Meeting Minutes from the DDWG-2 telecons:

[DDWG Notes 2025-01-09](#)
[DDWG Notes 2025-01-23](#)
[DDWG Notes 2025-02-06](#)
[DDWG Notes 2025-02-13](#)

title: DDWG Notes 2025-01-09
layout: default
date: 2025-01-09

January 9, 2025
Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees: A. Bailey, J. Blalock, B. Hirsch, L. Huber, S. Hughes, R. Joyner, D. Kahan, D. Kazden, P. Lawton, J. Mafi, S. McLaughlin, E. Schaefer, M. Seritan and M. Tiscareno (*'s indicate people who voted during this meeting - if applicable)

DDWG Agenda
(Included in email sent January 8, from J.Mafi, Agenda for 2025 Jan 09)

We will have a DDWG telecon this Thursday, January 9 at 9:30 PST (12:30 EST, 10:30 MST). Instead of discussing specific SCRs, we will review the status of all of the currently open SCRs, assess their status, next steps and priorities. Please be prepared to advocate for any issues that you would like to see be given high priority.

Upcoming meetings:
Jan 23 – DDWG telecon (regularly scheduled)

For the latest version of this agenda, see the Google Doc

Front-matter/What's new
1. Submitted to the CCB:
   - CCB#4 – Backwards Incompatibility policies
   - CCB#48 – Add JP2 as an allowed extension in the PDS tool Validate (approved)
   - CCB#13 – Ensure file name and directory path name adhere to SR
2. New issues in GitHub:
   - CCB#52 – Enable cross-namespace validations in sch files
   - CCB#53 – Improve cross-namespace validations in sch files
3. Ready for a vote (None)
4. Build 15.1 freeze date: 2/27/2025. The following SCRs are queued for implementation: CCB#48, CCB#49.
5. Withdraw by author (None)
   (Discussed)

Tier 1 issues
- CCB#3 – Adopt Semantic Versioning with version 2 transition The CCB returned this, requesting that it be resubmitted as part specific proposal to transition to IM V2.0.0.
- CCB#13 – Ensure file name and directory path name adhere to SR
- CCB#20 (JIRA-CCB-358) – Instrument Package Context Products Need to form tiger team

- CCB#4 – Backwards Incompatibility policies
  Presentation: Backwards Compatibility
- CCB#46 – Disallow multiple versions of the same LID from occurring in a single collection
- CCB#5 – Move to V.2.0.0 for June 2025 Release
- CCB#11 – Add a Funding Information class to the Identification Area
- CCB#32 – Add Host type to Observing System Component
- CCB#31 – Ensure that dictionary versions are specified in labels
- CCB#35 – Add Alias Index and Acronym Index to the Investigation class
- CCB#36 – Add Mission Phase to the Investigation class
- CCB#37 – Add List Author, List Editor, and List Contributor to the Modification Detail class
- CCB#39 – Fixed problem where LDDTool does not include all rules from IngestLDD
- CCB#40 – Change cardinality in Product Bundle to better support PDS3/4 hybrid bundles
- CCB#41 – Create a way for classes or attributes to be exposed to other LDDs but not to data providers
- CCB#44 – Issues caused by the failure to expose pds: attributes that are referenced in an LDD.
- CCB#45 – Add reference types values for *-to agency
- CCB#50 – Clarify Ambiguous Author Information in Product Document
- CCB#51 – Add an optional attribute in the Target Identification class to identify Primary/Secondary targets
- CCB#28 – As a user, I want validate to allow delimited tables with whitespace-only numeric fields
- CCB#12 – Document Nuances for Reusability of Generic LDD Classes/Attributes
- CCB#21 (JIRA-CCB-367) – Provenance LDD Using PROV-DM
- CCB#22 (JIRA-CCB-164) – Display Settings not required for images Trent will take another look at this One issue was the one-to-many reference to make sure it made sense for multiple image objects
- CCB#23 (JIRA-CCB-211) – XML/schema based files as archival data
  (Discussed)

Tier 2 issues
- Product Metadata Errata?
- Create a supplemental label to live next to original label, that can add aliases and supersede metadata
  (Discussed)

