for sky survey archiving
 - I.M. 1.G.0.0 (1.16..0.0) in initial beta
 - HDF5 (NetCDF4) continues to crop up, does someone (we) need to take any action?
- **(Discussed)**

I. Ready for a vote (TA requested)

- 1) CCB-327 - Require PDS4 labels to reference the PDS core schematron and validate accordingly
- **(Did Not Vote)**

II. Status and New SCRs.

- 1) New - Bug CCB-328 - please review -- inconsistency in title type definition

- 2) CCB-326 - Inconsistent Direction on How to Use Discipline Facets

-- Please review or comment

- 3)CCB-211/260 -- PDS4 file extension -- new thoughts or in-house survey

- 4) CCB-324 -- still might need some support from DDWG members before vote (review current status).
- **(Discussed)**

III. Discussions (order somewhat random, we will get to what we can and is ready to be presented)

ATM: 303

NAIF: 295, 269

CIS/IMG: 209/316, 164, CCB-325 - Support for video as product observational

EN: status on 209 (Steve)

IPDA:261, 263

PPI: 222, 282, 230
RMS: 314, 210/275, 212
(Not Discussed)

parking lot:

1) CCB-265: need to ping Anne again.

2) RS:2589/281 (see new attachment to CCB-281) - presented last time, still need to talk to Bob (on hold)
(Not Discussed)

IV. Passed for next build

- 1) CCB-Approved: Implementation complete
- 2) CCB-Approved: Ready for Implementation

Next meeting, Thursday, May 6th, 2021

DDWG

Front Matter

The empty field issue on Github is closed or withdrawn. It was about if we can have an empty string.

CCB-277 (Design and implement needed support for sky survey archiving, see <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-277>) has been withdrawn by the author. It was resolved internally.
~ Anne sent email to Pat asking her to withdraw it.

1G/1.16 is eminent. There's a little bit of time to update LDDs. Trying to build/release everything at once. New, compatible versions of everything. Not sure when.
~ Steve will ask. **(Action Item)**

Discussion - we keep getting hit by people on the NetCDF issue. Europa Clipper, discussions, MAVEN, etc.. Not sure who would take the lead.
~ ATMOS is looking at it. Getting a push to use NetCDF for atmospheric.
~ HDF5 is like XML. It's an implementation of that. A bit confusing. Different kinds of NetCDF. It can be complicated.

Mars 2020 is still stressed regarding video because of the helicopter. Mastcam is doing video. Got questions about it. The team is doing individual frames, 1800 images in a one minute movie. MPEG4 video can be stored in browse or documents. Question is if each individual frame has to point back to the original video.
~ They could use an internal reference.
~ It could go the other direction too, not that you would.
~ Haven't checked possible reference types.

Question: MPEG4 - can a document file type be in a browse collection? What's allowed in browse?
Answer: Someone thinks it can.
~ Someone else doesn't think we test that. Browse only has product browse.

****Action Item - Trent**** will look up the rules for browse with other types.

Movies will be necessary as movies.

~ Yes, even if in browse or documents. The issue is that a data science product in browse or document doesn't give a warm, fuzzy feeling.

~ Someone looked at the SR. Browse collection can have product browse or thumbnail, but it doesn't rule out document.

I. Ready for a vote

CCB-327 - Require PDS4 labels to reference the PDS core (common) schema and schematron and validate accordingly

See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-327>

Question: There was a lien?

Answer: This focuses on core schema/schematron. There could be others that should be referenced.

~ Seems to be an implementation issue. If we go back following Anne's comment, not sure this belongs in the SR.

~ Author looked at her comment, and agrees. Hadn't realized this was discussed years ago. Not sure how to go forward on this. But agrees with her that we shouldn't require URLs in labels. However, up in the text in jira, where it's asked that the DPH be tweaked, it does imply you have to use references. So, to the NSSDCA, it seems like they should be required. Maybe the DPH needs to be toned down.

~ So validate tool uses the right files to validate, even if they are not listed.

~ You can tell validate what to use.

~ Yes, what version of the IM.

Question: When you specify a version of the IM, does validate tool automatically look at the correct schema and schematron? If so, only documentation needs cleaning up. There's a documentation issue and the question of if validate is using the correct schema and schematron, whether they are listed in the label or not.

Answer: Okay.

~ We can send a quick email to Jordan to ask if validate tool acts correctly with or without references.

****Action Item - Steve**** will check with Jordan and put the answer in jira.

~ If it doesn't we will need a new SCR. For this one we still need to tweak the DPH. The issue though is that some of us wanted to avoid local file references. Anne doesn't want either.

~ Someone doesn't agree with her.

~ Someone else too, but can see her point. But leaving in local pointers could lead to user confusion. Could say the best practice is not to leave in local file references.

Question: Lost. For testing?

Answer: Some people don't use URL, they use a file in their local computer. Anne is saying we don't need either. Saying IM version should be sufficient.

~ It gets downloaded locally.

~ Uses catalog files.

Question: So, where are we?

Answer: ****Action Item - Stef**** will check with Jordan about validate tool and edit the DPH, E.3.3 (D?) to remove it as a requirement and say it's a best practice.

~ If we change that people will do what they want.

The NSSDCA software looks for URLs in the bundle and collection XML products. A quick validation - if it doesn't find the schema it can't continue. Working on that.

~ If not requiring the URL style and someone leaves a local file, there's no way of knowing if the local files were changed.

~ Okay as a best practice. Required in the DPH now, but not the SR.

~ Good point. Assumed the DPH mimicked the SR.

~ That's why validate throws a warning.

~ Thought the issue was that we had early data that didn't include the XML statement.

~ Yes.

~ My thought is that it makes sense to point to the core and whatever LDDs are being used. That's the logic I use.

~ Makes sense, but Anne would say our system should work without it.

~ That goes back to what validate tool is doing. There are lots of ways to run the validate tool. Probably get different results depending on how you run it. It might be nice to have that decision tree. Anne did advocate for not specifying what LDDs are used. Think software needs to know that for validate. For most standard XML tools.

Question: Does Stef know what to do?

Answer: Ask Jordan if validate tool works properly when specific schema and schematron are not specified in the label.

~ Someone is not sure we don't identify LDDs except in the overhead.

~ Someone else wondered that too, how you pick up the LDDs without that.

~ Rings is encouraging people to include schema and schematron. Maybe we need a new keyword or something.

~ There's an open SCR on that.

Another Question: Once Jordan answers, does Stef know what to do?

Answer: Depends on his answer. May need to come back to the DDWG. Hopefully, will just need to tweak the documentation, but maybe we'll need a new SCR.

****Action Item - Everyone**** post comments and send email to start a discussion.

II. Status and New SCRs

CCB-328 - Inconsistency in title type definition

See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-328>

New SCR from Anne.

~ Basically, there's a comment that someone found a bug - ASCII or UTF-8, but failing.

~ It's listed as urgent, but if already ASCII, it should be backwards compatible.

~ A secondary concern is how are schema and schematron different.

Someone looked into this. Definitely a bug. IM says one thing, schema another. IM is object orientated. Can have different types, but XML can not. Defined once. Definitely a bug. Not sure how it happened.

~ Some one can see that. Sometimes ASCII and sometimes UTF-8.

~ Feels like a Github issue.

Someone suggests we make all titles UTF-8.

~ We can choose that and go forward and be done.

~ We will vote next time.

~ We could vote now and do the paperwork later.

~ Let's wait.

~ Someone is concerned that the same model is generating different things in two places.

Question: You mean fix the problem?

Answer: We could eliminate a whole bunch of bugs if we fix the discrepancy.

~ Um. If the question is if we can fix a bug, yes.

Another Question: Can we, in schema, have the same attribute name have different definitions?

Answer: Some attributes can change, some can't. Data type has to be consistent. Descriptions can change. Can make a list.

Another Question: Sounds like we have an internal model that gets translated into schema. Is there a way to create a mapping so if something is UTF-8 it will always be UTF-8?

Answer: Manual. Could put in a mechanism.

~ Not sure we are communicating in the same language.

~ Yes, certain capabilities in object oriented land are different in XML land. We can discuss this off line. The way to fix this would be to go in and modify the model to make it consistent.

We can bring this up next time.

Question: Why wait? There's no fix other than what's being proposed.

Answer: List everywhere title is used. Make them UTF-8. We don't want anyone to spend weeks on this.

~ Someone already knows the list.

Question: How about an e-vote?

Answer: It doesn't matter. No time issues.

~ Anne wanted this ASAP. Might be able to get this in as a point build since in integration and testing.

Another Question: Any objections to voting now?

Answer: Someone wants to see the SCR and how it will be implemented first.

~ Let's vote.

~ The requested change is to make title short string collapsed, UTF-8 in all cases. That's a lien. Need a TA and to fix the requested changes.

~ Maybe title was supposed to be something else in one case, not UTF-8.

~ Maybe we wanted them readable in Roman characters, not Chinese characters. Never mind.

~ We have this issue in planetary that we support ASCII and UTF-8 in the data base.

~ Someone is looking - sees it as short string collapsed ASCII in some places - terminological entry and property maps. We need to update the SCR before we vote. Make sure all are appropriate for UTF-8.

~ Would require creating new attributes. Completely non-backwards compatible. Pretty major change.

Question: Are we certain we are not breaking something else if we change them all to UTF-8? Getting nervous.

Answer: Given the OPS, no problem.

~ No problem.

~ Could have occurred when composite structure was put in, but not sure why we haven't seen this before, but there is only one solution.

~ No, there are three. Make them all ASCII, make them all UTF-8 or new attributes - one for each. The SCR now is to make all titles all UTF-8.

We will vote next time.

~ We need to see how late we can vote to get this in. It's a bug fix.

~ No, just fixing it all the titles will be UTF-8.

~ Someone wants to think about this.

~ It needs to go through the system.

~ We have some time, not sure how much.

****Action Item - Steve**** will submit the issue into the tracker and find out from Jordan when it could be implemented. Will also do a TA.

Question: Are we agreeing it's a bug?

Answer: Yes, but put in full impact for composite structure and everything if all are changed to UTF-8.

CCB-211/260 -- PDS4 file extension

Someone would like to know if there are any new thoughts on this.

Someone is strongly opposed to anything besides .xml. Prefers .xml.lbl, option 2 in the list.

IPDA is split on using a new extension, but .lblx or .pds4x were majority preferred.

Question: Thought IPDA was against any change?

Answer: Wanted to check with everyone.

Question: Did people float the idea of .tabx for data?

Answer: Someone is against that. We don't need a new mime type. It's easier to do .lbl.xml

~ That might be true in the real world, not application ruled.

Question: .lbl.xml is new?

Answer: It was in the SCR.

~ Someone doesn't remember that.

~ Personal preference. We need to decide how to move forward.

~ GEO is changing data files for InSight now. Something like .sxml.

We'll leave this here for now. There are potential non-trivial software impacts.

Next meeting is May 6. We will vote on the new bug, unless there's an emergency and we need an e-vote. Maybe CCB-327.

Dick has a conflict May 6. Can email his votes.

DDWG Notes 2021-05-06

title: DDWG Notes 2021-05-06

layout: default

date: 2021-05-06

May 6, 2021

Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees: M. Drum, M. Gordon, E. Guinness, T. Hare, L. Huber, S. Hughes, R. Joyner, D. Kazden, T. Lim, J. Mafi and S. McLaughlin

Known Observers: P. Lawton and M. Costa Sitja

DDWG Agenda

(Included in email sent May 4, from T. Hare, DDWG agenda for May 6, 2021)

0) Front-matter

- 1.G.0.0 has been released for beta testing
- next release lock date: 10/15/2021
- CCB-328 passed during evote. Quick debrief since that was a little rocky (try not to do that again).
- Mitch requested a little discussion time (below)

(Discussed)

I. maybe ready for a vote (TA'd)

1) CCB-327 - Require PDS4 labels to reference the PDS core schematron and validate accordingly

-- see new comments

(Discussed)

II. Status and New SCRs.

1) CCB-326 - Inconsistent Direction on How to Use Discipline Facets

-- on hold for this week

2) CCB-211/260 -- PDS4 file extension -- new thoughts or in-house survey

3) CCB-324 - still might need some support from DDWG members before vote (review current status).

(Not Really Discussed)

III. Discussions (order somewhat random, we will get to what we can and is ready to be presented) RMS (Mitch)

- "a possible way forward on discipline dictionary change control"

ATM: 303

NAIF: 295, 269

CIS/IMG: 209/316, 164, CCB-325 (link) - Support for video as product observational

EN: status on 209 (Steve)

IPDA: 261, 263

PPI: 222, 282, 230

RMS: 314, 210/275, 212

(Discussed first one)

parking lot:

1) CCB-265: need to ping Anne again.

2) RS: 2589/281 (see new attachment to CCB-281) - presented last time, still need to talk to Bob (on hold)

(Not Discussed)

Next meeting, Thursday, May 20th, 2021

DDWG

Front Matter

Feels like a calm time for us - people are working on proposals.

We had a rough evote for CCB-328 (Inconsistency in title type definition, see <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-328>). Want to discuss that.

IM version 1G is released. Next lock-down is October 15. Earlier for us. Jordan likes to see a list from us of what we are shooting for for the next release. If people have anything, let's get it on the list.

Mitch wants to discuss a new topic.

The lock-down date is when SCRs should be fully approved.

~ We need a DDWG date.

~ Steve used to be the keeper of the calendar, but it's been turned over to Jordan.

~ We should figure out where that calendar is.

~ Our date could be a lot earlier or later than we think.

Action Item - Steve will find the calendar link.

CCB-328 - There was a lot of action. It was implemented. Jordan pushed the LDDs through.

~ Someone wants to apologize to Dick - he may have felt we didn't take his comments seriously.

~ He's not on the call today, but he was worried we were moving too fast.

~ Someone voted no. Concerns weren't with the evote, it was the actual issue about how that attribute is generated in the model.

~ It will be interesting to see if there is any fallout.

~ SBN tested the original issue and now it works.

~ Still worried that this could be a breaking change.

~ Someone else doesn't think so, but things get complicated when we have to push real fast. The issue about how attributes are generated is a very good question about what we actually do with the files. Started a sidebar discussion on the process to understand how it could have happened, but actual bug was straight forward.

~ Others would also like to participate in the sidebar.

The SCR passed. RS said no, but yes if Steve addressed issues.

I. maybe ready for a vote

CCB-327 - Require PDS4 labels to reference the PDS core (common) schema and schematron and validate accordingly See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-327>

Question: Are anymore updates needed? Think we will vote next time.

Answer: Someone wants to loop back to Anne's comments and about what validate tool actually does. Relying on the XML header isn't good. Setting a bad precedence.

~ Someone agrees, but can't vote. Sees what is being said. Having the IM specified in the labels makes sense.

~ Changes to validate tool to help enforce would be good, but wider scope than this ticket.

~ A ticket was put in on that, but Jordan said he couldn't change that, so this ticket was put in.

Someone understands the position that schema location is a hint, a pointer to the canonical schema, but as part of the label. Something we could validate. Never understood why schema location should be forbidden.

~ Someone agrees. Our best practice and without a mechanism to list LDD versions, don't know what we do without a major change. We need a way to know where LDDs are. Not sure how you do it.

~ Long term for deep archive, people will only see the IM version. Not sure how.

~ The schema location being accurate is good, it just can't be the only indicator. We need to build some intelligence in. Core is different from LDDs, but obviously knowing what dictionaries are included in a given label is important.

~ Someone wants to see schema location in a label, but thinks validate tool should be working on metadata and have all LDD versions. Identification area should have LDD version IDs for each LDD in the label. Validate tools primary look should be based on the metadata.

~ Several people agree.

~ This doesn't seem like a best practice. See others listing direct path to schema location.

~ Ours aren't an accurate schema location. Hints. We want hints consistent with the metadata and not conflicting. Can require validate tool to use that.

~ Right now we have the version in the name. Showing files that have it in the path...

~ Someone believes we are moving forward as we build everything in sync so there will always be a consistent set of LDDs for each build. Maybe we use that as the standard way and then have a way to do exceptions.

~ Someone is doing updates to their nodes discipline LDD, specifying namespace in the label. Metadata has to be sufficient.

~ Didn't realize exceptions are really the rule.

Having a stable build cycle is the first step.

~ Part of why we designed LDDs the way we did was to be able to get updates and changes into them quickly. We need to be able to do out of cycle updates to LDDs.

~ The mission development cycle is not in sync with the PDS build cycle. Two different schedules.

We need three new SCRs: change identification area to include namespace and version for all LDDs, have to give schema location and validate tool has to validate based on that.

~ Someone agrees. The information should be in the model, and we should get it in, but this could be opening Pandora's box.

Question: Is there a way to make sure LDDs are in sync with common?

Answer: Good question, but out of cycle happens because of mission or R&A needs for the discipline or mission LDDs.

~ We need some sort of stamp of approval. That's what Jordan is trying to do.

Another Question: Don't we use LDDTool to validate against common?

Answer: Yes, but ten years from now, how do we know that was done? That's what Jordan is trying to do.

~ Good point, but we are far from the SCR.

~ Here is an example where PDS and the mission cycle are not in sync. Mars 2020 needed an update to common for a new unit. Mission had to wait for 1G and do several updates. Just wanted to point that out.

Someone keeps reading the line about major IM version is specified, but there's opportunity to override that.

~ We do not want the validate tool to parse the label to determine what files to use. It's inefficient. We need to specify. Validate tool will check the version and toss it out if there's a conflict. We don't want validate tool to parse the label first.

~ That's not different from what I said. Want schema and schematron LDD info all consistent with what's there.

~ Okay.

~ Not sure where to take this.

~ Splitting the SCR makes sense.

~ We don't want to vote on a bad practice. Could withdraw this SCR.

~ There's still some disagreement on that.

~ We could withdraw the SCR because the issue arose from a very early file.

~ Yes. This was all triggered by an early LADEE bundle. Okay with withdrawing. It has gotten very complicated. Fine having this dismissed.

~ Someone would rather see it parked until we have a new SCR.

~ We need to see if anyone will take this forward.

~ We have an open SCR with a request to add all LDDs to the labels.

~ It might be good to resurface that.

~ Definitely something to start with.

Action Item - Trent will hunt that down and put it on the agenda. Won't park this yet.

Discussions

Mitch

Mitch is sharing a presentation on discipline dictionaries that will be for the MC. Wants DDWG consensus on the problem and solution. The IRB discussed complaints about how we do peer reviews and that we don't document our LDD process. That was also discussed at the steward's meeting - the lack of control over LDDs and the need for regression testing. We need an integrated review for discipline LDDs. There are 18 of them currently. We need to do a bunch of things and we need the time. It will be a time intensive project. Proposes that we shut down the DDWG in February 2022 so the stewards can get this done. Suggesting it be done in person, in a room for a week. Probably start in the L.A. area so we can include the EN people. Thinking it will take 4 to 6 weeks.

~ Someone likes the suggestion. Saw it coming for some time. We did it for the common model. Always knew we needed to do it for others.

Question: Does anyone think (Mitch) is out to lunch here?

Answer: The capability for us to do regression testing is hard. No one has time. If this would allow that, than all in favor.

~ Anne would be in favor.

~ It will be a big meeting. Will need a good size room with wipe boards. Will discuss this at the next MC. Probably will take more time than the DDWG. Lots of travel.

~ Someone is not sure all of it has to be in person, but now is the time to get it in the budgets.

~ We will need some F2Fs. Set it for February because we will want Anne as a part of this, and that gives us time to get the DDWG to go on hiatus.

Question: What happens if an emergency ticket comes in?

Answer: We will have to deal with it.

Mitch will send everyone his slides.

~ Pat will discuss this with Anne.

~ Someone says Jordan is pushing hard to get an interface in Github.

~ That's what we want. "Here's the dictionary, here's the documentation..."

~ Not sure. The biggest problem is the standard modeling paradigm. A lot of issues will disappear when everyone is using the same paradigm. Was using one for common model, Protegee, but LDDs turned into the wild, wild west.

~ Good opportunity to bring some younger modelers into the system.

~ We often get cases where outsiders want to put something in an LDD and it conflicts with the IM or SR, and this would help put further constraints on that happening.

Question: Need to decide what we are doing at each stage. Is it expected that we will all use Protegee?

Answer: No, but want to get everyone to understand all the principals. All use the same constraints.

~ Targeting February, so we have more than six months to plan. First step is to convince the MC.

~ One of the ways one of the nodes trains students is to make them do regression tests.

Question: Any objections? We aren't getting a velocity of issues. A pause in the DDWG is probably okay.

Answer: (Silence)

Someone is interested in continuing the discussion around PDS extensions.

~ It will come back around. Hopefully, more nodes can do some canvassing.

~ GEO asked their people. Will send Trent the results. ****(Action Item - Ed)****

Question: Someone is seeing a lot of options. Is label extension part of this SCR for us to agree on?

Answer: Someone sees two issues - a consistent way to extend labels and also archiving XML data.

Another big issue coming is understanding if we will allow encoded formats for science, like video, before September.

~ We need to deal with all of this before the DDWG hiatus.

~ Will be on the list for Jordan.

Next meeting May 20.