Parking lot – need a driver!
- JIRA-CCB-326 - Inconsistent Direction on How to Use Discipline Facets
- RS: 259/281 (see new attachment to JIRA-CCB-281) (on hold)
- JIRA-CCB-364 – Disallow bundles referencing collections by LID
  (Discussed)

Historical links:
Export of history: https://github.com/NASA-PDS/PDS4-CCB/tree/main/data
Backup: https://nasa-pds.atlassian.net/jira/software/c/projects/CCB/issues (limited seats)
Next meeting: 23 Jan 2025

DDWG

Front Matter

The process today is going to be to check priorities and make sure we are getting things we need to accomplished. We will go through the SCRs as listed in the agenda, check status and discuss. We will try to prioritize in terms of urgency, ease of completion and any other considerations.

CCB#48 (Add JP2 as an allowed extension in the PDS tool Validate) has been approved by the CCB.

There are two new SCRs, CCB#52 (Enable cross-namespace validations in sch files) and CCB#53(Improve cross-namespace validations in sch files). They were submitted over the holiday break. Related to discussions on setting restrictions on one attribute in a dictionary that will effect another dictionary.

Question: Any comments?
Answer: Seems to be, no strong opinion about implementation, but seems like it would be good for cross references we were trying to promote in CCB#41 (Create a way for classes or attributes to be exposed to other LDDs but not to data providers). Think the consensus on CCB#41 is to expose things and trust people not to be bad citizens.
~ Someone agrees. Think cross referencing will be implemented. This is important for Mission Common LDD to enforce values for a specific mission. See these as important. Should get high priority.

CCB#3 (Adopt Semantic Versioning with version 2 transition) and CCB#4 (Backwards Incompatibility policies) went to the CCB. They rejected CCB#4. Mia sent Joe a detailed email with their concerns. He will forward it to everyone (**Action Item - Joe**). Basically, they see the transition to version 2 as a very complex change and they want to see a detailed plan for implementation that can be iterated on and reviewed, possibly at a F2F or something like the DMSP. That's where those two are. Think there's a lot of merit. Discussed for CCB#4 having the details written down. There's some work to do, a lot will need to be in coordination with the document writing group and the CCB. See this as a high priority task that needs coordination.

Tier 1 Issues

CCB#13 - Ensure file name and directory path name adhere to SR

Question: What's the status of this? We voted, it went to the CCB. Never heard back.
Answer: An email about our vote went to the CCB.
Action Item - Joe will check with the CCB on the status of CCB#13.

CCB#46 - Disallow multiple versions of the same LID from occurring in a single collection

There has been a lot of discussion. Think someone was working on this. Think the SCR still needs some updates.
~ It was suggested that we pivot to the SR language first.
~ We discussed this before the holidays. Will get back to it.
(**Acton Item - Matt**)

CCB#5 - Move to V.2.0.0 for June 2025 Release

June 2025 is out of date. We need to re-write this to resolve CCB#s 3 and 4 or close this and write a new one. Needs more work.

CCB#11 - Add a Funding Information class to the Identification Area

We haven't worked on this in a long time.

Question: Any advocates or thoughts?
Answer: Someone thinks there was a recent comment. T.C. was interested and Jordan said this is implemented. Confusing.
~ Sounds like we need to run this down.
Another Question: Do we know who T.C. is?
Answer: On JUICE for ESA. Think lead archivist for JUICE.
~ Probably with PSA to have access to GitHub.

CCB#11 was rejected/withdrawn and closed.
~ Oh. Okay.
~ It was withdrawn by author.

Action Item - Joe will remove it from the list.

CCB#32 - Add Host type to Observing System Component

This is linked to CCB#20.

CCB#20 - Instrument Package Context Products

The Tiger Team met and will meet again next week.

A comment on CCB#s 32 and 20 - We have a higher level ontology. Been asked lately to document it formally. Took all reference types and what they related to to start. Think we need to consider the plan to put them in the context products and think about how we're going to implement them and think about how we're doing it for instrument package and what it means for instrument package. Maybe I (Steve H.) should be on the Tiger Team. Hope that makes sense.
~ It does. In PDS4 everything is supposed to be explicit. If defining the ontology, it should be explicit.
~ The plan is to put them in the context products. Seeing observation area as ontology has been problematic. Needs to be defined explicitly.

Someone thought Steve already was on the Tiger Team.
Action Item - Matt will add Steve to the invite and send him all the Tiger Team emails. Meeting next Thursday.
Action Item - Steve will bring the draft ontology to throw darts at.

CCB#31 - Ensure that dictionary versions are specified in labels

Believe we need updates to documents.
~ Yes. We discussed it at the last meeting. Will check on the action items.
~ Someone thinks we just need to write up the Proposed Changes.
~ Some people discussed this. Think there's more to do. It gets into how references are discussed in the SR.

CCB#35 - Add Alias Index and Acronym Index to the Investigation class

Question: What's the status of this one?
Answer: Steve will try to adjust several SCRs. CCB#35 (this one), CCB#36 (Add Mission Phase to the Investigation class) and CCB#37 (Add List Author, List Editor, and List Contributor to the Modification Detail class) - the ones on ontologies are all requested by the system folks. All have high priority. Impact on search. About five of them. Need to try to get them done. They are all high priority. We could do one per meeting.

CCB#39 - Fixed problem where LDDTool does not include all rules from IngestLDD

Question: What is the status of this one?
Answer: Someone thinks this issue was from Jesse Stone.
~ Someone else thinks this was an implementation issue. Thinks it can be resolved. We should check with Jesse.
~ Best practice might be to combine the rules.
~ Could be manually done or done in LDDTool, but automatic wasn't preferred. Think document

and review approach is preferred.
~ Documenting could be important so people know they need to combine rules. Software wasn't throwing any comments so users would know it was failing.
~ LDDTool could validate this.

Question: Action item? Just leave it open? An LDDTool issue?
Answer: Think we can put the issue on GitHub.
~ Yes. Maybe we need to update the SCR.
Another Question: Who will make the update?
Answer: Steve will update it. (**Action Item - Steve**)

CCB#40 - Change cardinality in Product Bundle to better support PDS3/4 hybrid bundles

Think this was from Bob and that there has been some initial discussion on this.
~ Someone feels like Bob has mentioned that he doesn't want to do this anymore. Need to sit down with him and discuss it. Think it was initially an issue connected to MSL. Will take the action item to figure it out.
Action Item – John

CCB#41 - Create a way for classes or attributes to be exposed to other LDDs but not to data providers

This has been mentioned already. Related.
~ Discussed in context of Rings LDD. Looked at it last time when the DDWG discussed it in October and there was a request from SBN. Discussed cross references instead of duplicating. So yesterday reread the minutes from the conversation in October. Think if expose something it can be used anywhere, but not necessarily as a direct child. Would like some safe guards, but unclear if that will happen.
~ Someone agrees. We should discuss this and think about preferences and enforcement mechanism to not be used irresponsibly. There were some ideas about how to implement restrictions. We can discuss this.
~ Another person likes where this is going, but has some input on this. Would like to be included in the discussions.
~ Post a comment in GitHub. (**Action Item - Steve**) ~ Will do.

There are a number of issues related to sharing attributes.
~ The new ones are related. Think this has been desired for a long time. Think we can make everyone happy.

Question: Currently, if element flag equals true then it has to be a class - direct child. What if we said it has to be a child...? Never mind. Bad idea.
~ For those from the original development, the original plan was to expose all attributes. External flag has little to do with how the model works. Will explain in the comments.

Question: Do we need a Tiger Team for this?
Answer: Don't think we need one yet.

CCB#44 - Issues caused by the failure to expose pds: attributes that are referenced in an LDD.

This sounds like a related issue. Was also from Steve.
~ Yes.
~ This is the SPICE kernel one.
~ A hole that's existed for years. Definitely related. Should all be discussed at once.

CCB#45 - Add reference types values for *-to agency

We discussed this a lot before the holidays. There were action items. Don't think the updates have been made.
~ Someone thought we were pretty close on this one. Maybe ready to vote.
~ The SCR has to be updated before we can vote.
~ That sounds right. Will check. (**Action Item - Steve**)

CCB#50 - Clarify Ambiguous Author Information in Product Document

This was from Joe. The issue came up because in product document there are two places for author information. Purely a documentation issue. Need to have a discussion on author information in citation area versus document area. Not urgent, but we will move this forward at some point.