DDWG Notes 2021-05-20

title: DDWG Notes 2021-05-20

layout: default

date: 2021-05-20

May 20, 2021

Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees: M. Drum, M. Gordon, E. Guinness, T. Hare, L. Huber, S. Hughes, R. Joyner, D. Kazden, T. Lim, J. Mafi, S. McLaughlin and R. Simpson
Known Observers: P. Lawton

DDWG Agenda

(Included in email sent May 19, from T. Hare, DDWG agenda for May 20, 2021)

0) Front-matter

- Key release dates (will keep link at

bottom): https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Furldefense.us%2Fv3%2F_https%3A%2F%2Fnsa-pds.github.io%2Freleases%2F12.0%2Fplan.html*key-dates_%3B!w!!PvBDto6Hs4WbVuu7!cGLG7hakCEftpwaXPOqYvSFj-DyOnaseZD_c9q_21O1oKmlh5snagK6pPBcGc4ssdKR5A1AxPZ0%24&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C398775d61a76431eb83008d92b99bebe%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637588761634323903%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&data=%2FVsnPd945Ub2VJ952SJtwCfMDDtWr1skGQRc%2FLkUxsQ%3D&reserved=0

- Quick summary/feedback for Mitch's discipline dictionary near-future "sprint"

- last call before Jordan

closes: https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Furldefense.us%2Fv3%2F_https%3A%2F%2Fgithub.com%2FFNASA-PDS%2Fvalidate%2Fissues%2F314_%3B!!PvBDto6Hs4WbVuu7!cGLG7hakCEftpwaXPOqYvSFj-DyOnaseZD_c9q_21O1oKmlh5snagK6pPBcGc4ssdKR5vK5Rmly%24&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C398775d61a76431eb83008d92b99bebe%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637588761634323903%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&data=04ApMuj44k8NY3bp%2BgiMKyKf1oiGUmyY35TERhlt5r1c%3D&reserved=0

- Quick thoughts on the proposed dLDD CCB Charter and management processes / teams:

dLDD CCB Charter

- https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Furldefense.us%2Fv3%2F_https%3A%2F%2Fdocs.google.com%2Fdocument%2Fd%2F1ecxIKzEVoOdRZ8ALrwA59wkz2M3-mk8asLUzLISaz34%2Fedit%3Fusp%3Dsharing_%3B!!PvBDto6Hs4WbVuu7!cGLG7hakCEftpwaXPOqYvSFj-DyOnaseZD_c9q_21O1oKmlh5snagK6pPBcGc4ssdKR5DX9ssIU%24&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C398775d61a76431eb83008d92b99bebe%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637588761634323903%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&data=sgrtjrnnocIbPUeOpoXV35WbQNPQPeSto%2BA2etrCKvzE%3D&reserved=0

dLDD Management Process -

https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Furldefense.us%2Fv3%2F_https%3A%2F%2Fdocs.google.com%2Fdocument%2Fd%2F1kC2jTOFk4RAbn3Lfdd_xYWx1i2qw2OLC9NaiGytirEQ%2Fedit%3Fusp%3Dsharing_%3B!!PvBDto6Hs4WbVuu7!cGLG7hakCEftpwaXPOqYvSFj-DyOnaseZD_c9q_21O1oKmlh5snagK6pPBcGc4ssdKR5DOKGvoA%24&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov

[%7C398775d61a76431eb83008d92b99bebe%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637588761634323903%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6I1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=WZj8mFLzKIQFAedxcUa8EgM8wkhTaLVXz4WIZhdKPMMA%3D&reserved=0](#)

(Discussed)

I. ready for a vote
n/a

II. Status and New SCRs.

- 1) CCB-327 - Require PDS4 labels to reference the PDS core schematron and validate accordingly
 - 2) CCB-326 - Inconsistent Direction on How to Use Discipline Facets
-- on hold for this week
 - 3) CCB-211/260 -- PDS4 file extension -- new thoughts or in-house survey
 - 4) CCB-324 -- still might need some support from DDWG members before vote (review current status).
- **(Some Discussion)**

III. Discussions (order somewhat random, we will get to what we can and is ready to be presented)

ATM: 303

NAIF: 295, 269

CIS/IMG: 209/316, 164, CCB-325 - Support for video as product observational

EN: status on 209 (Steve)

IPDA: 261, 263

PPI: 222, 282, 230

RMS: 314, 210/275, 212

(Not Discussed)

parking lot:

1) CCB-265: need to ping Anne again.

2) RS: 259/281 (see new attachment to CCB-281) (on hold) **(Not Discussed)**

Next meeting, Thursday, June 10, 2021

DDWG

Front Matter

SCR freeze date is August 24, 2021.

~ Steve needs to know all the SCRs that have a chance to get in by then. And approved. Unclear what to do with emergency ones.

~ Good place to bookmark. Let Jordan know if there's any input.

~ Steve used to control the dates, but Jordan is consolidating. Very systematized. One button push updates all.

Mitch did present (DDWG hiatus to work on LDDs) to the MC. All the managers agreed and acknowledged that shutting down the DDWG three to four months is not enough to do everything. Some people needed aren't in the DDWG, so there will be some node impacts. Will start planning and consider dates after the proposal.

- ~ Unclear if this will be in person. Probably have to support virtual too.
- ~ Hoping for February, starting in Los Angeles so the JPL software people can participate. Thinking a week. Will firm it up.
- ~ There should be some up front work first. Plan for what we expect to accomplish. Background. So we can start working immediately when face to face.
- ~ Someone agrees. Will form an organizing committee after the proposal. We are far enough out to do that kind of planning.

Question: Allocate ten minutes or so to discuss when ready?

Answer: Yes. This is the only group that includes the bulk of the people who would be involved.

Final call before Jordan closes CCB-314.

~ Yes.

Someone has a comment that follows on setting aside the DDWG to work on LDDs. Saw the email from Laura with a charter for the LDD group. Was struck that there are problems with the proposal. 1) Managing the process with four new teams to work on LDD issues. If we already are having trouble finding people to do the work, not sure about finding people for four new teams. 2) Doesn't refer to the DDWG, CCB or IM. Not sure how it fits with ongoing operations. Concerned, if board can just appoint stewards, there could be the same conflicts down the road. Also looks like more work. Think the DDWG should chime in.

- ~ Yes, there should be some clear lines.
- ~ Someone is not understanding the purpose of this.
- ~ Setting up an approval board. It came out of the MC.
- ~ Unsure where this came from.
- ~ For a long time we've said we needed oversight for LDDs. Shares the concerns mentioned about staffing. Might want to expand the charter of the CCB, but overworked. The IRB pointed out not much coordination between the LDDs. Jordan tried to start a stewards team to look at LDDs, but no one has time to check LDDs that don't have anything to do with them.
- ~ Thought using Github.
- ~ Not working very well. The structures in place, but assignment of responsibility is not. That's the problems where these two documents came from.
- ~ Someone put comments in google documents. Thinks Emily wrote this.
- ~ Someone offered to check around EN to see if can learn more about this.
- ~ We just need some explanation. We can invite Jordan or Emily.
- ~ Jordan is moving forward with plans to make things very automated, but the issue of having people reviewing isn't formally laid out. Thought that was what the IRB was saying.
- ~ This was on a different track while we were coming up with the DDWG hiatus plan. This should probably be after that.
- ~ Yes, it seems like it should come after.
- ~ Last two bullets of responsibilities in LDD management plan seem to be for Steve and someone else. We need a baseline.
- ~ Whoever is going to review the LDDs has to be someone who has been working on this.
- ~ But hopefully we will get a bigger pool of helpers from the stewards.

Status and New SCRs

CCB-327 - Require PDS4 labels to reference the PDS core (common) schema and schematron and validate accordingly See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds->

[jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-327&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C398775d61a76431eb83008d92b99bebe%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637588761634333856%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=%2BDklRF8ssppOT2FMdPqXveejDt2kPoXlXhFRKyKDZtA%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-327&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C398775d61a76431eb83008d92b99bebe%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637588761634333856%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=%2BDklRF8ssppOT2FMdPqXveejDt2kPoXlXhFRKyKDZtA%3D&reserved=0)

We are holding off on this unless there are any updates.

CCB-326 - Inconsistent Direction on How to Use Discipline Facets

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-326&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C398775d61a76431eb83008d92b99bebe%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637588761634333856%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=j06Fn%2B010Z8Ido9FUSII673zddN7f1nSw6pscR%2BGtHM%3D&reserved=0>

Someone is kind of waiting for an explanation of why it's difficult to make these consistent.

~ Someone else made an effort to try to understand the issue. We should meet off line to try to understand the issues and if we can do anything.

Action Item - Steve and Dick will set up a time to meet.

The IM specification says one thing and then there's a footnote. Schema enforces the footnote. Unsure why it's so difficult to get this working.

~ When we write it out this class goes from being hierarchical structure to being a flat structure. That's where the problem comes in. Should discuss and try to clarify.

~ Anyone who agreed to this should be included.

~ That would be Anne.

~ Might be a good opportunity to bring her in a bit. Maybe next time we can meet in three weeks, after the proposal, and then we can invite Anne to a few meetings.

CCB-260 - PDS4 label files do not have a unique file extension.

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-260&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C398775d61a76431eb83008d92b99bebe%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637588761634333856%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=GC03UflhggKwL6XQQwZ8%2BSbD2dsnmDlx0Rk7KcjcK2s%3D&reserved=0>

Not sure how to move this forward.

~ A recap of the options. Trying to archive XML files without conflicting with the labels. Interested in coming up with options at first label extension. Would be required at 2.0. Options were: 1) New extension with unique mime type, like LBLX. We would define our own format. PDS4 is a format. Wouldn't be treading new ground. 2) A stacked extension like .LBL.XML. Less elegant, but it solves the problem. 3) Solve in some other way with XML files. People were surveying the nodes to see what people think. Would like to decide what is the proposal so we can vote.

~ Yes. We want to get this moving forward or out.

~ Anne is violently opposed to stacked. Would like to know what the problem is.

~ LBL.XML was a non-starter with GEO's people. Can't remember why.

- ~ Think it was the two dots. Difficult to make this work.
- ~ Extension as defined by Windows is after the final dot.
- ~ Someone is not violently opposed, but would prefer a more elegant solution.
- ~ So, let's strike LBL.XML from the list.
- ~ Rings has to look at their notes, but preferred stacked to new. It seemed easier for their software.

We could have an informal vote. LBL.XML versus .LBLX to get rid of one option.

- ~ We should just ask each node what they prefer and start a matrix.

Question: Anyone opposed to removing LBL.XML?

Answer: RMS is opposed.

- ~ It would be RS second choice.
- ~ PPI is opposed to removing it.
- ~ IPDA people were split fifty-fifty.
- ~ If we are voting, would remove it.
- ~ IMG would vote to remove it.
- ~ Someone kind of on the fence.

We need to make a final call.

**** Action Item - Mitch and Joe**** let Mike know what the argument is for LBL.XML.

Question: Anyone in favor of PDSX?

Answer: GEO would live with it. Split between that and LBLX. Either one is acceptable.

Another Question: Any other comments on PDSX?

Answer: Anne will have comments.

- ~ She wanted a single extension.
- ~ So we have one fan of PDSX or LBLX. Some issues are that we know typical software won't understand it, but we could live with it.
- ~ RS likes it. Will be complications, but it identifies labels and XML.

Question: Is LBLX available?

Answer: Someone thinks Anne checked. Just have to register it.

Another Question: When 2.0 comes around this will be mandated?

Answer: Yes. Will make things consistent. Not backwards compatible.

Another Question: Comments on this being managed?

Answer: We should implement it now with restriction that bundles can only use one.

- ~ This has some implications for secondary members.
- ~ We can just write the requirement for primary members. Secondary members aren't validated.
- ~ Can set the value to only XML or only LBLX to enforce.
- ~ Still.
- ~ Only catch is if secondary products are included in the bundle. Same issue for LBL.XML.
- ~ Validate doesn't look at every file. Looks at catalog.
- ~ Validate looks at labels and files to see every file is there or referenced. Validate has to be able to find every file without opening it.

Question: Collection level?

Answer: Maybe could have a mix in a collection. A requirement for bundles might be more severe than we actually need.

- ~ Validate tool runs against a bundle. Will make it more complex.
- ~ We could add an attribute to the collection to say what extension we are using.
- ~ Not sure how much work that would be.
- ~ Want validate to implement the standards.

Question: Requiring it at the collection level makes some sense, but are secondary products a thing?

Answer: Only validate against them if they are present.

So, for the SCR, optional in version 1.0, LBLX, mandated at version 2.0.

- ~ **Action Item - Mike** will do some research about if this should be across a bundle.

We are based on LIDs. This goes into the weeds of implementation. Seems like the registry should point to the label. No matter what the extension.

- ~ But validate runs before it goes in the registry and labels need to be identified without opening the files.
- When we tell it LBLX represents a label it should be okay. Could be a problem when there are two extensions.
- ~ Not sure about that. Doesn't sound like a difficult thing to do in software. The files will be identified on two passes, to find files and then labels.
- ~ Complicated.
- ~ We're doing implementation here. Need the software guys.
- ~ Someone never heard that the software guys need to identify labels without opening the files. Thought labels mapped to LIDVIDs and would point to the file no matter what the extension because of the registry.
- ~ We need to hear from the software guys, but validate runs before the registry.
- ~ Getting complicated.
- ~ We can design it and how we want it and then move forward with implementation.
- ~ Good track.
- ~ Can reference Susie's apology to the software programmers.

Question: Is XML currently allowed to be a data type?

Answer: Lets do CCB-260 first, then 211 (XML/schema based files as archival data,

see https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-211&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C398775d61a76431eb83008d92b99bebe%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637588761634333856%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=2yw1yx3Ey2ImdNy6qLNZQ_Qhcg%2FZMVbsEIWdeosr0%2FwY%3D&reserved=0).

Another Question: Is anyone going to reject 211?

Answer: Unless XML is in the list of reserved extensions, it might already be allowed, but a hole if file and label are both XML.

- ~ GEO archives XML ASCII data files now.
- ~ CCB-211 is to treat XML as a structure stack language.
- ~ IPDA is turning XML into PDFs.

Question: Are we good? Is the take away that we will be ready to vote next time?

Answer: Lets see what comes out before we schedule a vote.

Question: Is everyone in freak out mode for June 3? Is it okay to push it a week?

Answer: GEO will be pushing to make the 7th.

Another Question: Are people good with June 10?

Answer: (Silence)

Next meeting June 10. Probably no votes. Maybe we can invite Anne and go over a few SCRs. Maybe, if it works out.

DDWG Notes 2021-06-10

title: DDWG Notes 2021-06-10

layout: default

date: 2021-06-10

June 10, 2021

Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees: M. Drum, M. Gordon, E. Guinness, T. Hare, L. Huber, S. Hughes, R. Joyner, D. Kazden, T. Lim, J. Mafi, S. McLaughlin, R. Simpson and M. Costa Sitja

Known Observers: P. Lawton

DDWG Agenda

(Included in email sent June 9, from T. Hare, DDWG agenda for June 10, 2021)

0) Front-matter

- Key release dates (will keep link at

bottom): https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Furldefense.us%2Fv3%2F_https%3A%2F%2Ffnasa-pds.github.io%2Freleases%2F12.0%2Fplan.html*key-dates_%3B!w!!PvBDto6Hs4WbVuu7!b1EhE9y53rXlzORK4L_EdmoCdA5e2d66PDxoycW1oWyqISq3ivUnm7W6VDas4ZaCcF54uh_kvzY%24&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cfa029c34ebb64c3f7ed408d9304bc819%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637593924314830755%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6lk1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&data=tihd%2Bq3v7uqTxBnTb7ZP85IRwjBgV4EsoSMFzjr5CoQ%3D&reserved=0

- Last thoughts on the proposed dLDD CCB Charter and management processes / teams:

dLDD CCB Charter

- https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Furldefense.us%2Fv3%2F_https%3A%2F%2Fdocs.google.com%2Fdocument%2Fd%2F1ecxlKzEVoOdRZ8ALrwA59wkz2M3-mk8asLUzLISaz34%2Fedit%3Fusp%3Dsharing_%3B!w!!PvBDto6Hs4WbVuu7!b1EhE9y53rXlzORK4L_EdmoCdA5e2d66PDxoycW1oWyqISq3ivUnm7W6VDas4ZaCcF54-AvW-Qk%24&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cfa029c34ebb64c3f7ed408d9304bc819%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637593924314840712%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6lk1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&data=NTWbPvt4lwvQBbCXoky9Y98RFu7J4sWty33zpBrlTm4%3D&reserved=0

dLDD Management Process

- https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Furldefense.us%2Fv3%2F_https%3A%2F%2Fdocs.google.com%2Fdocument%2Fd%2F1kC2jTOFk4RAbn3Lfdd_xYWx1i2qw2OLC9NajGytirEQ%2Fedit%3Fusp%3Dsharing_%3B!w!!PvBDto6Hs4WbVuu7!b1EhE9y53rXlzORK4L_EdmoCdA5e2d66PDxoycW1oWyqISq3ivUnm7W6VDas4ZaCcF54T0VWkn0%24&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cfa029c34ebb64c3f7ed408d9304bc819%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637593924314840712%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6lk1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&data=bsWTKLvpz%2FN7UG9Sd4Mof%2FSd8i34ET3o%2FW3hQ6uPzo8%3D&reserved=0

(Brief Discussion)

I. ready for a vote

n/a

II. Status and New SCRs.

- 1) new CCB-331 - Add Values to Product Context.Reference List.Internal Reference.reference type
- 2) new CCB-330 - PDS Data Provider's Handbook contains contradictory phrasing with respect to files with the same file name
- 3) new CCB-329 - Broaden Definition of Attribute aperture
- 4) CCB-211/260 -- PDS4 file extension -- new email comments from Steve we can discuss here
- 5) CCB-327 - Require PDS4 labels to reference the PDS core schematron and validate accordingly
- 6) CCB-324 -- still might need some support from DDWG members before vote (review current status).
- 7) CCB-326 - Inconsistent Direction on How to Use Discipline Facets
-- on hold for this week
(Discussed)

III. Discussions (order somewhat random, we will get to what we can and is ready to be presented)

ATM: 303

NAIF: 295, 269

CIS/IMG: 209/316, 164, CCB-325 (link) - Support for video as product observational

EN: status on 209 (Steve)

IPDA: 261, 263

PPI: 222, 282, 230

RMS: 314, 210/275, 212

(Not Discussed)

parking lot:

1) CCB-265: need to ping Anne again.

2) RS: 259/281 (see new attachment to CCB-281) (on hold) **(Not Discussed)**

Next meeting, Thursday, June 24th, 2021

DDWG

Front Matter

Question: Is everyone still in a haze from the proposal?

Answer: Just starting to see the light of day.

~ Not sure how people did other work.

Not much on the agenda for today. Keeping key releases at the bottom.

Sounds like, from the MC yesterday, that we need to keep LDD planning sprints on the agenda. Need to see if new LDDs are allowed to be born.

~ No planning has been done yet. Will get a list out to figure out what needs to be done before a face to face

and we need a credible charter.

- ~ Someone is still learning GitHub, LDDs, the build system and such. There's a big learning curve.
- ~ There certainly is.
- ~ Understanding the process is difficult too.
- ~ Hearing this made someone feel better - glad it's not just them.
- ~ One person messed something up and had to have Jordan fix it. Thought they understood, but didn't.
- ~ Someone said they use a client for GitHub. Tends to help. Easier than using a command line.
- ~ Others used that too. Issue was more with understanding the process.

Status and New SCRs.

CCB-331 - Add Values to Product Context.Reference List.Internal Reference.reference type

See<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-331&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cfa029c34ebb64c3f7ed408d9304bc819%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637593924314840712%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=qeN8fZA1t2uvUwzioRsltE52hSQ72oWHikS1pzzZSQ%3D&reserved=0>

New SCR from Dick. It adds three reference types. It will either be withdrawn or modified. Will be using context to associate reference. It works.

Prefer that to waiting for CCB-288 (Change Internal Reference reference type to 'guided' text,

see<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-288&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cfa029c34ebb64c3f7ed408d9304bc819%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637593924314840712%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=s5CO%2BivLCnHQB%2FhAw%2F250E1DU%2FM26z0lqUPh7%2BN%2BbeQ%3D&reserved=0>). CCB-288 was a global solution. This just adds values.

- ~ Someone is surprised. Thought this looked pretty straight forward.
- ~ Someone else is working with a team that parses terms for search. Not sure what will happen with CCB-288.
- ~ Encouraging reporter to leave this in. Just need to put the definitions in.
- ~ They are in, but maybe misunderstood how to put this in jira. It's to add value change, but started putting it in as an SCR.
- ~ Someone is not seeing an enumerated values tab.
- ~ The values shouldn't have gotten lost.
- ~ Someone sees the definitions.
- ~ Reporter is not sure what queue this went into, but if people can see the definitions...
- ~ People will add comments.
- ~ Someone already did. Thought observatory seemed redundant, but fine.

CCB-288 is a larger bucket. Still hoping to get to it for the context browser and stuff, but also interested in hearing about parsing out stuff for search.

- ~ In one task using get reference type. This is becoming a key area of the IM.
- ~ Yes. It's critical to support search and navigation.

CCB-330 - PDS Data Provider's Handbook contains contradictory phrasing with respect to files with the same file name.

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-330&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cfa029c34ebb64c3f7ed408d9304bc819%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637593924314840712%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6I1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=YMcZaa2krR4s9efg18TBdPSuWsjNnfeh43Mx4RFmCf%3D&reserved=0>

This is a new one from Marc. It's straight forward. You can have products with the same file name across the archive. Need a minor update to the DPH.

~ Not sure who updates the handbook. Maybe Susie. Maybe we can just let her know and be done with this. It's not a standard.

Someone put in two comments. Thinks this is important. Wants to elevate this at least to a best practice or, even better, a requirement. XML file name has to be LID because we do everything by LID. It's easier for users if file names map to LIDs. Seems like we've missed something not making that association required.

~ But labels point to the LID.

~ This is a separate issue. For NAIF, at the last part of the LID a prefix collection is added, so user can have a reference to where the file is. What you are presenting doesn't help SPICE archive users. Not filename.

~ We need to work on this.

LID might need more to make it unique. ATMOS has some that are a combo of sub-directory and filename. Filename alone not always enough for uniqueness.

~ If we are trying to make sure LIDs in a collection are unique than having filenames in different sub-directories might not be unique without the directory structure. Bigger problem.

~ This will have a big impact on backwards compatibility.

~ This is very concerning. We need a tiger team for this.

~ Directory structure is ephemeral. There's no requirement to have a directory structure when you deliver the archive.

Question: Products have a file area and lots of references, so from product down is there sufficient information to identify the files?

Answer: The issue is the same filenames in different sub-directories. We don't require a directory structure.

Another Question: Confused. Isn't directory name in the file area?

Answer: No.

~ That should have been there.

~ We don't require directories. PDS4 deals with logical structure. Issue is unique filenames. I hijacked this simple SCR and went down a rabbit hole.

Question: Lost. Does everyone agree with the change to the DPH?

Answer: No. Haven't read it yet.

~ Someone doesn't see new suggested phrasing for the Requested Changes.