CCB#51 - Add an optional attribute in the Target Identification class to identify Primary/Secondary targets Think this is also from T.C. We discussed it when it was introduced. There were concerns about if this was needed.

Question: Any comments on this?
Answer: Lots of shades of meaning. Hard to see this being useful in a meaningful way. Maybe we need an advocate for this to attend a meeting.

Question: In ontology - a primary and secondary?
Answer: Assumed it means you observed an object and something else was in the frame.
~ Sometimes you mean to see two things. Lots of distinctions in different situations.
~ It happens a lot where you capture more than originally intended. Will set up a meeting with the requester. (**Action Item - Joe**)

CCB#28 - As a user, I want validate to allow delimited tables with whitespace-only numeric fields

Question: Advocates for this? Unclear what the need was and if it's proposing something that is allowed should be a validate ticket.
Answer: **Action Item - Joe** will take a look at this since he was involved in putting together the DSV spec.

CCB#12 - Document Nuances for Reusability of Generic LDD Classes/Attributes

This is being subsumed by the latest submissions, CCB#52 (Enable cross-namespace validations in sch files) and CCB#53 (Improve cross-namespace validations in sch files).
~ We should withdraw this.

Action Item - Steve will take a look first to see if CCB#12 is covered by CCB#s 52 and 53. If so, it can be closed.

Someone looked at this a long time ago.
~ That's why we are doing this today. To see if some SCRs can be closed or moved on. The action item is to take a look at this.
~ It seems like a duplicate. Has comments from Jordan.
~ The action is for Steve to decide if this can be closed.

CCB#21 - Provenance LDD Using PROV-DM

This is critical. Would like to change the title. It has evolved quite a bit.
~ Someone thinks it's desired to do that.
Action Item - Steve will update the SCR title.
~ Joe will update the agenda. (**Action Item - Joe**)

Put a comment so people will get an announcement. (**Action Item - Steve**) Edits don't trigger an alert, but comments do.
~ That makes sense.
~ Something we did work on and need to come back to.

CCB#22 - Display Settings not required for images

Question: Does anyone know the status of this?
Answer: Trent hasn't mentioned it. John will ask him. (**Action Item - John**)

CCB#23 - XML/schema based files as archival data

We haven't looked at this in awhile, but think it's still a concern.

Question: Any comments on this? It was Jira CCB-211.
Answer: Mike had a lot of perspective on this. It's why we're using LBL file extension. Would make sense to finish this. Jesse made a presentation on reasonable restrictions.
~ Sounds like an action item is to reach out to Jesse. Joe will do that. (**Action Item - Joe**)

Tier 2 Issues

Product Metadata Errata

Think there was a suggestion this could be dropped.

Parking lot

There are three in the Parking lot:
- JIRA-CCB-326 - Inconsistent Direction on How to Use Discipline Facets
- RS: 259/281 (see new attachment to JIRA-CCB-281) (on hold)
- JIRA-CCB-364 – Disallow bundles referencing collections by LID

Someone is unclear why the second one would be a good idea.
~ Someone else thinks the plan was LIDVID only.

Question: But why is that a good thing?
Answer: That's what PPI does. Provides a record of each product version included in a bundle, but other ways of doing that. It needs a driver. Think it was Jordan advocating for this. Joe will check with him. (**Action Item - Joe**)

It never got migrated to GitHub. Still on Jira.
~ Joe will talk to Jordan.
_____

More Discussion on CCB#52 (Enable cross-namespace validations in sch files) and CCB#53 (Improve cross-namespace validations in sch files)

As far as I know, nothing in the IM precludes a DP from writing schema or schematron specific to a bundle. It's why we have a schema collection. Don't see why that would be a problem.
~ Someone tested and verified with the Mission Commons and MAVEN LDDs. Think the issue is there's no way to do it with LDDTool. Think it's not that you can't do this, but that we need LDDTool to know external context for the rules to apply.
~ LLDTool is a tool, not the model.
~ Depends on Ingest LDD, which is controlled by the model, so yes, a tool issue.
~ Both are right. The discussion needs to continue.