~ It's the last phrase of the paragraph.

~ Everyone should review this. Comments might be outside the scope of this. Think this is really a surface issue.

****Action Item - Everyone** review this.**

CCB-329 - Broaden Definition of Attribute aperture

See [https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-330&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cfa029c34ebb64c3f7ed408d9304bc819%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637593924314840712%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6I1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=YMcZaa2krR4s9efg18TBdPSuWsjNnfeh43Mx4RFmCf%3D&reserved=0)

[327&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cfa029c34ebb64c3f7ed408d9304bc819%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637593924314840712%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Iik1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=XyeGllpgb2wZb1WMYEmALUZhSAE3eSHqopBUNKVaCD4%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-327&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cfa029c34ebb64c3f7ed408d9304bc819%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637593924314840712%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Iik1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=XyeGllpgb2wZb1WMYEmALUZhSAE3eSHqopBUNKVaCD4%3D&reserved=0)

Another new SCR from Dick. Should be an easy one. Definition of aperture is for telescope and includes words like "light". We also have aperture in radio science. Want to change the wording to be more general. Exact wording being requested is in the SCR. Ran the proposal by SBN. They are Okay with it.

IMG got a request to add aperture number DSL or R cameras.

~ That might be a different issue.

~ Sounds like multiple apertures on an instrument and need to specify. Ready to vote now.

~ We need a TA.

~ We can vote on this next time. IMG will figure out the other issue.

Question: Definition question, is there a discrepancy...?

Answer: Will look at that. Not all apertures are circular. Intent was to come up with a diameter of a collecting area. Will check on that.

CCB-327 - Require PDS4 labels to reference the PDS core (common) schema and schematron and validate accordingly See [https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-327&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cfa029c34ebb64c3f7ed408d9304bc819%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637593924314840712%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Iik1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=AOkplhw9M%2Bw%2FFfKODb3GZDpD%2BGftKW1bgC0JouAxUwQ%3D&reserved=0)

[327&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cfa029c34ebb64c3f7ed408d9304bc819%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637593924314840712%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Iik1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=AOkplhw9M%2Bw%2FFfKODb3GZDpD%2BGftKW1bgC0JouAxUwQ%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-327&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cfa029c34ebb64c3f7ed408d9304bc819%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637593924314840712%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Iik1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=AOkplhw9M%2Bw%2FFfKODb3GZDpD%2BGftKW1bgC0JouAxUwQ%3D&reserved=0)

There were updates by email. Stef emailed Trent that NSSDCA decided to modify their software to stop issuing an error when it can't find a reference to the core schema and schematron. Just a warning now. Would like to withdraw this, unless the DDWG wants to continue with it.

Question: Comments?

Answer: Maybe this isn't urgent for the nodes.

~ Withdraw it. If it comes up again can point to this.

~ Someone still has concerns. More concerns about having this than not having it.

~ There were some good comments related to validate tool. Would maybe put in a software ticket.

~ Did first submit a software ticket, but Jordan said to take it to the DDWG.

~ Someone agrees with Jordan. It should come to the DDWG first to make sure what we ask them to do is what we want.

Question: Will withdraw this if it's alright with everyone.

Answer: Yes.

~ Important PDS issue, but not critical for NSSDCA.

Trent has Stef's agreement to withdraw this.

~ Maybe someone will take this forward in the future.

CCB-260 - PDS4 label files do not have a unique file extension.

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-260&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cfa029c34ebb64c3f7ed408d9304bc819%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637593924314840712%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=bU6qbVfNU7CbPwjIzFXFQz1F64h6C6w69h3QFgXDGfs%3D&reserved=0>

We had a goal to get this done, but there was a big email of concerns sent.

~ We had a good conversation last time, with no real conclusion. Had an action item to ask Jordan if he was concerned about having to open every file. Also said if hybrid solution he has to open all the files. I still prefer no change, but only two people support that. If we have a registry it should get you to the label, but we don't have that capability yet. Might need to add a suffix to the label. Think that might have been voted down, but don't have to open files with that. LBLX might be the best solution. I voted against it, but now would vote for XML with suffix at the end.

~ That's a non-starter for GEO. Mars 2020 packed so much information into their filenames that they became unintelligible for users trying to read the name. It becomes impossible.

~ So, making it longer won't work.

~ Thought the issue was not having to have software open the files. A suffix would fix that.

~ That's only one part of it. Anne was vehemently opposed to stacked extensions. Seemed like there was consensus behind a single extension, mime type.

~ So many what ifs. We need to consider the SCR as stated.

Question: So, you would require all labels to have PDS4 as final part of the filename before the file extension?

Answer: Yes. Something parseable. Says it's a label.

Another Question: Instead of LBLX? Problems with .XML context files.

~ XML extension makes sense for XML files.

Another Question: So, you think PDS4.XML. Would the same think work with LBLX if we created a mime type?

Answer: If hybrid bundle than Jordan has to open every file. With a suffix he doesn't.

Another Question: Same thing either way. Have to go back and insert that everywhere. So why not LBLX?

Answer: Either solution. The point is the need to be uniform across the bundle and we won't be successful if secondary products from version 1.0 are in the bundle. Software driving this is wrong approach. Should have a flag to say what label extensions are used in the bundle, LBLX or PDS4.XML. It will require a bit of intelligence for the tool. Not seeing PDS4.XML as an advantage.

Question: Regarding supplemental references - aren't they LIDs? that point to a label?

Answer: The problem is including secondary members and them being included with labels from version 1.0.

~ One of you is talking about supplemental products, the other is talking about secondary.

~ If want to include a physical product from version 1.0 as a secondary member in my new bundle that has a XML label. Could do it with two passes - look at every file twice.

~ We've had this discussion. The ticket hasn't been updated yet, but want to formalize the proposal and then we can debate the specifics.

~ Jordan says he has to open files if mixed cases. Doesn't want to do that.

This is it for today. We need to move this forward. This is a big change. Users may or may not like it. Has repercussions. We need to be comfortable voting on this as it reads. Still waffling myself. XML is special, and we're years into this. Maybe we shouldn't allow XML data. Don't know. Okay with LBLX.

~ We might need to provide better tools to our users.

~ Lots of libraries don't care about the file extension. Have to decide if we want to go down this road.

****Action Item - Mike**** will go ahead and update the SCR and include a comment so it will get a time-stamp.

The goal is one more pass at this and try to make it concrete enough to vote on. Not sure if we have ever voted on this in the past.

~ No.

~ Next time is the session with Anne. We may have a pile of SCRs to deal with.

Question: Should we go over this with Anne?

Answer: Yes, but at the end.

~ Trent will try to send the agenda out early.

Question: Is anything happening with the DDWG at the F2F in July?

Another Question: Do we want to do a half day session?

Answer: Not everyone will be there.

~ There's nothing for Jordan, but we could discuss the sprint coming up for the February LDD hullabaloo.

~ SBN has a topic - versioning in the archive and registry. There are lots of open questions on that.

~ Trent will talk to Jordan. Doesn't expect a F2F. Maybe we could do two or three hours since we won't be in person. Could just extend one of these sessions.

****Action Items- Trent**** will talk to Jordan. ****Everyone**** think of special topics. Versioning is an important one.

Question: Open floor? Any emergencies?

Answer: (Silence)

Next meeting June 24, 2021.

DDWG Notes 2021-06-24

title: DDWG Notes 2021-06-24

layout: default

date: 2021-06-24

June 24, 2021

Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees: M. Drum, E. Guinness, T. Hare, L. Huber, S. Hughes, R. Joyner, D. Kazden, J. Mafi, S. McLaughlin, A. Raugh, R. Simpson and M. Costa Sitja

Known Observers: D. Coia (alternate for T. Lim) and B. Hirsh (alternate for P. Lawton)

DDWG Agenda

(Included in email sent June 22, from T. Hare, DDWG agenda for June 24, 2021)

0) Front-matter

Invited Anne to maybe settle a couple of issues (see below)

(Anne Attended)

I. ready for a vote? (requested T/As)

1) CCB-329 - Broaden Definition of Attribute aperture

2) maybe - CCB-211/260 -- PDS4 file extension

(Voted to pass CCB-329)

Anne to help clarify (Anne reported most)

1) CCB-265 - Complete internationalization for local dictionaries -- I would like to close

2) CCB-164 - Display Settings not required for images -- On my plate but could be onerous if implemented...?

3) CCB-261/222 -- Add citation text to Citation Information -- consider withdrawal?

4) Maybe talk to file extension and there are a few others (not for now, e.g. 230, 210/275, 314, 259/281)

(Discussed)

II. Status and New SCRs.

1) new CCB-332 - Header definitions are too loose for the validate tool

2) CCB-330 - PDS Data Provider's Handbook contains contradictory phrasing with respect to files with the same file name

3) CCB-331 - Add Values to Product Context.Reference List.Internal Reference.reference type - moving forward?

4) CCB-327 - Require PDS4 labels to reference the PDS core schematron and validate accordingly

5) CCB-324 -- still might need some support from DDWG members before vote (review current status).

6) CCB-326 - Inconsistent Direction on How to Use Discipline Facets

-- on hold for this week

** (Not Discussed) **

III. Discussions (order somewhat random, we will get to what we can and is ready to be presented)

ATM: 303

NAIF: 295, 269

CIS/IMG: 209/316, 164 (see above), CCB-325 - Support for video as product observational

EN: status on 209 (Steve)

IPDA: 261, 263

PPI: 222, 282, 230

RMS: 314, 210/275, 212

** (Some Discussion) **

parking lot:

1) IMG: CCB-265: need to ping Anne again (see above).

2) RS: 259/281 (see new attachment to CCB-281) (on hold)

** (Some Discussion) **

Next meeting, Thursday, July 8th, 2021

DDWG

(Note taker had audio problems at the very start of the meeting. Unsure if missed anything)

I. ready for a vote

CCB-329- Broaden Definition of Attribute aperture

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds->

[jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-329&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cc52f57f43e7f42af8ebb08d93b52ea96%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637606049578072078%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjA)

[329&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cc52f57f43e7f42af8ebb08d93b52ea96%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637606049578072078%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjA](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-329&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cc52f57f43e7f42af8ebb08d93b52ea96%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637606049578072078%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjA)
[wMDAiLCJQIjojV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IkhWwILCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&data=JAPOMM7QSg3K2ipsxslZnglaXbPLp1%2FYn0RcVRnFvml%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-329&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cc52f57f43e7f42af8ebb08d93b52ea96%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637606049578072078%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjA)

This one has a TA. Seems like we are ready to vote. RMS emailed a Yes vote.

Question: Any last issues or comments?

Answer: (Silence)

**The Vote for CCB-329

ATMOS - Yes

IMG - Yes

EN - Yes

GEO - Yes** (in Chat due to audio issues)

**IPDA - Yes

NAIF - Yes
PPI - Yes
RS - Yes
SBN - Yes**

Passed.

CCB-260 - PDS4 label files do not have a unique file extension

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-260&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cc52f57f43e7f42af8ebb08d93b52ea96%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637606049578082037%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=wqBZi%2B0q%2BqIB%2B3kRxrKUIIMHo%2B4Pym8yc80v1wCfjDFU%3D&reserved=0>

We are not voting on this yet. There is still some discussion to have. Will hold off on commenting while we wait for Anne to arrive. It was her ticket that Mike has taken on.

~ There have been some updates in jira to the secondary collection label issues. It can be discussed later.

Anne is here now.

Anne was asked if she had any last comments on this one.

~ Learned at an IVOA meeting that we can create a mime type without doing any paperwork. Thinks the Requested Changes look fine.

~ The TA has been provided, but someone still has reservations about the solution. A possible solution has been provided to mixed extensions. Everyone should look and make sure they agree. There will be significant impact. Original intent was to never access files through anything but a LIDVID.

~ True once data are archived, but can't access before registered or if it's taken off-line later. Ideally, yes, just walk through the registry, but there are boundaries.

~ Yes. Original design required a robust registry, which we don't have.

~ Extension can be changed if user needs that, once it's in the registry.

~ Someone is confused about what the TA says this effects the IM.

~ Maybe in OPS products, not in product observational.

~ Minimal impact on the IM. Impact is to the users. This is one of those things where the ideal solution is overcome by events.

~ This gets us to the file system not mattering. Now a bunch of assumptions are built in. The ideal is still achievable. Need to think about the registry, but it's not there. We will be dealing with a file system for awhile.

~ Any TA issues can be cleared up off-line.

This does have a broad impact. Probably the biggest change for this build. LF was the biggest for last time.

~ It will make an immediate difference. We will be able to archive our ingest.xml files and other XML files that should be included in the archive. Important because this is an issue that impacts us. Gives people with XML files a path forward.

Because of the impact to the community and our users, someone needs to check the wording in all our documents to make sure XML labels are not assumed.

~ Also need to make sure everyone understands the solution for all bundles and collections with mixed labels.

~ Can't mix at the bundle level.

Question: Why would we change the documentation if the SCR isn't voted in?

Answer: The documentation changes need to be in the Requested Changes. Part of the SCR.

~ SCR has a list of places we might want to make changes.

Another Question: Do we need a volunteer to dig through the documentation?

Answer: Someone looked at the Concepts document. It's a good idea to get people to look.

~ Someone is willing to take a look, but not sure what documentation needs to be changed by the SCR.

~ The common documents. The DPH would be a big deal.

Question: Will documents be updated twice? For the transition and when the transition is over?

Answer: Mostly once, but some twice.

~ If the DPH examples are changed to LBLX then that better work. Not sure what the software schedule is.

~ Next build. Need to have the documents updated.

~ Software has to be updated to support changes noted in the documents. Would do a transition document.

Wouldn't update the documents.

Someone is still fighting to have this voted on. If it fails, no changes. If it passes we'll need to let EN know this is coming. Would be willing to write an SCR to address the documentation issue tied to software. Seems like this is going to pass.

Question: Is anyone flat out against this?

Answer: Yes. NAIF.

~ Someone is still tempted to push for a vote.

~ IPDA has reservations.

Question: When is the next meeting?

Answer: July 8. People can send their votes in email or have a substitute attend.

CCB-265 - Complete internationalization for local dictionaries

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-265&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cc52f57f43e7f42af8ebb08d93b52ea96%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637606049578082037%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=q7H26i5%2BpGLHGRTxWrVVtzFp6hnnWhrxTiWiEcBQIQ0%3D&reserved=0>

There are several things to discuss while Anne is here, but this one keeps floating around. Mark said it could be withdrawn. Not sure if that is still the case.

~ If Mark is happy this can be closed. Anne opened it for IPDA because they couldn't do so at the time. This can be closed.

~ Withdraw and close are not the same thing.

~ That was easy.

CCB- 164 - Display Settings not required for images

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-164&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cc52f57f43e7f42af8ebb08d93b52ea96%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637606049578082037%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=GW7UpM3vPKIEHyH8g7zkti3>

[DNQcCBW9GYcKdaYSwM0%3D&reserved=0](#)

This is on Trent's plate. If we have a 300 band image we need display settings 300 times.

~ No. If 300 arrays because there's a one to one relationship through the local internal reference. There are two solutions. Could allow a single local internal reference to list multiple identifiers (like 300 of them) or point backwards with inverse logic from the local internal reference. Neither is particularly desirable. Could maybe say they all have to use the same settings. The other question is if you have 300 objects if you are going to display them.

Question: New people - any questions?

Answer: This is purely about display.

~ The issue of multiple arrays is the stopping point for passing this (bad audio).

~ Not sure - all options are not ideal. Do see this as important, but would be very rare to have a different display direction.

~ Someone hasn't seen that in our simple data. It could be possible in a composite object.

~ Would want a separate file in that case.

Question: Any other comments? We should resolve this.

Answered with Another Question: Is it possible there would ever be a label with a spectral cube with a number of back planes with 2D and 3D objects... (???)

~ Assume it's congenial, so if there's a single display settings class and that's what you do ninety percent of the time, then could make local internal reference optional and assume it applies to everything. Not good for modeling. Think between the assumption and a kludge. Like local internal reference equals asterisk, then asterisk is slightly preferable. So the relationship is from display settings to images.

~ Maybe on to something. Usually reference types relate to instances. This is more about parent class. Don't want N times, just refer to the class. Static versus non-static.

~ Could replace local internal reference with another class that defines the base object type and reference.

~ That makes sense. We don't want to overload what we have. Can add new construct of one to many.

~ Could be applicable to others, like geometry.

~ We can do what we want in the model, but this could cause a headache. Giving software a relationship without a hard link.

~ Might be useful to talk to Jordan and object orientated programmers and see if something can be added to the model.

~ This will impact people writing readers.

~ It's important to have programmers in this discussion.

~ Jordan is currently working on adding semantics.

We will look at this again.

~ Maybe back to design.

~ Optional.

~ Yes, but there are datasets with multiple display classes. Seems to be unnecessary complication instead of necessary complexity.

CCB-261 - Add an optional method for indicating that a product is a member of a larger collection that has a DOI and CCB-222 - Add citation text to Citation Information

See [https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-261&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C52f57f43e7f42af8ebb08d93b52ea96%7C0693b5ba4b184d)

[261&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C52f57f43e7f42af8ebb08d93b52ea96%7C0693b5ba4b184d](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-261&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C52f57f43e7f42af8ebb08d93b52ea96%7C0693b5ba4b184d)

7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637606049578082037%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=k9o9OQypkb%2BrrUw55xt2Ns9BGdTI3Psu48z08IcL32E%3D&reserved=0 and <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-222&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cc52f57f43e7f42af8ebb08d93b52ea96%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637606049578082037%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=Ub1Em5vfCFykiSZCDF4hzGjoapzZhE3wrLwJJoT5E5s%3D&reserved=0>

These are the citation ones.

~ Two completely different issues.

~ CCB-261 was filed by Anne because someone needed it filed - doesn't agree with it. Seems like PSA is planning to do something with DOIs that not everyone can support. That troubles someone. Don't think DOI metadata should be tracked to that level of metadata. This is a function that shouldn't be done by the PDS label.

Question: Other discussion?

Answer: Someone agrees. Would keep the metadata separate.

Another Question: Do we need to talk to Tanya?

Answer: Yes, and the other nodes too.

~ Someone thought CCB-261 was to provide metadata that product is a part of the collection.

~ If it can be assigned before it's archived then putting a DOI in that product is fine. Other DOIs it's associated with are not necessarily an inherit property of the data.

~ Tanya should be in this discussion.

~ Yes. We are getting context now. Comments will be added in jira.

CCB-222 has two problems. PDS can't tell publishers how to form citations. All we can do is provide the information. It is useful to be able to have the DOI metadata all formatable. We have free form text fields.

Would suggest new class that could be parseable, but a lot to burden a label with. The solution here is a new class with all the detail to help automate the DOI metadata process.

~ This is something someone has been thinking about. The fields we would want for search are what we would want for DOIs. Would be very valuable.

~ Someone wholeheartedly agrees with the new class.

~ Yes - either use the new class or use citation description. We can make a decision at 2.0. It will be non-backwards compatible.

Question: If you specify DOI in a base product or collection would this be required there?

Answer: The new class would tag the components, so the metadata can be extracted to get the DOI. Could also assume DOIs are gotten early. We have to maintain metadata.

Another Question: URI?

Answer: All are a URI automatically. DOI metadata would probably be in the registry because it's changeable. That doesn't belong in a label.

~ People haven't thought about this in a while.

~ This was pulled for today because Anne had a lot of comments.

Question: Why is this a high priority?

Answer: This floated to the top.

~ Not sure why we would consider it high priority.

~ This is more about the metadata. By not including this in labels we are missing metadata. Would be against

only including the DOI and not having all this stuff.

~ DOI metadata is a good model. Sort of common set of things.

~ In the last five years it is clear that everyone was working on metadata, but hadn't converged until Data Cite did.

~ Now someone is trying to convince Data Cite that they need an IM. DOI information might not be a good name for the new class.

~ Someone one wouldn't call it citation either.

~ Someone would call it provenance.

Next meeting July 8. We will probably vote on PDS file extension.

DDWG Notes 2021-07-08

DDWG on hiatus; no meeting on this date.

DDWG Notes 2021-07-22

title: DDWG Notes 2021-07-22

layout: default

date: 2021-07-22

July 22, 2021

Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees: M. Gordon, E. Guinness, T. Hare, D. Kazden, T. Lim, S. McLaughlin and R. Simpson
Known Observers: P. Lawton, L. Neakrase (alternate for L. Huber), Boris Semenov and J. Stone

DDWG Agenda

(Included in email sent July 20, from T. Hare, DDWG agenda for July 22, 2021)

0) Front-matter

Passed Bug report last time: CCB-329 - Broaden Definition of Attribute aperture Requested that Ron can close (per Anne/Mark) CCB-265 - Complete internationalization for local dictionaries ****(Brief Mention)****

I. ready for a vote? (requested T/As)

N/A

II. Status and New SCRs.

Follow-up with DDWG -- (also based on discussions with Anne)

1) CCB-260 -- PDS4 file extension -- new information to consider from F2F (e.g., allowing .xml and .blx forever).
reminder - related CCB-211.

2) CCB-261 -- Add an optional method for indicating that a product is a member of a larger collection that has a DOI -- Need to talk to Tanya

3) CCB-222 -- Add citation text to Citation Information -- elevate this? Who is willing to push this forward?

4) CCB-164 - "Display" -- moved to parking lot below ****(Some Discussion)****

0) new CCB-332 - Header definitions are too loose for the validate tool -- Marc C. out for meeting (push introduction)

1) new CCB-333 - add Units of Loudness with decibel (dB) as an option -- Trent will introduce

2) CCB-330 - PDS Data Provider's Handbook contains contradictory phrasing with respect to files with the same file name

3) CCB-331 - Add Values to Product Context.Reference List.Internal Reference.reference type - moving forward?

4) CCB-327 - Require PDS4 labels to reference the PDS core schematron and validate accordingly

5) CCB-324 -- still might need some support from DDWG members before vote (review current status).

6) CCB-326 - Inconsistent Direction on How to Use Discipline Facets

-- on hold for this week

(Some Discussion)

III. Discussions (order somewhat random, we will get to what we can and is ready to be presented)

ATM: 303

NAIF: 295, 269

CIS/IMG: 209/316, 164 (see above), CCB-325 (link) - Support for video as product observational

EN: status on 209 (Steve)

IPDA: 261, 263

PPI: 222, 282, 230

RMS: 314, 210/275, 212

parking lot:

1) CCB-164 -- Display Settings not required for images -- (IMG) - Need to think more about potential updates to Imaging and how Display might fit.

2) RS: 259/281 (see new attachment to CCB-281) (on hold) ***(Not Discussed)***

Next meeting, Thursday, Aug 5th, 2021

DDWG

Front Matter

We did not meet July 8. People were busy with the review.

We passed CCB-329 as a bug fix, there was some push back from the CCB. They say it is not a bug fix, more of an enhancement. There are no strict definitions.

It has been requested that Ron close CCB-265.

No votes today.

Status

CCB-260 - PDS4 label files do not have a unique file extension.

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds->

[jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-)

[260&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C8bc9793e86f94ae700ed08d9529dce59%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637631659998054641%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjojV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=F3S9atJVhWNDgk8whtjd6BS9FZx7DqOCTNexQ%2FFGRPY%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-260&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C8bc9793e86f94ae700ed08d9529dce59%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637631659998054641%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjojV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=F3S9atJVhWNDgk8whtjd6BS9FZx7DqOCTNexQ%2FFGRPY%3D&reserved=0)

The assignee is not here today, but we still want to try to take care of PDS extension. Boris made some strong arguments at the MC wanting to know why we can't allow both forever. He brings up good arguments asking

why we would change what we have always had.

~ Someone doesn't understand the objection. If NAIF is staying with version 1.5 forever, not sure why should they prevent others from changing.

~ It is not true that NAIF can stay at 1.5. At some point there will be a directive for all tools to only support version 2. It's what happened going from PDS3 to PDS4. When version 2 is mandatory everyone will have to replace all their labels. It will be a huge effort. Not hearing a good argument to do this.

~ In DDWG discussion no one even thought about that. Lots of other issues came up, but the idea that version 2 would limit the use of XML labels wasn't really considered. Glad this is being brought up. Version 2 will be difficult and will throw users under the bus. No reason to limit XML labels other than to be consistent.

Question: This is an instance where a tiny data type is driving a huge change. Are there any statistics on how many XML data files there will be?

Answer: Not sure that's the right way to look at it. That doesn't allow any XML data.

~ That's fine. Not arguing to not allow that, asking for both label extensions so that things can remain backwards compatible.

~ There would also be an issue for our LDDs.

Question: Wouldn't they be at EN node?

Answer: Struggling with the concern. For the sake of argument, we will go to version 2 and bundle will be required to use LBLX. Further in the future, everything will be required to migrate to LBLX. Don't see that as a problem. Seems trivial. As to why we should do this - it will make it easier to always identify a label for all of PDS. It will be a simplification. A benefit to the users.

~ If we disallow XML as labels then you know that all XML files are data. No parsing required.

~ Someone does not agree. You can look at the bundle file and know from that one file what kind of labels there are - LBLX or XML.

~ Yes, but a lot of users won't look at the bundle label. There are ways to write this so our software will be okay with both, but that would mean that there could be a problem for LBLX bundles including a physical copy of a secondary product that has an XML extension. We would need context products with both kinds of labels.

~ So, just change the extension.

~ Thought changing the extension is the problem.

~ All the producer pipelines and users who have been using PDS4 are trained to use XML and use that for their tools. Thinking about them.

~ Don't see a problem for pipelines. Probably one line of code to change. The bigger problem will probably be for end user software. Can restrict bundles to have one extension or the other, but context products with different extensions would have to be two versions of the same product. Not sure how we would handle that.

~ Someone isn't sure they agree. When you change the file extension of a label file you are not changing the product. Thought that what we care about is the LIDVID in the registry and the associations. Don't think changing the label extension matters.

~ Registry would include the product location, in addition to the LIDVID. The question is how to distinguish if both a LBLX or XML label. Could be a problem if we do a strict exclusion of XML. In PDS3 we had lots of label extensions, and it was frustrating, but it wasn't a killer. Sounds like for a vote there's enough people who would maintain XML in version 2.

Question: What about the TA?

Answer: IPDA has a big problem with this ticket. We form operational bundles. New versions of files are added. This will prevent updates because it will give us mixed bundles. We are having an issue with the XML documents. If the ticket could limit it to collections, not the whole bundle, then it could work for us. Need it uniform across a collection instead of a bundle.

~ That would imply that we should allow both.

~ IPDA has XML documents. Things wouldn't break if we could just label that, but if it has to be by bundle that would break us.

~ Not sure data products should become documents.

~ That's a different problem. When we (IPDA) upgrade a data bundle, we put new products with old ones. We wouldn't just be able to add the version 2 products. It would be a mess. Would be left in a legacy state. For new missions, could use the new file extension for XML documents, but wouldn't ask for that for a whole bundle.

Question: So it would be better for IPDA if you can choose only one option for extensions, but at the collection level, not the bundle level?

Answer: Yes. It would allow you to include ingest files too.

Another Question: Can you write this as a comment for jira? ****(Action Item - Tanya)****

Answer: Yes. This is the difference between my voting yes or no.

Someone looked at the TA. Not sure it's complete. Would like to see the impact on the software.

~ ****Action Item - Trent**** will tell Steve to add more info to the TA.

We are not ready to vote.

~ Need more details on how software will be modified and the impact. Would like feedback from the software guys.

~ Someone is in the middle, but it seems like limiting XML extension in version 2 sounds bad.

Question: Any last comments or questions?

Answer: (Silence)

CCB-261 - Add an optional method for indicating that a product is a member of a larger collection that has a DOI See [https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-261&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C8bc9793e86f94ae700ed08d9529dce59%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637631659998054641%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=%2FmSqEKU2YuGqjtDBfoaHR0pJWo%2FJuZznHOnSVDQYsw4%3D&reserved=0)

[261&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C8bc9793e86f94ae700ed08d9529dce59%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637631659998054641%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=%2FmSqEKU2YuGqjtDBfoaHR0pJWo%2FJuZznHOnSVDQYsw4%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-261&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C8bc9793e86f94ae700ed08d9529dce59%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637631659998054641%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=%2FmSqEKU2YuGqjtDBfoaHR0pJWo%2FJuZznHOnSVDQYsw4%3D&reserved=0)

IPDA is happy either way on this. Not really an issue, but the way PDS operates with operational bundles and data collections, it's killed us with versioning. We're just going to assign a single DOI to a collection. We know it breaks things and might make Anne cry, but it's how we have to work.

Question: Anyone have a reason to push this forward?

Answer: Fine if this is withdrawn.

Another Question: Can't remember Anne's comments. Anyone else have any comments?

Answer: (Silence)

CCB-222 - Add citation text to Citation Information

See [https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-222&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C8bc9793e86f94ae700ed08d9529dce59%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637631659998064598%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=bhQB6s%2BVFrnhJnbUav6Ni)

[jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-222&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C8bc9793e86f94ae700ed08d9529dce59%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637631659998064598%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=bhQB6s%2BVFrnhJnbUav6Ni](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-222&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C8bc9793e86f94ae700ed08d9529dce59%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637631659998064598%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=bhQB6s%2BVFrnhJnbUav6Ni)

[Oz%2Bp0XrEEXQ%2B3dxKeUOHIA%3D&reserved=0](#)

This seemed elevated last time. Not sure where it was left, but sounded like a real thing that needed to happen.

Question: Has anyone thought about this?

Answer: (Silence)

~ We will keep it and ask again.

New SCRs

There are two new SCRs. Maybe we won't introduce them both now.

CCB-333 - add Units of Loudness with decibel (dB) as an option

See [https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-333&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C8bc9793e86f94ae700ed08d9529dce59%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637631659998064598%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=XAc%2BxMFvJ7CRcF2aE0qaF%2FcGFe55cU%2FG%2F16RI5sRMPo%3D&reserved=0)

[333&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C8bc9793e86f94ae700ed08d9529dce59%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637631659998064598%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=XAc%2BxMFvJ7CRcF2aE0qaF%2FcGFe55cU%2FG%2F16RI5sRMPo%3D&reserved=0](#)

[333&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C8bc9793e86f94ae700ed08d9529dce59%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637631659998064598%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=XAc%2BxMFvJ7CRcF2aE0qaF%2FcGFe55cU%2FG%2F16RI5sRMPo%3D&reserved=0](#)

This is for Mars 2020. IMG got the message that decibel is wrongly stated as an SI unit, so the documentation out there is hit or miss. DB is widely used - it's an understood value.

Question: Is this a problem? They need something for loudness.

Answer: If this isn't a scientific unit that can be calibrated not sure we should be archiving it. They can archive the data.

~ Confused. It came up for RIMFAX, which is radar.

~ Yes, including a value in DB implies more than just sound. It's a ratio of power in some sense. Not necessarily sound. Different from microphones.

Question: If talking about relative strength of a signal, if broadcast and get back 20% of strength, that's not a microphone - are we mixing things?

Answer: Yes.

~ The type seems wrong.

~ Would be nice to have this in some way.

~ Not sure what they should use. All they need is a reference. Could be in pascals. There are many things to measure, like pressure. Got to be able to calibrate. Needs a lot more thought.

~ For radar we already have units for strength of signal received. This is for two things.

~ Radar labels had DB as units.

~ Usually in terms of element watts and then express strength of signal.

~ Unclear what we will allow in the IM.

~ Can't have DB by itself. Not a unit that can stand alone.

Question: Who could be contacted about this?

Answer: It came up in the EDR labels. Will figure it out off-line.

~ Person who started this didn't expect it to get this hard. Will check again with RIMFAX.

~ It's a ground penetrating radar. Not the first. Hangs off the rover, slightly above the ground.

To close today out, we have several tickets we've had for a long time. That includes display settings, which has been moved to the parking lot. Will think about images and how display settings fit.

Question: Anyone have anything we should discuss before the February LDD hullabaloo?

Answer: Someone wants to withdraw CCB-331 (Add Values to Product Context.Reference List.Internal Reference.reference type, see<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-331&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C8bc9793e86f94ae700ed08d9529dce59%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637631659998064598%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=ig%2BShLHXDsrgXsJeldohgCJWUBZnhEPxPGZXO74VatM%3D&reserved=0>). The reasons behind it were wrong.

Another Question: Do we need these enumerated values?

Answer: Someone thinks these are partly redundant. Maybe facility is the one we need.

Another Question: So, facility with an observatory would be facility to facility?

Answer: Yes, because observatories and laboratories are facilities.

~ What someone needs is context to facility.

~ **Action Item - Mitch** will change it to be facility to facility and add an example. Not a lot of work.

February plans.

~ We have a small organizing committee. We will begin with a February F2F if travel restrictions don't limit that. Everyone should try to keep February 2022 calendar open. It will be a fly in Sunday and leave Thursday night or Friday morning meeting. Organizing committee is looking at a few SCRs first - to clear the way. It will be two to three months of work. Probably weekly telecons and two to three F2Fs. There will be probably 20 to 30 people at the F2Fs. Will be an intense project. Dictionaries will be repaired by the end. Meeting - discipline modeling something project talking about modeling to make namespaces. Not much for people to do yet. Need to think about who will participate.

We will meet again on August 5.

DDWG Notes 2021-08-05

title: DDWG Notes 2021-08-05

layout: default

date: 2021-08-05

August 5, 2021

Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees: M. Drum, M. Gordon, E. Guinness, T. Hare, L. Huber, S. Hughes, R. Joyner, D. Kazden, T. Lim, J. Mafi, S. McLaughlin, R. Simpson and M. Costa Sitja

Known Observers: P. Lawton and Boris Semenov

DDWG Agenda

(Included in email sent August 3, from T. Hare, DDWG agenda for Aug 5, 2021)

0) Front-matter

Simply remove CCB-327 from list below -- already closed.

Mitch update for Feb. "DMSP" meeting.

(Discussed)

I. ready for a vote? (requested T/As)

N/A

II. Status and New SCRs.

Follow-up with DDWG -- (also based on discussions with Anne)

1) CCB-260 -- PDS4 file extension -- new information to consider from F2F (e.g., allowing .xml and .blx forever). reminder - related CCB-211. Please see new comment in Jira. Let Steve know needed T/A updates (for the meeting).

2) CCB-261 -- Add an optional method for indicating that a product is a member of a larger collection that has a DOI -- Last chance before recommending withdraw.

3) CCB-222 -- Add citation text to Citation Information -- elevate this? Who is willing to push this forward?

0) new CCB-332 - Header definitions are too loose for the validate tool -- Marc C. to introduce

1) CCB-333 - add Units of Loudness with decibel (dB) as an option -- Plan to withdraw and replace with Units of Power

2) CCB-330 - PDS Data Provider's Handbook contains contradictory phrasing with respect to files with the same file name

3) CCB-331 - Add Values to Product Context.Reference List.Internal Reference.reference type - moving forward?

4) CCB-324 -- still might need some support from DDWG members before vote (review current status).

5) CCB-326 - Inconsistent Direction on How to Use Discipline Facets

-- on hold for this week

****(Some Discussions)****

III. Discussions (order somewhat random, we will get to what we can and is ready to be presented)

ATM: 303

NAIF: 295, 269

CIS/IMG: 209/316, 164 (see above), CCB-325 (link) - Support for video as product observational

EN: status on 209 (Steve)

IPDA: 261, 263

PPI: 222, 282, 230

RMS: 314, 210/275, 212

****(Brief Discussion of 209)****

parking lot:

1) CCB-164 -- Display Settings not required for images -- (IMG) - Need to think more about potential updates to Imaging and how Display might fit.

2) RS: 259/281 (see new attachment to CCB-281) (on hold)

****(Not Discussed)****

Next meeting, Thursday, Aug 19th, 2021

DDWG

CCB-327 is closed.

Introduction to DMSP - Email was sent to the world - waiting for responses with date preferences.

~ Some people didn't respond because either date was fine.

~ DMSP would prefer to get email that says that so they can begin to get a headcount.

Question: Potential location?

Answer: Tucson. Just need to set a date. Would like to announce it at next week's MC so logistics can be arranged.

Status and New SCRs.

CCB-332 - Header definitions are too loose for the validate tool

See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-332>

Not much to discuss. This was found while working on new labels for the SPICE archive. Thought the header was stricter than it was. This should be documented in validate tool. Header was one byte off - overlapped with table - error was that table only had one record. Was hard to debug because of the non-specific error message.

Realized header definitely wasn't strict. Issue boils down to maybe improving the documentation and mentioning the looseness of the header definition in the DPH and improving the error message from validate.

~ Someone especially likes the suggestion to get more useful information from validate report.

~ A ton of confusion with offset last week. People are calling it 0 based and 1 based. In PDS3 you started at byte 1, in PDS4 your offset is zero, so start at one. Very confusing in tables. One based. So, saying that validate should be able to check for all this stuff.

~ This was an overlap. Header definition overlapped the start of the table character, so in this situation, finding the issue would have been helped with a better report from validate. Message was that table has one record.

~ Validate should say what happened.

Someone gets lots of messages that fields are overlapping.

~ It is forbidden for objects to overlap, so having validate say that would make validate easier to understand.

~ For two fields overlapping, would like validate to check that too. Seems the software is there.

~ Catches errors, but messages are not useful. Think this goes to Github as an issue.

~ There is a Github ticket too.

~ Someone checked - it's clearly a requirement - need to fix validate messages.

~ Sometimes multiple headers. The key is to get the correct start byte. Should make sure the DPH is very clear.

~ Offset is number you add to the start byte, so it's always one. It's a relative thing.

~ IM definitely says it's zero based.

~ Someone doesn't like that.

~ We need to check the SR and IM.

~ We already say objects can't overlap. Not something for this group to do. We need validate resolved.

Someone is concerned we are forgetting the clarity to the DPH and SR. That is in our purview.

~ Only the SR is in our purview. We can suggest updates to the DPH.

~ If a document is not as clear as we think it should be, we should fix that. Should leave this ticket open for that.

~ Someone is not sure how to change the SR.

~ The change would be in the SR. The document group would make the change after the CCB approval. Susie is the team.

~ Ron is involved too. Field location is defined, not start byte, but start byte begins at one.

~ Start byte is PDS3.

****Action Item - Mitch and Marc**** will work on recommendation for the SR and then bring it to this group, the CCB and then Susie. Marc will add a link to validate for the SCR.

Marc has found several confusing things in the last few months. Some one is glad of that and told him not to stop.

CCB-333 - add Units of Loudness with decibel (dB) as an option

See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-333>

This will probably be withdrawn. Reporter didn't understand. Will replace it with units of power. Assumed the ticket was for a microphone, but really more to do with radar. From RIMFAX team, wanted DB.

~ Make sure there is a correct unit before it is turned in.

~ This came up before. What's in the labels now is a note field. It says these are in DB. No unit associated with the attribute. Been through peer review and no one has complained.

This will be withdrawn and a better ticket will be put in.

~ Make sure the correct people are involved.

~ Reporter thought this was for audio, but it was not.

CCB- 331 - Add Values to Product Context.Reference List.Internal Reference.reference type

See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-331>

Reporter put in a very detailed request, then found a work around and was ready to withdraw, but someone was uncomfortable with that. Added an example. If we add facility to facility it would help. Or facility to observatory. Observatory is a facility. Laboratory is also a facility. So, if we put facility to observatory we should also put facility to laboratory. Would like to hear people's preferences. Facility to facility of facility to observatory and facility to laboratory. Would first like Steve's opinion.

~ Steve says all three are fine. If we want to make the relationships to a more specific facility, that could be useful for search.

~ Would also like to hear from Lynn.

~ We would need to look at what people have done.

Question: Anyone else?

Answer and Another Question: Yes, a question for Steve. When we have a product context and then reference a list, at the bottom we have the class. Is the idea for these references to go to class to something else in PDS?

Most references are in product context. Wondering if we have been misusing reference types. Should everything be context to something else?

~ Got about 80 percent of what you said.

Another Question: At the bottom you have facility. Should that be at top or reference types in that class at the bottom? Maybe overlapping jurisdictions.

~ Can iron this out, but to start - think of the bottom. Could have put product context instrument etc. Didn't do that. It's a short hand. User is interested in the product and what the reference is to.

Answer: There is an attribute at the top that tells you what is at the bottom. Wonder if we got off on the wrong foot. Been using context to associate, but seems useless for searching.

~ Context to anything is most useless. Discussed this years ago. Team kept it simple. Maybe we need to do some clean up or clarify.

~ The decision was to leave at the top to make it easier for software to find the references. Would be a fairly large change now.

~ We can nail it down and make it cleaner. Seems like we are installing band-aids.

~ Enough information to make a start. Will include all options in the SCR, including do nothing as an option.

This seems out of scope for February.

~ Maybe at an MC F2F. There should be a block of time for tech issues. A day or half a day for the tech group to meet. February is for discipline dictionaries.

~ Someone likes that suggestion.

~ Reference type has had some evolution but never got to where we were happy. It was for search. Jordan is using it now. This might be overcome by events. We probably won't be driving this. They will tell us.

~ We can ask for a heads up and let them know we are still grappling with this.

CCB-260 - PDS4 label files do not have a unique file extension.

See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-260>

Trying to get this off the table.

~ We all like LBLX. Going over the choice between LBLX and XML and the issue of how the software knows.

~ Someone wanted to know why version 2.0 would limit XML.

- ~ We were trying to minimize impact on tool guys. Then IPDA also brought up a problem. Maybe we should go to the tool guys now and ask about their algorithm.
- ~ Someone is fine with limiting to one or the other in a bundle, but not limiting XML.
- ~ IPDA needs the limit at the collection, not at the bundle.

Question: So, with IPDA bundle - they are reprocessing labels?

Answer: Creating new products with new LIDVIDs.

Another Question: Adjacent in the same collection? Is the data being reprocessed too?

Answer: Maybe not structurally, but improvements.

- ~ Darn. Suggested yesterday that products could have two labels. Thinks there's a misunderstanding about this ticket. The extension is not in the IM. Concerned about reprocessing. If files are duplicated or set to have a specific file extension it's really just an operational change.
- ~ Also a resource issue. IPDA has operational bundles with thousands of files. No resources to keep changing them.
- ~ This came up in a ticket for validate last week. Labels had upper case XML extension and validate refused it. We are already grappling with this.
- ~ Someone thinks this will fade away in the long run.

Sounds like we are still wanting to push forward.

****Action Item - Mike**** will update the SCR. Still would push to update at version 2.0. Not great, but it doesn't directly impact the IM. More of a documentation change.

Someone is concerned. We need to continue to support old versions of the IM when we are at 2.0, so we will always need support for XML.

- ~ Yes, multiple extensions exist at all times. Version 2.0 would be a transition until everything archived is migrated to 2.0.
- ~ Which there is no requirement to do.
- ~ And won't happen outside of NASA.
- ~ Probably not in PDS too.
- ~ And for long term missions.
- ~ This is a reckoning we need to have.
- ~ Can't see how. Version 2.0 isn't magical. We have to support all versions forever.
- ~ We are getting off topic.

Originally, there was an option to use either LBLX or XML within a bundle or collection. Want a minor impact on the tools. If a new bundle is going to have XML products they can use LBLX labels. they can do it anyway if they want to. Or they can stick with XML.

- ~ We need to update the ticket. In the Requested Changes.
- ~ If LBLX is an exception that will cause issues for people who don't know. Would like an action item for tools to see if having LBLX solves any issues.
- ~ We should ask if making it consistent in a collection solves the issue. In a bundle will be a problem.
- ~ Not if we allow XML forever.
- ~ If we have an XML data file, we need to have a LBLX label. Can't use XML for both product and label. There would be complications for tools.

The SCR will be updated and we will discuss this again.

- ~ Mike would like to have a side discussion with Steve on this issue and the EN core tools.
- ~ Someone from the development side can be involved.

Question: Did anyone see it coming that we would need to support upper case XML?

Answer: Think it's not case sensitive, but validate will complain if cases don't match. Warning if filename case is different. Haven't looked at the latest version.

~ Upper case XML was not being allowed by validate. We will revisit this next time.

Open Floor

Question: Any last questions?