Action Item - Lyle and Joe post comments about this in GitHub.
_____

Our next meeting is January 23.
Ethan gave Joe a reminder that we need to discuss NAN and INF.

title: DDWG Notes 2025-01-23
layout: default
date: 2025-01-23

January 23, 2025
Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees: A. Bailey, J. Blalock*, B. Hirsch*, L. Huber*, S. Hughes*, R. Joyner, D. Kazden, P. Lawton, J. Mafi*, E. Schaefer*, B. Semenov*, M. Seritan and M. Tiscareno* (*'s indicate people who voted during this meeting - if applicable)

DDWG Agenda

(Included in email sent January 22, from J.Mafi, Agenda for 2025 Jan 23)

Apologies for the late agenda. We will have a DDWG telecon this Thursday, January 23 at 9:30 PST (12:30 EST, 10:30 MST). We will cover the following issues:
Brief reports on action items from last meeting:

- CCB#51 – J. Mafi to set up meeting with requestor (T. Cornet)
- CCB#45 – S. Hughes to update SCR
- CCB#40 – J. Blalock to check with B. Deen on withdrawing SCR
- CCB#39 – S. Hughes to update SCR
- CCB#28 – J. Mafi to research
- CCB#23 – J. Mafi to contact J. Stone/M. Drum/T. Hare
- CCB#22 – J. Blalock to contact T. Hare
- CCB#12 – S. Hughes to verify whether this is subsumed by CCB#52 and CCB#53
- CCB#45 – Add reference types values for *-to-agency: We will discuss and vote on this SCR.
- CCB#3 & CCB#4 CCB Feedback: We will review the CCB's feedback on these two SCRs and discuss approaches to addressing the issues raised by the CCB. I will resend the email from Mia Mace immediately following this agenda.
  For the latest version of this agenda, see the Google Doc

Front-matter/What's new
1. Submitted to the CCB:
   - CCB#13 – Ensure file name and directory path name adhere to SR
2. New issues in GitHub:
   - CCB#54 – Add modification history for classes and attributes
   - CCB#55 – Funding Acknowledgment class enhancement (funding source and funding acknowledgment text)
3. Ready for a vote (None)
4. Build 15.1 freeze date: 2/27/2025. The following SCRs are queued for implementation: CCB#13, CCB#48, CCB#49.
5. Withdraw by author:

- CCB#11 – Add a Funding Information class to the Identification Area
  (Discussed)

Tier 1 issues
1. CCB#53 – Improve cross-namespace validations in sch files
2. CCB#52 – Enable cross-namespace validations in sch files
3. CCB#51 – Add an optional attribute in the Target Identification class to identify Primary/Secondary targets
4. CCB#50 – Clarify Ambiguous Author Information in Product Document
5. CCB#46 – Disallow multiple versions of the same LID from occurring in a single collection
6. CCB#45 – Add reference types values for *-to-agency
7. CCB#44 – Issues caused by the failure to expose pds: attributes that are referenced in an LDD.
8. CCB#41 – Create a way for classes or attributes to be exposed to other LDDs but not to data providers
9. CCB#40 – Change cardinality in Product Bundle to better support PDS3/4 hybrid bundles
10. CCB#39 – Fixed problem where LDDTool does not include all rules from IngestLDD
11. CCB#37 – Add List Author, List Editor, and List Contributor to the Modification Detail class
12. CCB#36 – Add Mission Phase to the Investigation class
13. CCB#35 – Add Alias Index and Acronym Index to the Investigation class
14. CCB#32 – Add Host type to Observing System Component
15. CCB#31 – Ensure that dictionary versions are specified in labels
16. CCB#28 – As a user, I want validate to allow delimited tables with whitespace-only numeric fields
17. CCB#23 (JIRA-CCB-211) – XML/schema based files as archival data
18. CCB#22 (JIRA-CCB-164) – Display Settings not required for images
    - Trent will take another look at this
    - One issue was the one-to-many reference to make sure it made sense for multiple image objects
19. CCB#21 (JIRA-CCB-367) – Provenance LDD Using PROV-DM
20. CCB#20 (JIRA-CCB-358) – Instrument Package Context Products
    - Tiger Team: M. Tiscareno (lead), B. Deen, B. Hirsch, S. Hughes, R. Joyner, J. Mafi, E. Schaefer.
21. CCB#13 – Ensure file name and directory path_name adhere to SR
22. CCB#12 – Document Nuances for Reusability of Generic LDD Classes/Attributes
23. CCB#5 – Move to V.2.0.0 for June 2025 Release
24. CCB#4 – Backwards Incompatibility policies
    - Presentation: Backwards Compatibility
25. CCB#3 – Adopt Semantic Versioning with version 2 transition
    - The CCB returned this, requesting that it be resubmitted as part specific proposal to transition to IM V2.0.0.
      (Some Discussions)

Tier 2 issues
- Product Metadata Errata?
- Create a supplemental label to live next to original label, that can add aliases and supersede metadata **(Not Discussed)**

Parking lot – need a driver!
- JIRA-CCB-326 - Inconsistent Direction on How to Use Discipline Facets
- RS: 259/281 (see new attachment to JIRA-CCB-281) (on hold)
- JIRA-CCB-364 – Disallow bundles referencing collections by LID **(Not Discussed)**

Historical links:
Export of history: https://github.com/NASA-PDS/PDS4-CCB/tree/main/data
Backup: https://nasa-pds.atlassian.net/jira/software/c/projects/CCB/issues (limited seats)
Next meeting: 6 Feb 2025

DDWG

Front Matter

There are two new issues:

CCB#54 - Add modification history for classes and attributes

CCB#55 - Funding Acknowledgment class enhancement (funding source and funding acknowledgment text)

CCB#54 is from RMS. They have been moving things around in LDDs, incrementing version numbers when they make changes. Annoyed there is no way to record what the changes are. May be that this doesn't need to be required, but would like it to be allowed as a child.

Question: This if for the ingest LDD?
Answer: Yes.

CCB#55 is from T.C. and is connected to the funding acknowledgment class. We will look at this in the future.

CCB#13 (Ensure file name and directory path name adhere to SR) has been passed by the CCB. It has been moved to implementation for the next release.

The next Freeze date is February 27, 2025. We will try to wrap up some of the SCRs as that date approaches.

~ A question was asked about what that date actually means. Unclear on if it is when things go to the CCB. We need a reasonable amount of time to get things done and for them to go to the CCB, and a week or two for them to respond. Then after that we should leave things to the next build.
~ At some point a deadline is a deadline.
~ Waiting for everything in the queue for the last build was problematic.
~ We need a clear deadline.

Action Item - Joe will talk to Jordan to get clarification on this issue.

CCB#11 (Add a Funding Information class to the Identification Area) has been withdrawn by the author. It was removed from our issues list.

Action Item Reports

CCB#51 (Add an optional attribute in the Target Identification class to identify Primary/Secondary targets) - this is from T.C. Joe made arrangements for him to attend the DDWG meeting February 20.

CCB#45 (Add reference types values for *-to-agency) - Steve made the updates and then started working on new updates from Joe and Ron. Updates continue. Will be discussed more today.

CCB#40 (Change cardinality in Product Bundle to better support PDS3/4 hybrid bundles) - John tried to check in with Bob but hasn't heard back. Likely because of fires. Will check in with him again.

CCB#39 (Fixed problem where LDDTool does not include all rules from IngestLDD) - Steve updated the SCR. Added comments.

CCB#28 (As a user, I want validate to allow delimited tables with whitespace-only numeric fields) Joe has no progress to report yet.

CCB#23 (XML/schema based files as archival data) - Joe emailed Jessie, Trent and Mike about this. No responses yet.

CCB#22 (Display Settings not required for images) - John got confirmation from Trent that he will start working on this again.

CCB#12 (Document Nuances for Reusability of Generic LDD Classes/Attributes) - Steve said that he believes that this is subsumed by the new SCRs, CCB#s 52 and 53. Was unclear if he should withdraw CCB# 12 or if there is a process for it to be subsumed by the new SCRs. Joe said that we want information from CCB#12 and can create a dependency. Steve agreed that sounded

good. Joe said we do not want to withdraw it. We will figure something out. We will keep working on this and move forward.

Tier 1 Issues

CCB#45 - Add reference types values for *-to-agency

There has been a lot of discussion and edits for this one. Title has been updated to refer to agency and node. The Requested Changes have been updated to reflect the decisions made by DDWG votes. The attachments have been updated too. A note was added to explain the DDWG considerations in the approach to the implementation because the Problem Statement doesn't exactly match the implementation now. Think it's important to retain the old Problem Statement to make sure it was addressed.