Answer: Yes. On CCB-209 (Correct Definitions of Tagged-*Object, see <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-209>) A question for Steve. There was a new draft for 209, no response from Steve yet. There are questions about inheritance, etc.

Answer from Steve: It's on my desk. Will get an answer out. Also, and everyone can say no. Collections - mix XML and LBLX. Could have a flag in the products.

~ That's a chicken and egg problem if you have to look at the label to see the label extension.

~ Someone does not like that.

~ We need to be at the higher level.

~ Most users download a data file - not a collection inventory.

Next meeting - August 19.

DDWG Notes 2021-08-19

title: DDWG Notes 2021-08-19

layout: default

date: 2021-08-19

August 19, 2021

Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees: M. Drum, M. Gordon, E. Guinness, T. Hare, L. Huber, S. Hughes, R. Joyner, D. Kazden, J. Mafi, R. Simpson and M. Costa Sitja Known Observers: M. Bentley (alternate for T. Lim) P. Lawton, Boris Semenov and V. Tang

DDWG Agenda

(Included in email sent August 17, from T. Hare, DDWG agenda for Aug 19th, 2021)

0) Front-matter

- Mitch update for Feb. "DMSP" meeting.
 - Still on PDS4 label extension. EN responded to software impact - Mike can you report on that.
- **(Discussed)**

I. ready for a vote?

N/A

II. Status and New SCRs.

0) new CCB-334 -- The CTLI dictionary is not documented and does not appear to allow the description of multi-mode instruments

1) CCB-260 -- PDS4 file extension -- new information to consider from F2F. reminder - related CCB-211. Please see new comment in Jira. T/A updates still?.

2) CCB-261 -- Add an optional method for indicating that a product is a member of a larger collection that has a DOI -- Last chance before recommending withdraw.

3) CCB-222 -- Add citation text to Citation Information -- elevate this? head to parking lot?

4) CCB-209 -- Correct Definitions of Tagged-*Object -- any updates?

2nd tier:

0) CCB-332 - Header definitions are too loose for the validate tool -- Marc C. withdraw -- software issue, status.

1) CCB-333 - add Units of Loudness with decibel (dB) as an option -- Still need to withdraw and replace with Units of Power

2) CCB-330 - PDS Data Provider's Handbook contains contradictory phrasing with respect to files with the same file name

3) CCB-331 - Add Values to Product Context.Reference List.Internal Reference.reference type - moving forward?

4) CCB-324 -- still might need some support from DDWG members before vote (review current status).

5) CCB-326 - Inconsistent Direction on How to Use Discipline Facets

-- on hold for this week

(Discussed)

III. Discussions (order somewhat random, we will get to what we can and is ready to be presented)

ATM: 303

NAIF: 295, 269

CIS/IMG: 209/316, 164 (see above), CCB-325 - Support for video as product observational

EN: status on 209 (Steve)

IPDA: 261, 263

PPI: 222, 282, 230

RMS: 314, 210/275, 212

parking lot:

1) CCB-164 -- Display Settings not required for images -- (IMG) - Need to think more about potential updates to Imaging and how Display might fit.

2) RS: 259/281 (see new attachment to CCB-281) (on hold)

Next meeting, Thursday, Sept. 2nd, 2021

DDWG

(Note-taker had a lot of issues with the audio)

DMSP - The proposed F2F is the week of February 7 in Tucson.

Question: Is anyone looking at travel issues from their host institution? May need to be a hybrid meeting.

Answer: We will need to keep the virtual option. Hopefully people will be able to attend in person.

~ Too far out to know yet.

~ Rules change frequently.

~ For now, we are shooting for in person.

Status and New SCRs

CCB-334 - The CTLI dictionary is not documented and does not appear to allow the description of multi-mode instruments.

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds->

[jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-)

[334&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cb210ceed0c774ee5693f08d96d5b7e79%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637661062002956989%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjojV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=m3Xc8di0dYZ1HXMC3coYkhYWpg5Zr19ZrLPAtdlKBKo%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-334&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cb210ceed0c774ee5693f08d96d5b7e79%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637661062002956989%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjojV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=m3Xc8di0dYZ1HXMC3coYkhYWpg5Zr19ZrLPAtdlKBKo%3D&reserved=0)

There is a question of protocol. Issues that affect an LDD should be discussed with the steward, and if there are big issues then brought to the DDWG. This doesn't seem like it needs to be discussed at the DDWG level. Would like Trent to send an email to the reporter to discuss this with the steward. ****(Action Item - Trent)**** ~ This could have been a GitHub ticket.

~ Reporter should have done that and then the steward would have heard about it.

~ This will be discussed, but it feels like this is like taking a standards issue to the MC.

Lyle is the steward.

(Note-taker kicked off - came back to find Trent got temporarily kicked off too. People were discussing audio being problematic today.)

(Trent back)

We will try to wrap this up with a GitHub ticket and let it go through the motions.

CCB-261 - Add an optional method for indicating that a product is a member of a larger collection that has a DOI.

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-261&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cb210ceed0c774ee5693f08d96d5b7e79%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637661062002956989%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjojV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=JB4amCDXnvO318cY3qLj6OiGdxERZ1zoxwWXi%2F%2F7yc%3D&reserved=0>

Question: Last chance - any last calls?

(Mark B. was kicked off)

Someone trying to speak is breaking up.

Question: Anyone lay claim on this? Kind of recommend this for withdrawal.

Answer: Someone wonders if PSA still wants this. It came through Tanya.

~ Think we agreed on this last time. Will ask if it can be withdrawn.

(Note-taker kicked off again)

CCB-222 - Add citation text to Citation Information

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-222&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cb210ceed0c774ee5693f08d96d5b7e79%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637661062002956989%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjojV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=Y7Uiw6zDfPFHgAfwTr7xCbgaLCvY2eINqhzKxXSJEYE%3D&reserved=0>

Someone hasn't had much time to do anything with this.

~ As DOIs come up to the forefront to us, seems like this is an important one. Unclear what this is trying to solve.

~ It was to make sure all the metadata for a DOIs available in the label. An agreed upon level of documentation.

Question: Would it be searchable within the registry once it's in the registry? To find the DOI?

Answer: Would hope so, but don't know.

A lot of extra metadata is being gathered to put in Datacite. The model doesn't have a place for it. Seems like our model shouldn't rely on external site for metadata.

Question: Did you say that because a DOI exists elsewhere that we don't need it in the product?

Answer: The opposite.

Another Question: Where does the DOI go?

Answer: It's required at the bundle, optional at the collection. Required in some documents. Some publishers have asked that we provide it at the collection level. No requirement to put them at the product level. Hard to build landing pages. There is a DOI work group. They just showed a draft to the MC of how to cite data in PDS in multiple ways. Should work on that before the DOI SCRs.

~ Someone thinks that what is missing from our archive is the author information. We don't even have a first name. Calling it a citation is probably wrong. We should include information that can be used for a citation.

~ Someone agrees.

Question: Don't a lot of authors just use a first initial? They may prefer to have their citations that way.

Answer: So, first name or initial.

~ To maintain backwards compatibility we will keep citation information.

Question: Datacite is being used for the DOI, but how is the mapping and landing page? How specific?

Answer: Hope it wouldn't impact.

~ Concerned about being tied to an organization.

~ Licensing is a big issue.

Another Question: What is the question?

Answer - The Question: Is the metadata generic enough for any organization? Not just Datacite?

Answer: Being informed by datacite, but can include anything necessary for other organizations too.

Seems like we need the DOI work group to continue working and maybe look at this SCR. Could put it in the parking lot for now - with a comment that it can't be tied to Datacite.

~ Someone emailed Jordan to say that maybe this and CCB-261 should be looked at by the DOI work group. We should also let him know that some hope this is not Datacite centric. Jordan is on vacation now.

Question: Any more comments?

Answer: (Silence)

CCB-260 - PDS4 label files do not have a unique file extension

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds->

[jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-)

[260&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cb210ceed0c774ee5693f08d96d5b7e79%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637661062002956989%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjojMC4wLjAwMDA%3D&data=a3h%2BSLMYP7GuZClwNqLtWGc8GptCYdpXLDqbhsWVy0%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-260&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cb210ceed0c774ee5693f08d96d5b7e79%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637661062002956989%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjojMC4wLjAwMDA%3D&data=a3h%2BSLMYP7GuZClwNqLtWGc8GptCYdpXLDqbhsWVy0%3D&reserved=0)

The background and impact were discussed with Jordan. Weighed the impact with these requirements - all labels after version 2.0 having new file extension for labels and being consistent within a bundle, probably after

the version after when it's implemented. He preferred keeping the requirements. It's a burden for tools and users. (Trent is sharing a document that note taker can't see) One use case we were worried about was accumulating bundles. Presumably they wouldn't be version 2.0, so they wouldn't need LBLX, so could use XML labels as long as no new data type files. Wanted to run through the impacts and see what we might need to consider or grandfather in. Text has a block quote from Jordan. "All new..." They want us to keep the requirement, but can make it work.

~ IPDA is concerned. They do upgrade the IM as they go along, so to do this would need to convert all data.

Tanya is concerned this is a lot of scope for IPDA resources. Have reached out to ask. No answer yet.

~ Tanya said if we made it consistent in a collection it would be okay.

~ Yes, that's one solution.

~ That wouldn't solve all the issues. Validation is at the bundle level. We want consistency.

~ Someone agrees.

~ If an accumulating bundle accumulates over a few years or over a new version, the combination of requirements could be bad for IPDA.

~ We need to upgrade the IM, but have existing old data that exists. Need to access the effort when there are millions of products.

Maybe we need to pause and get more feedback from users, data providers, etc. There's no urgent need for this now. There are work arounds. This could be pushed.

~ People would appreciate that.

~ Someone wants two separate SCRs. Proposes that this SCR allows both and another SCR keeps XML going forward. We need to access all the different tools and communities. Not everyone uses PDS tools. To me, this argument is unnecessary. We need to study the negative impact.

~ As a node tool developer, someone one would like consistency. Won't be consistent since not all data will be migrated, but the impact in the future will probably be worse if there's no consistency.

So, someone wants two tickets. One that allows LBLX, and one that mandates that XML is still allowed.

~ Yes.

Question: What's the mandate for allowing mixing? Not in the same bundle? Have to have one or the other?

Answer: Yes.

~ That should go in the first ticket.

****Action Item - Mike**** will edit the ticket to remove the requirement for version 2.0. Unclear what 2.0 will even look like.

~ It would be good to have a few years with both LBLX and XML. Probably less reason in time to retire XML.

Question: Does everyone understand? Ready to vote next time to allow LBLX?

Answer: Let's see the SCR first.

~ Yes.

~ It's mainly a deletion. Gives Jordan time.

~ Their issue was consistency in the bundle. Jordan will be okay.

CCB-209 - Correct Definitions of Tagged-*Object

See [https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-209&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cb210ceed0c774ee5693f08d96d5b7e79%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637661062002956989%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQJjojV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikh1aWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7s1eH1i%2F88ryZ96rt%2BpG)

[209&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cb210ceed0c774ee5693f08d96d5b7e79%7C0693b5ba4b184](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-209&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cb210ceed0c774ee5693f08d96d5b7e79%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637661062002956989%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQJjojV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikh1aWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7s1eH1i%2F88ryZ96rt%2BpG)

[d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637661062002956989%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQJjojV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikh1aWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7s1eH1i%2F88ryZ96rt%2BpG](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-209&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cb210ceed0c774ee5693f08d96d5b7e79%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637661062002956989%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQJjojV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikh1aWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=7s1eH1i%2F88ryZ96rt%2BpG)

Kfk8JMmfvCu8DfWzVWKdxj4%3D&reserved=0

Dick is still waiting to hear from Steve.

CCB-332 - Header definitions are too loose for the validate tool

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-332&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cb210ceed0c774ee5693f08d96d5b7e79%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637661062002956989%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=cseashkgA9wJDQx0egOivXEI5P%2BgVIDmZE2VyNhRvYc%3D&reserved=0>

Trent will respond to Marc's email. Will probably withdraw when satisfied with the software ticket. Maybe the SCR for the documentation changes.

~ Yes, if approved, can work on the SCR.

CCB-333 - add Units of Loudness with decibel (dB) as an option

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-333&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cb210ceed0c774ee5693f08d96d5b7e79%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637661062002966963%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=sEpRcKmmchjT2W7FUOyYeyRGJLpfM0SGmvUXPEUIZml%3D&reserved=0>

Units of power isn't on anyone's to-do list.

Question: Is there a new version of Geometry or Mars 2020?

Answer: Not yet. There's one update for Mark.

Someone will do an out of phase release of Imaging Surfaces.

Open Floor

Our next meeting is September 2. Maybe we can have one last discussion on CCB-260 and then vote. We need to pick the next big ticket for February. Maybe display. Ideas are welcome.

DDWG Notes 2021-09-02

title: DDWG Notes 2021-09-02

layout: default

date: 2021-09-02

September 2, 2021

Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees: M. Drum, E. Guinness, T. Hare, L. Huber, S. Hughes, R. Joyner, D. Kazden, T. Lim, J. Mafi, S. McLaughlin, R. Simpson and M. Costa Sitja

Known Observers: P. Lawton, Boris Semenov and V. Tang

DDWG Agenda

(Included in email sent August 31, from T. Hare, DDWG agenda for Sep 2nd, 2021)

0) Front-matter

- quick: Mitch update for Feb. "DMSP" meeting.
 - congrats to Radio Science Node!
 - DOI tickets (261, 222) in parking lot for DOI WG review
 - a few new tickets to introduce
 - CCB-334 (withdrawn) move to github
 - Still on PDS4 label extension (split into two issues, 260 and 338).
- **(Discussed)**

I. ready for a vote?

N/A - plan for CCB-260 (*.lblx) vote next meeting (maybe 338).

(Discussed)

II. Status and New SCRs.

- 1) new CCB-335 -- Inventory Specification Allows Too Many Delimiters - Dick S.
- 2) new CCB-336 -- Add a License Information class to the Identification Area - Mark B. (w. comments)
- 3) new CCB-337 -- Change data type Modification Detail/modification date to ASCII Date Time YMD - Mark B.
- 4) new CCB-338 -- Require .lblx for all PDS4 labels archived with IM version 2.0 - Mike D.
- 5) CCB-260 -- PDS4 file extension -- Split in two.

reminder - related CCB-211. Please see new comment in Jira. T/A updates still?.

- 6) CCB-209 -- Correct Definitions of Tagged-*Object -- any updates?

2nd tier:

0) CCB-332 - Header definitions are too loose for the validate tool -- Marc C. withdraw -- software issue, status.

1) CCB-333 - add Units of Loudness with decibel (dB) as an option -- withdrawn to be replaced with Units of Power

2) CCB-330 - PDS Data Provider's Handbook contains contradictory phrasing with respect to files with the same file name

3) CCB-331 - Add Values to Product Context.Reference List.Internal Reference.reference type - moving forward?

4) CCB-324 -- still might need some support from DDWG members before vote (review current status).

5) CCB-326 - Inconsistent Direction on How to Use Discipline Facets

-- on hold for this week

(Some Discussions)

III. Discussions (order somewhat random, we will get to what we can and is ready to be presented)

ATM: 303

NAIF: 295, 269

CIS/IMG: 209/316, 164 (see above), CCB-325 - Support for video as product observational

EN: status on 209 (Steve)

IPDA: 261, 263

PPI: 222, 282, 230

RMS: 314, 210/275, 212

(Not Discussed)

parking lot:

1) CCB-164 -- Display Settings not required for images -- (IMG) - Need to think more about potential updates to Imaging and how Display might fit.

2) RS: 259/281 (see new attachment to CCB-281) (on hold)

3) CCB-261 -- Add an optional method for indicating that a product is a member of a larger collection that has a DOI -- Last chance before recommending withdraw.

4) CCB-222 -- Add citation text to Citation Information -- elevate this? head to parking lot?

Next meeting, Thursday, Sep. 16th, 2021

DDWG

Front Matter

No DMSP update.

Congratulations to Dick and the Radio Science node for becoming official.

~ The details are still being worked out.

Someone said it was interesting getting back the proposal reviews.

~ NAIF is looking forward to the fun.

DOI tickets (CCBs 261 and 222) are in the parking lot and have been sent to Jordan so the DOI work group can chime in on them. We want to make sure the DOI group helps with those SCRs.

CCB-334 has been withdrawn and moved to GitHub.

PDS4 label extension is our big ticket item. Hopefully this is the last meeting where we have to discuss it. Hope to vote on CCB-260 next time. The SCR is two tickets now.

It was pointed out that anything we wanted in this next release might have missed the deadline.

Status and New SCRs

CCB-335 - Inventory Specification Allows Too Many Delimiters

See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-335>

There have been discussions about what should be in a collection inventory and what it should be named. Chapter 9 in the SR tells how to make it - two fields - one field, comma than the other field. The IM specification also allows vertical bar, semi-colon and horizontal tab. This SCR removes those and just leaves comma. This removes the conflict between the SR and the IM specification. Think comma is all that has been used, but this is not a backwards compatible change.

Question: Is there a way to figure out if anything else has been used?

Answer: Only received commas at NSSDCA. Based on standard.

~ Someone is interested in what Steve has to say about this, but okay with limiting it. Assumes the rule is inherited from the table delimited rules.

~ Exactly. So there is kind of a little problem. Can just create a new schema rule, but it's inherited.

~ That's kind of an important thing.

~ Someone is not sure, but guess we have to move forward.

~ Someone thinks this is a question for Steve and the IM and not introducing special cases that might come back to haunt us later.

~ We can use schematron rule. Will look into it, but think we can take care of this with a schematron rule and documentation. ****(Action Item - Steve)****

Question: Are there any other cases of this?

Answer: Steve will look around and research this.

~ Someone sees this as clarifying an issue, but not solving a problem. It makes a new inconsistency.

Another Question: Does it have to be inherited? Can't we create something new?

Answer: It inherits from table delimiter for now. Could make it a sibling, but than there are other issues. Can look into making it a sibling. It would inherit from (something - parseable?) byte stream. Suggest we think and research. Need to consider our approach. Sees three options: make inventory a sibling to table delimiter, kludge with the schematron rule and documentation or see if we did something else in the past.

Someone is interested in hearing if anyone didn't use comma. Would like people to put comments in the SCR.

~ Reporter is puzzled about why this is so complicated.

CCB-336 - Add a License Information class to the Identification Area

See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-336>

New SCR, known issue. There is unofficial action at EN and SBN to try to understand this licensing thing. Trying to be FAIR. Planetary is public domain. This SCR is driven by ESA. They need licensing too. There was a comment about meeting with Jordan. We'll try to follow what others in NASA are doing using a public domain for government derived things and creative commons zero for non-government.

Question: Does anyone feel like having a license at the collection or bundle level?

Answer: IPDA needs it at the data level. Might be possible at the collection level, but need to check.

~ Most other catalogs put it at the collection level, but not everyone downloads everything. Tedious.

Question: Is there any disagreement that we need a license? And does this fit the need?

Answered with Another Question: Have we addressed the concern about licensing changing over time?

Another Question: Impacting something that was already licensed?

Answer: Yes. Shouldn't change the label without a new version, but can't promise license won't change.

~ Hard to find any license statement in PDS.

~ Maybe it could be solved at the archive level. Attached to the distribution, not the labels.

Another Question: Above the bundle level?

Answer: Won't meet the requirement at PSA.

~ This is an optional class, but the request is still valid.

~ It's easier to swallow when it's optional. We can say PDS and PSA are FAIR. This is above PDS, at the NASA level, but don't see why we shouldn't have an option at all levels.

Anne is looking at this now. Would like to hear from her.

~ From the ten thousand foot level, required for access rights. People need to know what they can do. Some kind of statement.

~ Not sure why PSA would need two.

~ Think some need to be more - by media - not very clear on this. It's Mark Bentley's SCR.

~ If created by government worker they need this license. If PDART needs creative common zero. Think that's the difference for PDS.

Question: Any idea how many of these there might actually be?

Answer: More than 100 in SPDF. Licensing - not sure where this stops. Need to limit this or it goes crazy.

~ Need to decide if can have this in identification area. International archives could go in many directories.

~ Would need to be an open field. Not a pull down list to meet all the international needs. Above PDS. We can't decide here. We will let Jordan and Anne decide for PDS.

Question: Does anyone see an issue having this as an option?

Answer: Yes. Could be an issue having it in labels. Will add a comment to the SCR.

~ Maybe we need to hear from Jordan and Anne.

~ Maybe PDS won't use it, but the international community may need it.

~ This is way outside the PDS purview. It's also data providers and many different variations. IM should allow for the possibility.

~ Feels like this could be our next big ticket. Often licenses are tagged as a URL, so would need to use external reference extended. URLs are usually frowned upon in archives.

~ It could be a file distributed with the archive. That could change over time. Not sure we want to internalize it.

~ It might create expectations if it's only present in some products. Like the idea of a license file and referring to it. Maybe could be like DOIs, but above PDS.

~ Which license is above PDS. Maybe someone could add the license file idea to the comments.

Sounds like this is a big issue for PSA. We need an SCR we can vote on. There's a lot here. They need this.

~ Need to clean this up.

~ The idea of pointing to a file might help.

Question: Could it be that licensing restricts distribution?

Answer: Yes.

~ But PDS is open to the public. Now we're saying things have to be checked to see if they can be distributed.

~ Up to the host institution.

~ Jordan will have to build this into the system.

~ IF PDS wants to be FAIR we need a license.

****Action Item - Everyone**** - add comments.

CCB-337 - Change data type Modification Detail/modification date to ASCII Date Time YMD

See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-337>

Another new one. Adds date and time to modification data.

Question: Does anyone see any issues with this?

Answer: (Silence)

CCB-338 - Require .lblx for all PDS4 labels archived with IM version 2.0 +

See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-338>

This is the split off part of the PDS label extension SCR.

Someone hopes this is straight forward. It splits out the requirement for version 2.0. Should alleviate some of the concerns. Version 2.0 is far away, so we don't really need to vote on this now. Especially if 2.0 is five years away. Can leave the SCR in place for now. Tried to provide arguments for why this should be imposed. More interested in driving the other ticket forward.