Question: Does anyone think that should be edited?
Answer: Someone agrees. Has been wondering about that too. Thinks this is appropriate and reasonable. Likes keeping the history of the original statement.

Question: Any other comments?
Answer: (Silence)
~ We will keep the proposed statement as it was originally written, with a note on why the implementation is what it is.
~ Good points were raised. Also, the original Proposed Solution would be left and Requested Changes are what we do. Been moving to update the Requested Changes and Proposed Solution. Unsure why we need both.
~ We can look through the edits and revise to original state. Makes sense to retain the original Proposed Solution along with the DDWG notes. Maybe another guideline is to try to retain the original Requested Changes and Proposed Solution.

Question: Any comments?
Answer: (Silence)

This one is easier to deal with because the proposer is a member of the DDWG, but we do have SCRs that aren't from members, so it's important not to change the target after firing the arrow. We need to retain the original and explain any modifications.

Action Item - Joe will change the Proposed Solution back to the original. Implement is described in the Requested Changes.

Question: Any comments before we vote?
Answer: (Silence)

The Vote to approve CCB#45:
ATMOS - Yes
EN - Yes
GEO - Yes
IMG - Yes
IPDA - Not Present
NAIF - Abstain
PPI - Yes
RMS - Yes
RS - Not Present
SBN - Yes

This will be sent to the CCB.

CCB#3 (Adopt Semantic Versioning with version 2 transition) and CCB#4 (Backwards Incompatibility policies)

The email from the CCB was sent to the DDWG. Hopefully, everyone read it. Would like to hear what people thought about what the CCB is asking for. They want a detailed plan, a road map.

Question: Does anyone have any ideas?
Answer: (Silence)
~ The CCB mentions that maybe this could be discussed at the next F2F. We would need to do some work ahead of time, like with the DSMP, but don't think we want to do that for every major version. To create a procedure it might be worth that type of effort. Could form a Tiger Team to start the work on this.

Question: Thoughts?
Answer: (Silence)
~ If none then this will be a short meeting. Would like volunteers to work on an outline of a plan that we can throw darts at. Eventually we will need to work with the CCB and the Document Writing team to make sure we are developing a procedure that is feasible.

Question: Thoughts? Volunteers?
Answer: Ron volunteered to be on the Tiger Team.
Another Question: Anyone else?
Answer: (Silence)

Okay. Ron and Joe will have a lot of power. Excellent. They will start working on this and bring it to the group. The CCB asked for a very specific plan including for non-backwards compatible changes and for moving to version 2.0.0 and a process for future version transitions as well.
_____

Question: Any final comments?
Answer: (Silence)

Next meeting in two weeks.

title: DDWG Notes 2025-02-06
layout: default
date: 2025-02-06

February 6, 2025
Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees: A. Bailey, J. Blalock, K. Crombie, B. Hirsch, L. Huber, S. Hughes, R. Joyner, D. Kahan, D. Kazden, A. Knight, P. Lawton, S. Loftin, J. Mafi, S. McLaughlin, E. Schaefer, B. Semenov, M. Seritan and M. Tiscareno (*'s indicate people who voted during this meeting - if applicable)

DDWG Agenda
(Included in email sent February 4, from J.Mafi, Agenda for 2025 Feb 6)

We will have a DDWG telecon this Thursday, February 6 at 9:30 PST (12:30 EST, 10:30 MST). We will cover the following issues:
1. Action item reports:
    a. CCB#51 – J. Mafi to set up meeting with requestor (T. Cornet) b. CCB#45 – S. Hughes to update SCR c. CCB#40 – J. Blalock to check with B. Deen on withdrawing SCR d. CCB#39 – S. Hughes to update SCR e. CCB#28 – J. Mafi to research f. CCB#23 – J. Mafi to contact J. Stone/M. Drum/T. Hare g. CCB#22 – J. Blalock to contact T. Hare h. CCB#12 – S. Hughes to verify whether this is subsumed by CCB#52 and CCB#53 i. JIRA-CCB-364 – J. Mafi to contact J. Padams j. "Freeze Date" definition – J. Mafi to discuss with J. Padams
2. CCB#45 – This SCR was rejected by the CCB (see followup email). R. Joyner has updated the Schematron and test labels to address issues pointed out by A. Raugh. We will discuss the CCB's feedback and what (if any) the DDWG response should be.
3. CCB#52 & CCB#53 CCB Feedback: Please be ready to discuss these two, related SCRs.
4. Next meeting: The "Freeze Date" (Feb 27) is approaching quickly. I would like to consider holding an extra meeting next week (Feb 13), if there is a possibility that we have any SCRs ready for the DDWG by doing so. We will discuss this briefly at the end of the telecon.