~ Jordan is most concerned with consistency and would prefer one extension, but no mixing.

~ It's great that EN wants it, but they are only one part of the PDS community. Should wait.

~ Someone agrees. Let's put this in the parking lot for now. Think this is supportive of that concern.

For CCB-260 (PDS4 label files do not have a unique file extension, see <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-260>) the big drive was framed around the future requirement, so the SCR had been reworded. Don't want this to become an edge case that confuses people.

~ Someone sees it the opposite way. Think it's nicer for users to have both extensions available. Gives something needed for a small number of archives. Don't need cleanliness and purity. Can have both. Don't want to push everyone to LBLX. Want both extensions forever.

~ Yes, this ticket pushes LBLX to the forefront. Trying to push that PDS4 is a standard. It's not just XML. There's extra content. We are defining a file format. This reflects that.

~ Someone sees both sides, but one issue that got us on a tangent was Jordan saying consistency is important. The question is where. Seems like an issue of favouring one over the other.

~ Someone thinks he means for PDS or PSA, but shouldn't speak for Jordan.

~ For PSA, we can't just rename all our files. Don't think all of the international community will. Especially missions that have years to run. If this is insisted on, we won't be able to stay consistent.

Let's step back a second. CCB-260 isn't forcing anything. It's allowing XML or LBLX, and says we need to be consistent in a bundle.

~ It pushes LBLX for the future.

~ PSA has XML documents that are converted to PDF, but left with issues in operational bundles.

~ There's still the issue of figuring out what's in a file without opening it. Might need to use an indicator. Need some information outside the file.

~ Someone wants to remind people that this is tied to the standard, not the model. Can vary from one bundle to another. The IM is not affected by this.

Question: Does everyone understand the two requirements? Any archive can use either as long as there is consensus in a bundle.

Answered with Another Question: Why bundle and not collection?

Answer: Not all bundles are huge. SBN has small bundles. For many a bundle is what you grab.

~ IPDA has huge bundles.

~ Someone else doesn't understand why it can't be at the collection level.

~ A bundle represents the entirety of the set of data, so if some is different that is confusing. This SCR had trade offs.

~ Someone doesn't remember this requirement on a bundle. Don't understand the reason for this.

~ IN PSA's bundles, there are documents and data that could be very different types. All IPDA is requesting is that we make this at the collection level.

Question: Why not at any level?

Answer: PSA has one bundle per mission with many collections. Lots of history. The ability to not mix is a constraint. Could separate out documents.

Another Question: Why do we care? Is there a rule that says it has to be XML?

Answer: Would have to open files to know what's in them. Agree with the consistency in collections.

~ This is a very complicated issue.

Someone has very deep concerns about this being at the collection level. As a software engineer, don't want to open collections to see what file extensions are there. Have to write code for that. That's why pushing for consistency. That's better for our community.

~ Someone disagrees. What we have now is what they will expect in the future. For a small group, they will have to look.

Shutting this down. We should vote on this at the bundle level.

~ Someone understands the software and user arguments, but we have always tried to do something reasonable. We can't always make it easy for the programmers, but at least they won't have to open every product.

~ Nothing is stopping people from being consistent at the bundle level for their archive.

~ Jordan said EN tools could allow as needed exceptions. Not a fan of having archives that don't meet the standards.

We need to decide if we are going to vote as the SCR is written or change it.

~ Reporter doesn't see changing it. Would vote and then see.

~ We will vote at the bundle level being consistent and then we can revisit it.

~ Would need to be clear if that's why it is voted down. Could vote on collection after. Maybe we could vote bundle level versus collection level first.

Someone doesn't think a vote at this time is fair. There's one vote for a big group - IPDA, and it could go against them. This is very unfair.

~ We will do an informal vote next time. Bundle level versus collection level.

Open Floor

We need to resolve the license issue.

DDWG Notes 2021-09-16

title: DDWG Notes 2021-09-16

layout: default

date: 2021-09-16

September 16, 2021

Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees: M. Drum, E. Guinness, T. Hare, L. Huber, S. Hughes, R. Joyner, D. Kazden, T. Lim, J. Mafi, S. McLaughlin, R. Simpson and M. Costa Sitja

Known Observers: P. Lawton and B. Semenov

DDWG Agenda

(Included in email sent September 14, from T. Hare, DDWG agenda for Sep 16th, 2021)

0) Front-matter

? update for Feb. "DMSP" meeting.

Sorry - still on PDS4 label extension (split into two issues, 260 and 338). Discussed at IPDA meeting

I. ready for a vote?

N/A - if we can agree -- plan for CCB-260 (*.lblx) vote next meeting (maybe 338).

(Voted to pass CCB-337)

II. Status and New SCRs.

1) CCB-335 -- Inventory Specification Allows Too Many Delimiters - Dick S.

2) CCB-336 -- Add a License Information class to the Identification Area - Mark B. (w/ comments)

3) CCB-337 -- Change data type Modification Detail/modification date to ASCII Date Time YMD - Mark B., new comments

4) CCB-338 -- Require .lblx for all PDS4 labels archived with IM version 2.0 - Mike D.

5) CCB-260 -- PDS4 file extension -- Split in two.

reminder - related CCB-211. Please see new comment in Jira. T/A updates still?.

6) CCB-209 -- Correct Definitions of Tagged-*Object -- any updates?

(Some Discussions)

2nd tier:

0) CCB-332 - Header definitions are too loose for the validate tool -- Marc C. withdraw -- software issue, status.

1) CCB-333 - add Units of Loudness with decibel (dB) as an option -- withdrawn to be replaced with Units of Power

2) CCB-330 - PDS Data Provider's Handbook contains contradictory phrasing with respect to files with the same file name

3) CCB-331 - Add Values to Product Context.Reference List.Internal Reference.reference type - moving forward?

4) CCB-324 -- still might need some support from DDWG members before vote (review current status).

5) CCB-326 - Inconsistent Direction on How to Use Discipline Facets

-- on hold for this week

(Not Discussed)

III. Discussions (order somewhat random, we will get to what we can and is ready to be presented)

ATM: 303

NAIF: 295, 269

CIS/IMG: 209/316, 164 (see above), CCB-325 - Support for video as product observational

EN: status on 209 (Steve)

IPDA: 261, 263

PPI: 222, 282, 230

RMS: 314, 210/275, 212

parking lot:

1) CCB-164 -- Display Settings not required for images -- (IMG) - Need to think more about potential updates to Imaging and how Display might fit.

2) RS: 259/281 (see new attachment to CCB-281) (on hold)

3) CCB-261 -- Add an optional method for indicating that a product is a member of a larger collection that has a DOI -- Last chance before recommending withdraw.

4) CCB-222 -- Add citation text to Citation Information -- elevate this? head to parking lot?

(Not Discussed)

Next meeting, Thursday, Oct. 14th, 2021 (instead of Sep. 30th).

DDWG

(Note taker had difficulty with WebEx. Arrived a few minutes late)

CCB-337 - Change data type Modification Detail/modification date to ASCII Date Time YMD

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds->

[jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-)

[337&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cfebe80c096ba46d0771908d98e6efff1%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637697429655640297%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=K0eVAy%2FyBNvQa1Aj3tZL1IpOg2zNDarv0qG2dix0zVg%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-337&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cfebe80c096ba46d0771908d98e6efff1%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637697429655640297%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=K0eVAy%2FyBNvQa1Aj3tZL1IpOg2zNDarv0qG2dix0zVg%3D&reserved=0)

This is probably ready for a vote. Steve did a TA.

Question: Ready to vote? It is backwards compatible, doesn't force anything.

Answer: (Silence)

~ RMS already voted yes.

**The Vote - CCB-337

ATMOS - Yes

IMG - Yes

EN - Yes
GEO - Yes
IPDA - Yes
NAIF - Yes
PPI - Yes
RMS - Yes
RS - Yes
SBN - Abstain** (Hasn't finished reading it yet.)

This came up late, but it has been discussed.

##CCB-331 - Add Values to Product Context.Reference List.Internal Reference.reference type

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-331&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cfebe80c096ba46d0771908d98e6efff1%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637697429655640297%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=VuqvV9H9z6utWJqyCGj3svezTQ4al%2FUTxcoes%2BP92M%3D&reserved=0>

Added to the agenda.

RMS is no longer in need of this. Willing to withdraw, but need the author to do it.

~ Author wanted to withdraw it three months ago, but RMS took over. Unsure if author needs to send an email.

~ RMS sent Trent an email. That can be sent to Ron. **(Action Item - Trent)**

Author gave it up to RMS.

~ RMS no longer needs it. If no one else wants to pick it up we will withdraw it.

CCB-335 - Inventory Specification Allows Too Many Delimiters

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-335&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cfebe80c096ba46d0771908d98e6efff1%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637697429655640297%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=rTK9mHdb1fThZqrtxfxhIFfa%2F1N1dBhpyRq1nwmmi2I%3D&reserved=0>

There were some good comments. The SCR has been updated.

SR is very simple. Single field for primary or secondary, comma, LID. IM says inventory is from table delimited, so other delimiters are also allowed. There's a contradiction between the IM and the standard. This SCR is to reduce the delimiters to just comma, but was told we can't just do that. So, the SCR has been rewritten so this is now a subclass of parseable byte stream. Redefined to be a sub-class of parseable byte stream. Another way to do it is schematron rule, but this is cleaner.

~ It's not backwards compatible.

~ No, but that's okay because we are not at 2.0 yet.

~ Think this is a solution we don't need.

~ The other option also isn't backwards compatible. Have to do something because the IM and SR are not

consistent.

~ The point is that if we go with a schematron rule no one has to change how they are doing things, unless they are using another delimiter.

~ Still called inventory, so it should be okay.

~ If it's going to affect people's pipelines, I care, if not, I don't.

~ It's behind the scenes. The question is if anyone has used anything other than comma.

~ NSSDCA reported last time that they have only received commas.

~ So it probably won't be a problem to force this to comma. Need to make sure we are not breaking pipelines, but not a fan of only using schematron rules.

A sub-class of parseable byte stream, so moved up in the hierarchy. Equal to table delimited. The end result isn't a big change.

~ Moving up to lose the constraints to table delimited that have to apply to the inventory. Will make sure no issues with that. ****(Action Item - Steve)****

Someone would probably vote yes to a simple schema change.

Question: Last words on this?

Answer: (Silence.)

CCB-336 - Add a License Information class to the Identification Area

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds->

[jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-)

[336&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cfebe80c096ba46d0771908d98e6efff1%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637697429655640297%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=gqftG1GvrHvmdCtzwe5RJqQUrGK6pS2pl5r5vt7M%2Bg0%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-336&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cfebe80c096ba46d0771908d98e6efff1%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637697429655640297%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=gqftG1GvrHvmdCtzwe5RJqQUrGK6pS2pl5r5vt7M%2Bg0%3D&reserved=0)

There's been more chatter on the issue of licenses. Think it will be our next big ticket. There were comments. It was pointed out that we need license and copyright at the MC, but not sure that's true for PDS or if government or public domain. Then someone said something scary about what level we issue licenses at. Above PDS. This will impact everything. Others also added comments.

~ Someone was trying to boil down their concerns. Tying it to the label is scary for a lot of reasons. Can change outside the metadata. Would have to update the label version. Could imply that older products under old licenses. Talked about GitHub license - having a file in the bundle that can be referred to by file path, instead of LID.

~ In GitHub site, would have licenses for everything underneath it, so just a file next to a bundle.

~ Really just an acknowledgement. See no reason for PDS metadata to have to be aware of the license.

~ Someone understands, but argues that license information is part of the provenance. It needs to be part of the metadata.

~ Maybe another way to do this is to have it in a comment in a label, commented out, not part of the IM. Could change it without changing the label.

~ The problem here is that people need to understand how they can use an individual product. Could be a pointer we can update. Need to have something to be FAIR compliant. An IPDA reviewer complained it wasn't there. Need something.

Someone is having trouble with this. Need to solve this, but it's sort of out of our purview. Unclear where it should go. Hesitant to put it in comments. Doesn't sound right, but a pointer doesn't sound right either. It's like

a URL that could go away.

~ It could be a LID.

~ Would like it at the top level. It would emulate the rest of the world.

~ If this is higher than us, not sure why we are spending time on it. Happy to do what HQ says to do.

~ There is a group working on this. Irregardless, we need to help recommend where it goes.

~ If everyone in PDS is using the same license, it would be easier to point to that. Not sure how that is solved for ESA, JAXA, etc., but as a one liner for NASA is simple.

~ It might not be a one liner and it might need to change for one product but not another.

PSA expects to have three types of licenses - including derived and calibrated and facility delivered.

~ PSA has different problems than NASA.

~ NASA might get multiple licenses too.

~ If we have two that reside in a bundle at the EN we could point to them.

~ They would be like a context product.

~ Yeah. Very good.

Question: How would you reference them?

Answer: They would go in the context area.

Another Question: Where does the reference to it go?

Answer: In the context area.

Another Question: What do we think?

Answer: Someone would be happy with that. Can point to the LID.

~ Think we need to consider possible licenses changing.

~ Someone would need to see a real example of this. Not a hypothetical. We all know DPs can do dumb things, but we tell them not to.

Anne felt very strongly. Could change at higher level.

~ Usually goes from harder to softer if changes. Shouldn't happen under NASA.

Question: Do we have a way forward?

Answer: Yes. Happy with context product. Need to assign licenses.

~ One thought - licenses are more like documents. They could go in the document collection. Maybe point to the bundle. Inventory could be set up by time to know what applies when.

~ Someone kinda likes that. If a document changes in a bundle, have to increment. Maybe make an exception. Would be happy with that.

~ Need an example. Having trouble understanding how this would work.

****Action Item - Mark**** will put together a context product example.

~ There's also the document suggestion.

~ And the GitHub example.

~ People grabbing a product need a recognizable way to know they need the license file too.

~ Might be important to include things.

~ Yes.

Not sure where to take this.

~ Doesn't matter if it's a context product or a document. The issue is when updates happen, have to change the version. Think that's critical here.

~ Yes. Could use a reference. Wouldn't affect version of the bundle. Gives us the flexibility we need.

Question: What's being updated in that scenario?

Answer: The license.

~ So we would only need to version the document.

~ New version of the license. Thought there was a forced version change to bundle.

~ If one thing changes in a bundle, don't have to update the version. We have accumulating bundles that call things by LID, not LIDVID. They are added to the inventory.

~ Allows for possibility of updating license.

~ Could be a problem if license is updated and becomes two licenses.

~ Never going to be perfect.

Question: So, the recommendation for this SCR is to make a file optional and the product points to that file?

Answer: With the file being referenced from a collection.

~ Could get very hacky with it. Change the virtual collection as needed, but...

Shutting this down for now. A lot of options. Think about it. If you have an idea - mock it up.

Question: Any last comments?

Answer: (Silence)

CCB-260 - PDS4 label files do not have a unique file extension.

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds->

[jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-)

[260&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cfebe80c096ba46d0771908d98e6efff1%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637697429655640297%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=LLOAshmlqIpHsfGovrTnfYZ00%2FO2xjvuM29sAphUvaw%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-260&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cfebe80c096ba46d0771908d98e6efff1%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637697429655640297%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikl1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=LLOAshmlqIpHsfGovrTnfYZ00%2FO2xjvuM29sAphUvaw%3D&reserved=0)

Question: Is there anything to say from the IPDA meeting?

Answer: People are working on PDS4 implementation for IPDA. Presented CCB-260 to IPDA. Jordan had some questions. Had an email exchange. Think he understands IPDA's issues now. Missions with PSA, JAXA, etc. will be affected. ISRO wasn't present, but at least three agencies will run into problems.

~ Someone would prefer to go with IPDA's request to have consistency at the collection level because it makes things easier for the international community. But dealing with XML, LBLX has to happen either way.

Question: Sounds like bundle level is too restrictive. Can get everyone on board for collection level. Ticket would need to be updated. Is the author willing to change it?

Answer: Under protest. Willing to change, especially if Jordan is okay with it.

~ Someone wants to agree, kind of under protest. The thing is that we have a number of deliverable products, but only one archive product, a bundle. That's why I have a hard time with this. Consistency should be at the bundle level. Sympathetic to our international partners, but think they made a poor choice and we're having to pay the price to accommodate them.

~ That's the point - you don't. You can impose it at the bundle level for your archive. Just asking for it at collection level to allow the flexibility to accommodate us.

~ No one is forced to use LBLX in the standard.

~ The problem is IPDA has XML documents they would like to include as XML files, not PDFs.

~ There will be another ticket down the road. XML products. Been wanting to put that one in, but not until this one is clear.

- ~ To summarize, a lot of best practices out there, but can make the concession that some may be mixed.
- ~ Best practices are edge cases. Not rules with exceptions.

Question: Grandfather clause?

Answer: Yes. Exception for specific cases when have to have a mixed bundle. Exception for validate tool.

- ~ Need to check on that. Remember Steve talking about flags, but not this.
- ~ Someone will try to summarize. Sounds like we are starting to converge. Grandfather clause or pushing consistency to the collection level.
- ~ Unsure what people are leaning towards.

Question: How would a grandfather clause work with validate?

Answer: Not sure. Jordan described, but I don't know. Would probably specify collection by collection what extension is being used.

- ~ Sounds very messy.
- ~ Validate can use a configuration file. Okay with collection level, which doesn't preclude doing it bundle wide.

Another Question: Why would a flag be needed?

Answer: If you have data files that are XML. Don't need to worry about how validate will work, just how we want it.

- ~ Probably a default to flag exceptions that are different from the bundle.
- ~ The important part would be not to mix. Not vast numbers of collections in bundles. For legacy bundles at IPDA, usually 2 collections, LDD ingest files and documents. Most collections would be XML data files, not mixed in any way.
- ~ Archiving LDD files seems like it will be a challenge in the future.

Our next meeting will be in a month from now. That will give us time to work on licensing issue and to try to change this ticket. Hopefully, we can vote on it next time.

- ~ Author would like an impression of who still prefers bundle level with exceptions.
- ~ We can do an informal vote to give author guidance.

****Prefer consistency at:**

ATMOS - Bundle
IMG - Collection
EN - (no answer in notes)
GEO - Collection
IPDA - Collection
NAIF - Abstain
PPI - Collection
RMS - Not Here
RS - Collection
SBN - Bundle******

The majority prefers consistency at the collection level.

Someone is willing to concede to collection and hope people don't mix.

- ~ Not sure of practical difference between collection level or bundle level with exception.

Author will change the SCR under protest ****(Action Item - Mike)****

- ~ Jordan would probably vote bundle, but can manage at collection. Can check emails to see what he meant by

exceptions.

We have withdrawn a lot more than we have voted on in the last six months.

We will meet again in a month. October 14.

DDWG Notes 2021-10-14

title: DDWG Notes 2021-10-14

layout: default

date: 2021-10-14

October 14, 2021

Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees: M. Drum, M. Gordon, E. Guinness, T. Hare, L. Huber, S. Hughes, R. Joyner, D. Kazden, T. Lim, S. McLaughlin and R. Simpson

Known Observers: P. Lawton and B. Semenov

DDWG Agenda

(Included in email sent October 12, from T. Hare, DDWG agenda for Oct 14th, 2021)

0) Front-matter

- welcome back.

- CCB-337 -- DDWG Passed: 9 (ATM, IMG, EN, GEO, IPDA, NAIF, PPI, RMS, RS), 1 Abstain (SBN) for CCB vote

- CCB-333 -- withdrawn, Units of Loudness, withdrawn.

- CCB-331 -- withdrawn, Add Values to Product Context.Reference List.Internal Reference.reference type

- PDS4 label extension (split into two issues, 260 and 338). Last chance?

- help reboot (prioritize current tickets)

(Discussed)

I. ready for a vote?

N/A - if we can agree -- plan for CCB-260 (*.lbox) vote next meeting (maybe 338).

(Discussed)

II. Status and New SCRs.

1) new CCB-339 -- add Units of Power with SI watts as option - Trent/Jesse

2) CCB-260 -- PDS4 file extension -- Split in two.

reminder - related CCB-211. Please see new comment in Jira. last call before vote?.

3) CCB-338 -- Require .lbox for all PDS4 labels archived with IM version 2.0 - Mike D.

4) CCB-336 -- Add a License Information class to the Identification Area - Mark B. (w/ comments)

possible discussion: SCR Needed? Display Settings (one to many or many to one)

5) CCB-335 -- Inventory Specification Allows Too Many Delimiters - Dick S.

6) CCB-209 -- Correct Definitions of Tagged-*Object -- any updates?

(Some Discussion)

2nd tier:

- 1) CCB-332 - Header definitions are too loose for the validate tool -- Marc C. withdraw -- software issue, status.
- 2) CCB-330 - PDS Data Provider's Handbook contains contradictory phrasing with respect to files with the same file name
- 3) CCB-324 -- still might need some support from DDWG members before vote (review current status)
- 4) CCB-326 - Inconsistent Direction on How to Use Discipline Facets
-- on hold for this week

III. Discussions (order somewhat random, we will get to what we can and is ready to be presented)

ATM: 303

NAIF: 295, 269

CIS/IMG: 209/316, 164, CCB-325 - Support for video as product observational

EN: status on 209 (Steve)

IPDA: 261, 263

PPI: 222, 282, 230

RMS: 314, 210/275, 212

parking lot:

- 1) CCB-164 -- Display Settings not required for images -- (IMG) - Need to think more about potential updates to Imaging and how Display might fit.
- 2) RS: 259/281 (see new attachment to CCB-281) (on hold)
- 3) CCB-261 -- Add an optional method for indicating that a product is a member of a larger collection that has a DOI -- Last chance before recommending withdraw.
- 4) CCB-222 -- Add citation text to Citation Information -- elevate this? head to parking lot?
(Not Discussed)

Next meeting, Thursday, Oct. 28th

DDWG

Front Matter

Ron is preparing for the next build cycle. There are some that need clarification.

CCB-337 passed the DDWG and went to the CCB yesterday.

CCB-333 was withdrawn. A new ticket has been added instead.

CCB-331 was withdrawn.

Hoping to do more on label extension today.

As we move into the new build cycle we need to re-access what we should focus on. License is one that needs to be solved. Unsure who might take that on. The original SCR is from ESA.

Showing the build from Ron. There's a question about any influence to our documentation. Don't think we had anything that should impact the documents.

Question: That only shows that two were passed - CCBs 329 and 283.

Answer: Yes. We withdrew a bunch.

~ Thought we had one that was a request for clarification.

~ That was a request from Marc. A software and documentation issue.

~ I think so.

~ It was CCB-332 (Header definitions are to loose for the validate tool,

see <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds->

[jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-)

[332&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cbe01ed87dcf64bdb441008d999988f09%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637709702784985000%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=J2rlfTRt5Y7putzz2o5dAqhEZdOdulhgknQPp4I9V1M%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-332&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cbe01ed87dcf64bdb441008d999988f09%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637709702784985000%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=J2rlfTRt5Y7putzz2o5dAqhEZdOdulhgknQPp4I9V1M%3D&reserved=0)).

~ Not off the list or withdrawn yet. There's something to clarify in the language first. ** (Action Item - Trent and Marc)**

~ Two on the second tier are documentation related.

~ Those seem to be all the documentation updates we need. Can probably withdraw CCB-332.

The next cut off date is February 25.

~ Someone thought they were rolling it now.

~ Yes, in integration and testing. The next cut off date for us is February 25. This one snuck up on us.

People who want LDD updates will need them in jira pretty soon.

There's probably not a lot of opposition to voting for things for February. Our hiatus begins in February.

Question: Priorities. Is there an ESA person who can talk about licenses?

Answer: It's not super urgent.

~ This one is bugging someone. A lot to tackle at once. DOIs, copyright, license, etc.

~ Not a topic for the LDD group.

~ IPDAs need is simple and straight forward, but PDS needs to sort out a solution.

~ If the new class is optional, it seems harmless.

Another Question: Is this on the MC agenda? We can't solve this.

Answer: Yes, but we have to make a proposal. Anne and Jordan are discussing this, but license class being optional seems okay - unless things change.

~ IPDA can wait. The ticket just gets the ball rolling.

~ A lot wrapped up in that ticket. Been dealing with these issues at USGS all year.

Status and New SCRs

CCB-339 - add Units of Power with SI watts as option

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds->

jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-339&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cbe01ed87dcf64bdb441008d999988f09%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637709702784985000%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=TxmszexD9DRWtc3KpVYi3Xqpn6xN8uF1SzQpx6GcuU%3D&reserved=0

This is a new SCR. Tried to put a reasonable list for units. Didn't try to introduce dBm. Not sure if we need to tackle that at the same time.

~ Someone hasn't looked at the SCR yet, but thinks including it might save a step.

Question: Looking at the comments from dBm - don't need a reference?

Answer: No. Need a reference if say dB. Don't want dB as an applicable unit.

~ So dBm logarithmic.

~ There's dBi antenna units - antenna gain, but should focus on units of watts for this one.

~ Took some out.

~ Want kilo, giga, milla, etc. Can add more if necessary later.

In the Proposed Solution it needs an edit. Says dB.

~ Also, this is a class with three attributes.

Question: What's 10 to the minus 21?

Answer: Zeptowatts.

~ Someone thinks LOLA uses that for something. Could be septo.

~ That's what RS uses.

~ Thinks they use it for their laser.

~ There are plenty of options.

****Action Item - Trent**** will write up an example targeting Mars2020 RIMFAX. Jessie also needs this for his radar instrument. Haven't been able to make contact with a RIMFAX person yet.

~ ****Action Item - Ed**** will send a contact to Trent.

~ Trent can also check with the LOLA guys. ****(Action Item - Trent)****

Setting New Priorities

There is a worry about setting priorities for the February 25 freeze.

~ Yes. Haven't really heard of any.

~ Should ask the DDWG to go through and prioritize the urgent ones. Wait until next Friday so people have time.

~ Six months ago we made a list that we could re-evaluate. Will start with that set. Several are in the parking lot. Citation information is on hold for DOI and license. Don't want to miss anything. Could need a lot of changes in the January time frame.

~ Give us until next week to add any new SCRs. Then we can evaluate the list.

Question: The volume of new tickets is shockingly low. Anyone have a reason for that?

Answer: Unsure of the answer, but we are more stabilized. No missions now. Some documentation changes, some IM changes.

~ Trent hopes to be able to hand off what we are working on to the next person when the time comes.

CCB-260 - PDS4 label files do not have a unique file extension

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds->

[jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-260&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cbe01ed87dcf64bdb441008d999988f09%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637709702784985000%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjoV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=eBiz%2FzVPZhTUDAK50NxOX5TfECMkU%2FQg6wptkku6vt8%3D&reserved=0](https://jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/FCCB-260&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cbe01ed87dcf64bdb441008d999988f09%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637709702784985000%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjoV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=eBiz%2FzVPZhTUDAK50NxOX5TfECMkU%2FQg6wptkku6vt8%3D&reserved=0)

The last conversation about this was if we were keeping consistency at the bundle or collection level. The author changed the SCR to require consistency at the collection level and added comments about how we should approach validation. We could have a bit of a problem if no consistency, so raised some concerns about warnings or errors, but it has performance implications. Didn't see any responses yet.

~ At some point we say this is what we need and the software team figures it out. Not concerned about the impact. Validate tells you if there's no label. Software folks outside JPL think it will be trivial.

~ Someone still wants to add specific feature request for validate tool. Error or warnings. Thinking a feature to require consistency in collection, if not, get an error. Warning if any missing or inconsistent labels.

~ If not requiring consistency at the bundle level we don't need a warning.

~ Someone still wants consistency across the bundle as a best practice. That's why want a warning.

Question: Is that a lien on this ticket?

Answer: A note for software.

~ Someone else would not put a warning if inconsistent at the bundle level. A warning is not helpful.

~ Could call it information. Would like to know if inconsistency happens in my bundles.

~ Validate could do that.

There is a place in the bundle XML file that lists all the collections. Could add an attribute there to say what type of labels are being used. Validate would only have to open that one file to know what to expect.

~ That's consistent with what someone else was thinking.

~ People download products without collections.

~ But we are talking about validating bundles. That's the one place where a list of collections appears. Would have to change bundle member entry class to have a new attribute like label type, XML or LBLX. Software would only have to look at that. Maybe it's a wild suggestion.

~ Someone likes it. Elegant.

~ Worth considering. Expressed concern in past because introduces a reference to a file. Breaks some assumptions. Couldn't do it for older bundles. Hopefully drifting towards accessing the labels with a registry and API that won't need to know, but this issue is file extension.

Someone thinks the idea has merit, but it doesn't need to be in this SCR. If a collection has LBLX files the collection file will be LBLX. If we put the extension in the model that is implementation, and the model is implementation agnostic.

~ Someone appreciates the concern, but the model is to make things efficient. If adding this helps us, that's fine. But there's still the issue that this will not be backwards compatible. No problem changing the IM for this. Not concerned.

~ So, this would be a new SCR to go with CCB-338 (Require .lblx for all PDS4 labels archived with IM version 2.0

+, see <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds->

[jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-338&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cbe01ed87dcf64bdb441008d999988f09%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637709702784985000%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjoV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=aE6FK8ffbALI3Yfi9O0uOXUZBtPPrJgNuOUOXsshFwY%3D&reserved=0](https://jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/FCCB-338&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cbe01ed87dcf64bdb441008d999988f09%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637709702784985000%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjoV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=aE6FK8ffbALI3Yfi9O0uOXUZBtPPrJgNuOUOXsshFwY%3D&reserved=0)). Doesn't seem necessary for CCB-260.

Would have a new attribute.

~ For bundle member entry. Would need a separate new attribute. Really hopes software doesn't actually need this.

~ Someone agrees. Would need to be a new attribute in the class.

~ So we agree this would be a separate SCR.

~ Yes, and only if needed. Should hear from the software people.

Question: There were some changes. Author wants to add some new language. Any concerns with this? Can we vote next time? Concerned the CCB might not understand this. They might need a presentation.

Answer: Could see if they want more information. It could be straight forward for them. Willing to vote next time on 260 and 338.

~ On the issue of the CCB, they are worried about impact and we have been discussing that. May need to write something up on that for them.

Another Question: Comfortable with 260 and 338?

Another Answer: Someone still has some issues with 338.

~ It wasn't written to be voted on immediately.

~ CCB-338 could go to the parking lot.

~ Someone thought we would approve CCB-260 and give it a few years.

~ The need or non-need will reveal itself.

~ Someone wants to see how many bundles actually have LBLX.

~ Someone else is in favor of putting CCB-338 in the parking lot.

The dictionary group will not be tackling 2.0 stuff.

~ Want the dictionaries stable before we go to 2.0. Think where we're going is changes to the IM, but nothing version 2.0 specific. Looking at getting consistent. Getting to 2.0 is a different topic.

~ Someone is perplexed about what version 2.0 means. The Common Dictionary is stabilizing. That makes sense for 2.0. Discipline dictionaries will take awhile. Not sure what 2.0 really means.

~ Thought things that are deprecated go away and large breaking changes allowed.

~ Would make all the non backwards compatible changes. Then if we need more would have to go to 3.0. That's why we need consistency.

~ Good definition, but still concerned.

Sounds like we will vote on 260, but not 338.

~ That's what someone would like.

~ Someone else thought 338 would fail.

~ Better not to vote on it yet.

~ Let it ripen.

CCB-336 - Add a License Information class to the Identification Area

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-336&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7Cbe01ed87dcf64bdb441008d999988f09%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637709702784985000%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWIjojMC4wLjA wMDAiLCJQljojV2luMzliLCJBTil6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&data=sZfjHzc1MruVvzXFqsMr%2F%2BDNHe0GyyLTjsnhwBXP%2FGQ%3D&reserved=0>

Question: Any last thoughts on this?

Another Question: Do you have a vague idea when we'll be ready for this ticket?

Answer: Unsure how the DataCite DOI discussions are moving ahead. Maybe Anne is thinking about this. She hasn't discussed it with anyone yet.

~ Need to integrate if that's necessary.

~ Think it's separate. Citation and DOIs are use cases.

Question: There's one where Anne wanted to change the citation class. Does it have to be linked with licenses?

Answer: If there's a vote on 260 NAIF will vote yes. Have to hang up now.

~ We will vote on that next time. Will think more about licenses. Think IPDA's proposed solution to keep it optional is good. Would like people to think about it. We can discuss it next time.

~ IPDA is open to a different solution.

There are problems with planning for our next meetings. Holidays, vacations, etc. We can do next week - October 21 or December 9.

~ The Geometry group is meeting next week - October 21.

~ If we meet October 28 Trent will need a helper. Will be out of the country. Could then meet November 18.

Someone is worried about CCB-336 - about the principals. Provenance and such are part of the necessary information. Not worried about implementation, but we need to be able to link from IM to products. Can't be a little thing on the side.

~ We need to get to the license text.

~ Yes. Something to click. Representation network. A way to get to it to be true to the original design of PDS4.

~ Okay.

Question: Any last words?

Answer: (Silence)

Next meeting October 28.

DDWG Notes 2021-10-28

title: DDWG Notes 2021-10-28

layout: default

date: 2021-10-28

October 28, 2021

Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees: M. Drum, M. Gordon, E. Guinness, L. Huber, S. Hughes, R. Joyner, D. Kazden, T. Lim, J. Mafi, S. McLaughlin, R. Simpson and M. Costa Sitja
Known Observers: B. Hirsch, M. Mace and B. Semenov

DDWG Agenda

(Included in email sent October 25, from T. Hare, DDWG agenda for Oct 28th, 2021)

0) Front-matter

Ed will be leading (if I can't connect)

- CCB-330 - (Implemented by Susie); PDS Data Provider's Handbook contains contradictory phrasing with respect to files with the same file name. closed

I. ready for a vote (finally!)

2) CCB-260 -- PDS4 file extension

-- early votes: NAIF and IMG: yes **(Voted Yes for what Requested Changes say)**

II. Status and New SCRs.

1) new CCB-342 (341!) -- incorrect WARNING if Internal Reference has no reference type - Richard Chen

-- might need to ask Richard for clarification and/or is it a software bug?

2) newCCB-340 -- Local Internal Reference.local identifier reference cardinality - Mitch

3) updated CCB-339 -- add Units of Power with SI watts as option - Trent/Jesse

-- Please check if more updates are needed. Sent email to RIMFAX contact (no response yet).

4) CCB-336 -- Add a License Information class to the Identification Area - Mark B. (w/ comments)

-- BTW, for now, NASA is landing on a CC0 license for data (from Jordan). But we still need to know where this info goes.

5) CCB-335 -- Inventory Specification Allows Too Many Delimiters - Dick S.

6) CCB-209 -- Correct Definitions of Tagged-*Object -- any updates?

(Some Discussions)

2nd tier: (on hold this week(?))

1) CCB-332 - Header definitions are too loose for the validate tool -- Marc C. withdraw -- software issue, status.

2) CCB-324 -- still might need some support from DDWG members before vote (review current status).

- ~ In the Proposed Solution.
- ~ Right. Was a few months ago. According to the SR at delivery to end user.
- ~ Thought the Proposed Solution and Requested Changes were the same, but not so here.
- ~ Right. That's one reason someone thinks the MC should weigh in.
- ~ That goes beyond the nature of this SCR.
- ~ It could be a lien. The Proposed Solution should be cut and pasted from the Requested Changes. We can vote on that.
- ~ A lot to cut out of the Proposed Solution. A lot interesting.
- ~ Someone would vote on the Requested Changes.
- ~ Seems like why both exist in jira is questionable. Could move to a discussion area.

There are other issues.

- ~ Other issues were about cleaning up parts where it talks about bundle consistency.
- ~ Comments were things in attached document.
- ~ No, in Best Practices. Says it would be marketed for collection, but required for collection.
- ~ Author fixed that.
- ~ Didn't seem right when looked at this morning.
- ~ It was corrected to consistency in bundle is the best practice, but it's required in a collection.

Question: Are there other issues? Are people still uncomfortable voting?

Answer: Yes.

- ~ If just vote on Requested Changes, okay, but also have issues with stuff about secondary products in the Proposed Solution.
- ~ Someone else agrees.
- ~ So, a lien. The text in Proposed Solution will be moved elsewhere and will become exactly what's in the Requested Changes.
- ~ That's a big re-write.
- ~ We always vote on the Requested Changes.
- ~ That leaves a lot to EN.
- ~ Someone disagrees.
- ~ The Requested Changes would be pasted to the Proposed Solution. Keep the Requested Changes. Some of the Comments and Proposed Solution will be put in a discussion section. No requirement at this stage on how to handle secondary products for a delivery. Not concerned about telling software there are the requirements. Think the Requested Changes are as good as we are going to get with this.

Question: Does that address people's concerns?

Answer: Yes.

- ~ Someone is still not ready to vote.

****The Vote for CCB-260 - voting on what the Requested Changes say:**

NAIF - Yes

ATMOS - Yes

EN - Yes

GEO - Yes

IPDA - Yes

PPI- Yes

Rings - Yes

RS - No** (No longer sure what is being voted on)

****SBN- Yes****

This goes to the CCB.

CCB-341 - incorrect WARNING if Internal Reference has no reference type

See [https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-341&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikh1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=VJHg94bRAcsfFCleqDJsmbB3NTMv0mYj3trga8%2FRy9E%3D&reserved=0)

[341&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikh1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=VJHg94bRAcsfFCleqDJsmbB3NTMv0mYj3trga8%2FRy9E%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-341&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikh1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=VJHg94bRAcsfFCleqDJsmbB3NTMv0mYj3trga8%2FRy9E%3D&reserved=0)

This is a new one from Richard Chen. There's a curious case related to schematron. Had a sample label with internal reference. Had a LID, but no reference type. Got an error and a warning from validate. The error was that the internal reference was incomplete. The warning was that the reference type "Airborne" was deprecated. There's no Proposed Solution yet.

Question: Any comments? Seems to be a bug.

Answer: When this first came up, someone thought of keeping it at the system level as a bug. The error thrown in is valid. The question is why the warning appeared. So far, no one has come up with an answer. If any schematron experts want to weigh in - most of us don't know.

~ Someone else looked, but it didn't seem worth taking time on. Reference type seems like it should be there, so not sure why we should go down this rabbit hole.

~ Someone is confused. The error should come from the schema. Realize it had an invalid value, but weird that it's coming from schematron and that the error is that it's a deprecated value.

~ Two errors. First caught by schema, second by schematron. Mystery.

~ There's a schematron rule where a warning is enforced, but not worth re-writing.

~ So, internal reference class, no reference type and got a warning that it's deprecated. The problem was it didn't have reference type.

~ Yes, and the bogus warning. Suggests this is a bug fix, rather than an enhancement. Should have Ron and Steve decide if we should pursue this or not worry about it. No warning if correct/valid reference type. Can come back and tell us if Richard wants to withdraw it.

****Action Item - Steve and Ron**** talk to Richard and look into this.

CCB-340 - Local Internal Reference.local identifier reference cardinality

See [https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-340&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikh1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=KFATIV9IkFGEPwZoJT%2FB%2FKv9ZH0%2FKpl%2B%2FR1RjeozwKM%3D&reserved=0)

[340&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikh1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=KFATIV9IkFGEPwZoJT%2FB%2FKv9ZH0%2FKpl%2B%2FR1RjeozwKM%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-340&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikh1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=KFATIV9IkFGEPwZoJT%2FB%2FKv9ZH0%2FKpl%2B%2FR1RjeozwKM%3D&reserved=0)

[340&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikh1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=KFATIV9IkFGEPwZoJT%2FB%2FKv9ZH0%2FKpl%2B%2FR1RjeozwKM%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-340&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikh1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=KFATIV9IkFGEPwZoJT%2FB%2FKv9ZH0%2FKpl%2B%2FR1RjeozwKM%3D&reserved=0)

This is a new one from Mitch.

~ Imagine you have a file with a bunch of images. You currently need different instances of display direction for each, even if they are the same. This fixes that. Would list LID for all the images. Display direction for all of them.

~ Someone wonders how often local display direction is used. Found an instance in Common in array. Lists cardinality 0 to 0. Might be a bug.

~ Not sure.

~ That was a way to take it out. Pseudo deprecation. Can't remember why we did it that way.

~ Think it was a solution to display direction.

Question: Why didn't we allow 1 to many before?

Answer: Think we just didn't think it through.

~ When we designed it, it was very early in the game. We knew we would get some things wrong. Could even be a typo.

~ Surprised it's there.

~ Anne didn't have any comments. Seems lost in the mists of time.

~ Like this one - it will help with others.

Question: Other comments?

Answer: (Silence)

****Action Item - Steve**** will do a TA for next time.

CCB-339 - add Units of Power with SI watts as option

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-339&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjAwbMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=xfhDxdRFojYg32mjSHeHqidZTxJPI5tpx5bWPRgZsFg%3D&reserved=0>

This was introduced last time. New class of units. Units of power. A few changes were made. Would like to see some other types besides just watts, so we don't have to go through the entire CCB process.

~ Chapter 6 covers this. With nanoseconds we had to explicitly put them all in. Thought would keep it simple with watts, but can be explicit. Didn't want things like micro dBm to happen.

~ If it's not listed in schema, schematron will get validate errors. That's what happened with nanoseconds.

****Action Item - Dick**** will go back and fix it.

This is another one where the Requested Changes and Proposed Solution don't match. Template for unit would have dropped the Proposed Solution. Requested Changes and Proposed Solution should match. We could have a separate SCR that validate will catch it.

~ Something to raise to the software group. Can make validate work, but won't make Oxygen or other editors work.

****Action Item - Steve**** will do a TA after ****Dick**** makes the changes.

CCB-336 - Add a License Information class to the Identification Area

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-336&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjAwbMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=ywoDs5ocrGA0N18gmQYWAwXyBwQyw12%2BgkN60LnGync%3D&reserved=0>

Skipping this one. Beyond what we know about. Unless people have comments.
~ (Silence)

CCB-335 - Inventory Specification Allows Too Many Delimiters

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-335&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=USHF%2BPXgAZ54RVRycTtiBvXal7GIhaNHwppNMCwQVVM%3D&reserved=0>

This was from Dick awhile ago. In Requested Changes it talks about inventory class with record delimiter CRLF. That should be CRLF or LF.

- ~ The change can be made. It's from before LF was allowed. Wrote this a long time ago. Think it's ready for a TA.
- ~ Once the change is made, can see if there are any comments and then be ready for a TA.
- ~ Right. In six months. Our next meeting is in a month. Then the holidays and then the hiatus.
- ~ Anything we vote on now goes in the next build.
- ~ Thought we agreed to meet earlier than December.

****Action Item - Dick**** - Change from CRLF to CRLF or LF.

CCB-209 - Correct Definitions of Tagged-*Object

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-209&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=Wb9kbtHqfSFxotLmKxU%2B%2F%2FfTpBNaaHRkt0Us0h1tHhs%3D&reserved=0>

This is on Dick's plate. He will get back to it.

~ Steve is off the hook.

2nd tier SCRs

Question: Any updates?

CCB-332 - Header definitions are too loose for the validate tool

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-332&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWlloiMC4wLjA%7CwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=LJCaatFRTM3w93Eg%2F%2FxrhyUwQLBpN9zlenqse8WWtCA%3D&reserved=0>

Question: Want to withdraw this?

Answer: Not sure. Marc will discuss it with Trent. ****(Action Item)****

CCB-330 - PDS Data Provider's Handbook contains contradictory phrasing with respect to files with the same

file name.

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-330&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=70a020kOCs6wr5RcXy%2F3IExJNnmHWmwI3UO7OihIT%2BY%3D&reserved=0>

This had to do with documentation. Did make it into the latest DPH.

CCB-324 - Create a data type for Type attributes that require a permissible value list.

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-324&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=SkeZSEKXoFXD7C5oNfjvlwaHXU8kVEVOTJolXzUpS0c%3D&reserved=0>

This still needs a lot of discussion so we will skip it today.

CCB-326 - Inconsistent Direction on How to Use Discipline Facets

See <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-326&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IklhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=lw3NMDaN0fmcpC5RsQdz8og7H1yOrq8h75YLTrThrY0%3D&reserved=0>

This pointed out that the documentation and schema didn't line up. Very confusing when you look at the IM and schema.

~ Two levels of issues. What's in schema isn't how it looks. Was modelled as a hierarchy. If going to be a change in the model we need Anne. Primary Results Summary is her baby. Unclear if this is documentation or model.

~ Someone had an issue with a user over where discipline name goes. There's a problem that should be fixed. Not sure what the path forward is or if we need Anne for a solution.

~ Currently, discipline name is part of the discipline facets. That's where it goes.

Question: Discipline facets in the IM?

Answer: Yes. The IM represents what Anne wanted, but then it was flattened. No question about where it goes. It belongs in discipline facets, science facets.

~ Maybe this isn't high priority, but will try to find an example. ***(Action Item - Ed)*** ~ Hierarchy, but flat when written so things disappear. It's clear in the model where it goes. Examples will help.

We are almost out of time. Thought we came up with November 18 for the next meeting.

~ Yes.

~ Someone agreed to move a meeting to make room for the DDWG.

~ It was on my calendar.

Question: Almost done with the Geometry LDD?

Answer: Yes. Hoping to finish up with emails.

Question: Parking lot or other discussion? Anything to add?

Answer: Someone would like to pull CCB-164 (Display Settings not required for images,

see [https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-164&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDA%3D&reserved=0)

[164&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDA%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-164&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDA%3D&reserved=0)

[164&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDA%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-164&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDA%3D&reserved=0) out of the parking lot. That and several RMS SCRs are all the

same problem. About making Ingest LDD archivable. Needs classes. In RMS's court. Probably won't make the next build. Don't think CCB-314 (Bundle type of "Supplemental" seems oddly defined,

see [https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-314&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDA%3D&reserved=0)

[314&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDA%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-314&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDA%3D&reserved=0)

[314&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDA%3D&reserved=0](https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov%2Fbrowse%2FCCB-314&data=04%7C01%7Cthare%40usgs.gov%7C052d96cb78304c9a694108d9aa0b45e8%7C0693b5ba4b184d7b9341f32f400a5494%7C0%7C0%7C637727787663873695%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDA%3D&reserved=0) is urgent.

Question: Other comments?

Answer: (Silence)

Next meeting November 18.

DDWG Notes 2021-11-18

title: DDWG Notes 2021-11-18

layout: -

date: 2021-11-18

Notes by Dick Simpson. Comments and discussion summaries, interleaved with the posted agenda, are highlighted in red. Minor agenda edits are also in red. Action items are in **bold red**.

DDWG AGENDA

Trent called the meeting to order at 09:30 PST. He apologized for the late notice and thanked Ed for serving as Chair during the previous (October 28) meeting.

Attendees: Marc Costa i Sitjà, Mike Drum, Mitch Gordon, Ed Guinness, Trent Hare, Ron Joyner, Pat Lawton, Tanya Lim, Joe Mafi, Boris Semenov, and Dick Simpson.

Trent reviewed definitions of SCR categories — that is, their priorities in the discussion queue. Owing to the low number of attendees, he wondered whether DDWG should vote on the two SCRs listed under ‘Votes’. Lyle (Huber) had e-mailed ‘yes’ votes on both. Mike said he had lost track of where we are in the review cycle for several SCRs; he wondered whether we could go back to the older practice of including build deadlines in each agenda. Mike would like to have CCB-339 approved for the next build. There was consensus that SCRs with DDWG approval by mid-January should get into the next build. Dick said he didn’t understand CCB-340; he asked for some discussion before a vote (preferably next time).

0. Front-matter

- CCB-260, PDS4 extension passed the CCB! Congrats to all, that was a tough one to get through.
- brief parking lot discussion for Ron (at the end).

I. Votes (maybe!).

1) CCB-340 ([link](#)) -- <Local_Internal_Reference>.<local_identifier_reference> cardinality – Mitch

Mitch explained that <local_identifier_reference> is an attribute in Local_Internal_Reference; the attribute must appear once and only once (cardinality “1”). The proposed change would allow multiple instances (cardinality “1..*”), but the multiple occurrences would have to have the same <local_reference_type>. He added that this change is being supported mostly by CIS and GEO; approving CCB-340 will make implementation of CCB-164 simpler, if that SCR is ever approved.

Rather than increase the cardinality of <local_identifier_reference>, Mike said he would prefer to have multiple Local_Internal_Reference classes — for example, within Display_Settings. This would be more consistent with how repeated information is handled elsewhere in the Information Model.

Dick wondered how much this proposal is driven by what labels look like rather than how machines read them; Ed said we need to find a balance. Mitch suggested prototyping the two proposed solutions to see what they

look like; Trent thought that would be a good idea, and **he offered to draft some examples**. Mike said that Jesse (Stone) has provided two examples in JIRA, but **he will help Trent to draft some others off-line**.

2) CCB-339 ([link](#)) -- add Units_of_Power with SI watts as option - Trent/Jesse

Dick updated this SCR after the last DDWG; there have not been any new comments, and he thinks the SCR is ready for a vote.

II. Status and New SCRs.

1) CCB-341 ([link](#)) -- incorrect WARNING if Internal_Reference has no reference_type - Richard Chen
-- *Steve to discuss with Richard, might withdraw.*

Trent said this SCR will be discussed at the next DDWG; it may be withdrawn. But a check of JIRA by Pat Lawton shortly after the meeting showed that it has already been closed (withdrawn by author on October 28).

2) CCB-336 ([link](#)) -- *Add a License_Information class to the Identification_Area - Mark B. (w/ comments)*
-- *NASA is landing on a CCO license for data (from Jordan). But we still need to know where this info goes.*
-- *need to discuss how to move this forward*

Trent is not sure how to move this forward; he's not convinced it would pass in its present form. The SCR addresses how to put the license information into the archive. There is a separate issue about what the license actually is and means. Tanya said PSA just needs a container; PSA is not so concerned about contents. Because data users often download only products, a product-level class would be best, a collection-level class might be OK, but a bundle-level class would not. Mike said Anne (Rough) does not want to see license information in labels; she would prefer a meta-archive with license information. Tanya said pointers in product labels to a meta-archive with license information would be OK. **Trent will talk to Mark Bentley about possible revisions.**

3) CCB-335 ([link](#)) -- Inventory Specification Allows Too Many Delimiters - Dick S.

Dick said this SCR clears up an inconsistency in the Information Model; it is really an IM 'bug'. He updated the SCR after the last DDWG so that Inventory allows <LF> record delimiters. It should be ready for a TA and a vote at the next DDWG.

4) CCB-209 ([link](#)) -- Correct Definitions of Tagged_*_Object -- *any updates?*

This is being worked by Dick and Steve but the cycle time is long. Steve characterizes it as "under the hood". Dick thinks most people won't notice changes in practice if it is adopted, though the number of Requested Changes in the SCR is long. It could be resolved in the next couple months; but Dick suspects it will take longer based on history so far.

2nd tier: (on hold this week(?))

1) CCB-332 ([link](#)) - Header definitions are too loose for the validate tool
-- *Marc C. to review for possible withdraw -- software issue, status.*

2) CCB-324 ([link](#)) -- still might need some support from DDWG members before vote (review current status).

3) CCB-326 ([link](#)) - Inconsistent Direction on How to Use Discipline_Facets

III. Discussions (order somewhat random, we will get to what we can and is ready to be presented)

ATM: 303

NAIF: 295, 269

CIS/IMG: 209/316, 164,

CCB-325 ([link](#)) - Support for video as product observational

JAXA has created archives of fixed frames which can be displayed sequentially as “movies”. Trent said MARS2020 will do something similar. Because of these workarounds, Trent hasn’t tried to move the SCR forward. He thinks any video observational data should be compressed to minimize storage; but that would require a change in PDS policy. Mike Malin has recommended using Product_Native to capture compressed video downlinked from a spacecraft. Dick noted that PDS only requires that lossy data received from a spacecraft not be made more lossy on the ground.

IPDA: 261, 263

PPI: 222, 282, 230

RMS: 314, 210/275, 212

parking lot:

Trent believes everything above is ‘important’; the SCRs below have not been given any special priority. He thinks “parking lot” may not be the best name, but it’s functional. Dick suggested leaving SCRs in the parking lot until an advocate steps forward. Ron added that there is some pressure from Management to close SCRs if they are going nowhere.

Trent said the parking lot list should include the SCR requiring use of *.lblx in IM v2.0; although important, its provisions are sufficiently controversial that adoption is not likely soon.

Trent said he’s trying to think how to prioritize open SCRs when he passes his duties on to the next DDWG Chair. Archiving video may be a big deal; Mike said archiving XML files is another. Ron said CCB-164 has been pending for so long he thinks it should be closed; if the issue is still important, a new SCR could be submitted. Ron also thinks CCB-205 could be closed because the issues are being addressed through other channels. Dick suggested that Trent create a list of SCRs to close; DDWG could discuss them at the next meeting. Giving the next Chair a scrubbed list might be best since DDWG may be inactive for months before the new Chair takes over.

1) CCB-164 ([link](#)) -- *Display_Settings not required for images* -- (IMG) - Need to think more about potential updates to Imaging and how Display might fit.

2) RS: 259/281 (see new attachment to [CCB-281](#)) (on hold)

3) CCB-261 ([link](#)) -- Add an optional method for indicating that a product is a member of a larger collection that has a DOI -- Last chance before recommending withdraw.

4) CCB-222 ([link](#)) -- Add *citation_text* to *Citation_Information* -- **elevate this?** head to parking lot?

Joe thought Mike was taking CCB-222. Mike agreed that SBN has institutional interest (largely in the person of Anne). Mike agreed to accept joint responsibility for the SCR, but Joe said he will leave it on PPI's plate.

IV. Passed for next build (new Jira links)

1) CCB-Approved: Implementation complete ([link](#))

2) CCB-Approved: Ready for Implementation ([link](#))

3) Key release dates ([link](#))

Next Meeting: maybe Thursday **Dec 9th, 2021(!)** (due to holidays). Happy to hear other ideas for dates.

The next meeting was confirmed for December 9. Expect to vote on CCB-335 and CCB-339. CCB-340 needs a bit more work. Trent will work with Mark on the licensing question.

Adjourned 10:34 PST.

DDWG Notes 2021-12-09

title: DDWG Notes 2021-12-09

layout: default

date: 2021-12-09

December 9, 2021

Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees: M. Drum, M. Gordon, E. Guinness, T. Hare, L. Huber, S. Hughes, R. Joyner, D. Kazden, J. Mafi, S. McLaughlin, R. Simpson and M. Costa Sitja
Known Observers: P. Lawton

DDWG Agenda

(Included in email sent December 6, from T. Hare, DDWG agenda for Dec. 9th, 2021)

0) Front-matter

- CCB-341 - incorrect WARNING if Internal Reference has no reference type (CLOSED)

- Timing for DDWG hiatus and chair

- Trent - introduce potential tickets to close (still building).

(Discussed)

I. Votes.

1) CCB-339 -- add Units of Power with SI watts as option - Trent/Jesse

2) CCB-335 -- Inventory Specification Allows Too Many Delimiters - Dick S

(Voted - Passed 339. Passed 335, then discussed further. Will vote on 335 again.)

II. Status and New SCRs.

0) CCB-340 -- Local Internal Reference.local identifier reference cardinality - Mitch (please review for discussion)

1) CCB-342 -- NASA, CODMAC, and PDS Processing Levels for Science Data Sets -- newish, Steve - needs to introduce.

2) CCB-336 -- Add a License Information class to the Identification Area - Mark B. (w/ comments)

-- NASA is landing on a CC0 license for data (from Jordan). But we still need to know where this info goes.

(Some Discussion)

2nd tier:

0) CCB-209 -Correct Definitions of Tagged-*Object -- any updates?

1) CCB-332 - Header definitions are too loose for the validate tool

-- Marc C. to review for possible withdraw -- software issue, status.

2) CCB-324 - still might need some support from DDWG members before vote (review current status).

3) CCB-326 - Inconsistent Direction on How to Use Discipline Facets **(Not Discussed)**

III. Discussions (order somewhat random, we will get to what we can and is ready to be presented)

ATM: 303

NAIF: 295, 269

CIS/IMG: 209/316, 164, CCB-325 - Support for video as product observational

EN: status on 209 (Steve)

IPDA: 261, 263

PPI: 222, 282, 230

RMS: 314, 210/275, 212

SBN: 222 (helping PPI), new ticket - archiving XML ****(Not Discussed)****

parking lot:

1) CCB-164 -- Display Settings not required for images -- (IMG) - Need to think more about potential updates to Imaging and how Display might fit.

2) RS: 259/281 (see new attachment to CCB-281) (on hold)

3) CCB-261 -- Add an optional method for indicating that a product is a member of a larger collection that has a DOI -- Last chance before recommending withdraw.

4) CCB-222 -- Add citation text to Citation Information -- elevate this? head to parking lot?

****(Not Discussed)****

Next Meeting: Thursday, Jan. 6, 2022

DDWG

Front Matter

The SCR freeze date is at the end of February, but we are shooting for the end of January because of the hiatus.

CCB-341 is closed. Was a typo.

The next DDWG is December 23, but people will probably be off. We could push to January. Need to decide when we want to shut down.

~ A February 3 meeting would be okay, but we have to stop before the February (DSMP) meeting.

~ Let's shoot for February 3 as our last. Maybe we can vote on minor things after that. Final voting date. The hiatus will give us two or three more meetings. Looking at all the tickets, taking notes in the spreadsheet. Done this every six months or so. Some feel like they should be closed so they can be re-done. It's a good transition to hand this off to the next chair.

Question: Any comments?

Answer: Sounds good.

~ Spoke to folks about the transition. Spoke to Mike Drum. He feels he is too new, but this is mainly managing tickets.

Another Question: Okay with this Mike?

Answer: Yes, but happy to defer if someone else wants it.

~ Trent will be around to help with the transition. If anyone has ideas or wants to throw their name in...

~ Someone seconds Mike. Thinks he is a good choice. Happy to help.

~ Another person says yes too.

~ A third person said they have to question anyone who volunteers for the role. Fully supports Mike.

Votes

Ready to vote. Thanks to Steve for the TA.

CCB-339 - add Units of Power with SI watts as option See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-339>

Question: Any discussion?

Answer: (Silence)

****The Vote for CCB-339**

ATMOS - Yes

IMG - Yes

EN - Yes

GEO - Yes

IPDA - Not Here

NAIF - Yes

PPI - Yes

RMS - Yes

RS - Yes

SBN - Yes**

IMG is not longer CIS. Went back to IMG.

CCB-335 - Inventory Specification Allows Too Many Delimiters See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-335>

Question: Discussion? Just got a TA.

Answer: Someone is in favor. Looked this morning. Was confused by something to do with schematron rules.

~ Didn't check that. Question is what is the context. Think typically Requested Changes should address any concerns.

Maybe a lien. When implemented could look at that.

~ No problem approving this, just don't want a problem when implemented.

~ We are moving the context of inventory class. Unclear if need to specify.

~ If leave a lien in place than everything falls into place.

~ Yes, but the question is for Requested Changes.

~ Lien would be to move constraints to inventory after defined for new inventory.

~ As long as Steve knows what to do...

~ ****Action Item - Steve**** will look.

****The Vote for CCB-335, with double checking the lien ATMOS - Yes IMG - Yes EN - Yes GEO - Yes IPDA - Not Here**

NAIF - Yes PPI - Yes RMS - Yes RS - Yes SBN - Yes**

Status and New SCRs

CCB-342 - NASA, CODMAC, and PDS Processing Levels for Science Data Sets See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-342>

New SCR to introduce. It was discussed at the MC. Became an action item for Steve to document the issue and create a mapping for NASA and CODMAC. Not sure what this really is supposed to be. Not a policy. Just mapping. Some questions in the comments need discussion to figure out what we can move forward with.

~ The big question is where this will live.

~ Someone is not sure why we would be voting on this.

~ We won't be. It just gets attached to the policy.

- ~ That makes the most sense. Think if people can't decide what bucket their data goes in they shouldn't be doing it.
- ~ We should just clean this up and be done. Different people have different levels ingrained, so it's good to have the mapping.
- ~ Someone agrees. Gets different definitions with different missions and groups.
- ~ Trying to get JPL not to use EDR, RDR is a nightmare.

If we attach this to the policy, people have to know about that. We could put it in the documents - SR and DPH.

- ~ Could put it in the DPH. SISs often have cut and paste from there. Wouldn't put it in the SR.
- ~ A table in the DPH has our levels, but worried about going back to NASA or CODMAC levels.
- ~ SR says people have to use the PDS4 values. See the DPH and the policy. If putting a table with the policy is the way to go, good with that. Agree correlation is dangerous.
- ~ Reference. Tell people to look at the policy page for mapping. The spreadsheet should live with the policy.

Question: Are there people who really want to review this?

Answer: Would like someone very interested in this.

Another Question: Where did the words come from? Policy in the DPH?

Answer: Yes. From documents.

Another Question: Description, NASA, CODMAC?

Answer: Not CODMAC. Assume from NASA. Unsure.

~ Those are straight out of the PDS3 SR. Probably CODMAC definitions.

Someone attached a copy of CODMAC report. Maybe the third column should say CODMAC.

- ~ Someone is unsure.
- ~ Should clarify field description.
- ~ Someone agrees that it is from the PDS3 SR.

Someone found a description of the NASA levels. Thinks on an Earth site. Nothing official.

- ~ Someone else came across this at some point - people saying it didn't matter.
- ~ Still think that to make this consistent we need acronyms like EDR.
- ~ That's a bad idea for PDS to do as a whole.
- ~ It's for helping people understand the processing levels.
- ~ Would take the acronyms out. Not consistent. They mean different things to different people.

Question: What would the filename have in it?

Answer: Whatever the mission decides to put.

- ~ This isn't about filenames.
- ~ ATMOS names collections data raw, data calibrated, etc.
- ~ GEO too.
- ~ Yes.

Someone goggled NASA levels. Got incorrect information.

- ~ The wording doesn't match.
- ~ The descriptions are the CODMAC descriptions. Packet data is NASA level 1.
- ~ Table 4-1 attached shows some that correspond.

Question: Product native?

Answer: Don't go there.

- ~ Could be raw.
- ~ Has to be raw because it's what comes off the instrument.

****Action Item - Steve**** will work on this.

Could note at the bottom that PDS3 used CODMAC.

~ Yeah, that was a requirement.

~ People used EDR, CDR, etc.

Question: Remove the PDS3 column? Leave the description column in?

Answer: Yes.

Another Question: Three or four processing levels?

Answer: Thought we have five.

~ Text changed when we added telemetry.

~ Take out the numbers.

~ Need to update the policy.

~ A typo. Concerned with removing PDS3 acronym column. Would rather say they are deprecated.

~ Yes. You are right.

~ A single value isn't how the world works. Can't just say RDR equals calibrated. It's not always true. Could be partially processed or derived.

~ Could take out columns four and five. Trying to help people with PDS4.

~ Agree, but need to consider original MC action item.

~ Yes. Need to clarify the boundaries.

~ Three letter acronyms can mean anything.

~ Someone likes the idea to deprecate. Works with mapping. Clear.

~ At the top of the spreadsheet, need to be more specific - where it says "note", say "PDS3 wasn't used consistently".

~ Typically, when a node works with a DP we know what to tell the DP. Concerned there are a lot of acronyms missing. If the group is okay with leaving them, okay. Wouldn't refer to this table because I know what to do.

~ So tell people if it's unclear to talk to their discipline node.

~ Someone thinks PDS3 should be there. Saying deprecated helps.

The sentence will be sent out so that people can pound on it.

~ We also need to go back to the original request and get it into the Problem Statement.

~ It should be in the MC minutes.

More on CCB-335

By changing the inventory to not be a table we lose some control. Could add a schematron rule or create a delimited table or make it byte stream. Getting fuzzy directions.

~ It's a parseable byte stream, not a table.

~ It is a table with schematron rules.

~ Was a table delimited, so not a table.

~ Yes, but if not table delimited, not a table for modeling.

~ Thought we were making this like a table delimited.

We are having a vocabulary issue. Specification for inventory, tagged digital object, byte stream, parseable byte stream, table delimited. Need to add restriction.

Question: Do we need to take it out from table delimited?

Answer: Maybe we should look at this and discuss it next time.

~ The Requested Changes are very detailed. Can do that or leave as a subclass.

~ Original proposal was to add constraints. We have been discussing this and going in circles.

CCB-340 - Local Internal Reference.local identifier reference cardinality See <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-340>

Question: Anymore thoughts on this?

Answer: Two attachments were added to the SCR. Tried to show our current version and the change. You get a sense of the scale. The change compacts it. Makes it easier to read. Unclear if there is a modeling issue. If use multiple internal references could complicate things.

~ Sort order is unfortunate. Think it's enforced. This looks a lot cleaner. Wish we could just say *, but that would be a complete XML breakdown.

~ Someone would use a fixed value - a convention. Could see problems with it.

~ This is a really good example. My argument is the same human readable versus machine. The type issue is in LDD design. You have option to say how many local internal references can be inside a class. Would lose ability to constrain at LDD level. Maybe nobody cares.

~ Thinking in terms of data labels. Not thinking about ingest LDD.

~ In favor of compact, less cluttered, but would like to hear if there's a conflict.

~ Willing to discuss this more off-line.

~ CCB will make the final decision. Have a rabbit hole about this class. Kinda assumes logical identifiers are pointing to something that can be displayed. Value doesn't check that. But that is separate from this.

~ Think that goes back to CCB-164 (Display Settings not required for images, see <https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-164>).

~ Yes.

~ But this problem, would need a schematron rule to check. Problem is getting the schematron rule to work. Ron could probably write it in ten minutes.

~ Even in the compact form, have to have the whole list again.

~ If using the other approach it's even longer.

~ If doing a VIMS cube...

~ Spectral is different, can do it as a table. But don't want to promote that because then doing backplanes.

~ Display settings to array is only one type. Need to add backplanes. Also need to make local reference type something we can validate.

~ Far away from you on that.

~ Complicated alternatives.

~ Someone could work with either option.

~ We should look again at the ingest issues.

We will discuss this again.

Next meeting January 6, 2022