Front-matter/What's new
1. Submitted to the CCB (none)
2. New issues in GitHub (none)
3. Ready for vote (none)
4. Build 15.1 freeze date: 2/27/2025. The following SCRs are queued for implementation: CCB#13, CCB#48, CCB#49.
5. Withdraw by author: CCB#11 – Add a Funding Information class to the Identification Area **(Discussed)**

Tier 1 issues
- CCB#55 – Funding Acknowledgement class enhancement (funding source and funding acknowledgement text)
- CCB#54 – Add modification history for classes and attributes
- CCB#53 – Improve cross-namespace validations in sch files
- CCB#52 – Enable cross-namespace validations in sch files

- CCB#51 – Add an optional attribute in the Target Identification class to identify Primary/Secondary targets
- CCB#50 – Clarify Ambiguous Author Information in Product Document
- CCB#46 – Disallow multiple versions of the same LID from occurring in a single collection
- CCB#45 – Add reference types values for *-to-agency
- CCB#44 – Issues caused by the failure to expose pds: attributes that are referenced in an LDD.
- CCB#41 – Create a way for classes or attributes to be exposed to other LDDs but not to data providers
- CCB#40 – Change cardinality in Product Bundle to better support PDS3/4 hybrid bundles
- CCB#39 – Fixed problem where LDDTool does not include all rules from IngestLDD
- CCB#37 – Add List Author, List Editor, and List Contributor to the Modification Detail class
- CCB#36 – Add Mission Phase to the Investigation class
- CCB#35 – Add Alias Index and Acronym Index to the Investigation class
- CCB#32 – Add Host type to Observing System Component
- CCB#31 – Ensure that dictionary versions are specified in labels
- CCB#28 – As a user, I want validate to allow delimited tables with whitespace-only numeric fields
- CCB#23 (JIRA-CCB-211) – XML/schema based files as archival data
- CCB#22 (JIRA-CCB-164) – Display Settings not required for images
- Trent will take another look at this
- One issue was the one-to-many reference to make sure it made sense for multiple image objects
- CCB#21 (JIRA-CCB-367) – Provenance LDD Using PROV-DM
- CCB#20 (JIRA-CCB-358) – Instrument Package Context Products
- Tiger Team: M. Tiscareno (lead), B. Deen, B. Hirsch, S. Hughes, R. Joyner, J. Mafi, E. Schaefer.
- CCB#13 – Ensure file name and directory path name adhere to SR
- CCB#12 – Document Nuances for Reusability of Generic LDD Classes/Attributes
- CCB#5 – Move to V.2.0.0 for June 2025 Release
- CCB#4 – Backwards Incompatibility policies
- Presentation: Backwards Compatibility
- CCB#3 – Adopt Semantic Versioning with version 2 transition
- The CCB returned this, requesting that it be resubmitted as part specific proposal to transition to IM V2.0.0.

(Brief Discussion related to Action Items and Planning)

Tier 2 issues
- Product Metadata Errata?
- Create a supplemental label to live next to original label, that can add aliases and supersede metadata **(Not Discussed)**

Parking lot – need a driver!
- JIRA-CCB-326 - Inconsistent Direction on How to Use Discipline Facets
- RS: 259/281 (see new attachment to JIRA-CCB-281) (on hold)
- JIRA-CCB-364 – Disallow bundles referencing collections by LID **(Not Discussed)**

Historical links:

Export of history: https://github.com/NASA-PDS/PDS4-CCB/tree/main/data

Backup: https://nasa-pds.atlassian.net/jira/software/c/projects/CCB/issues (limited seats)

Next meeting: 13 Feb 2025

DDWG

Front Matter

No new SCRs were submitted this week.

CCB#45 (Add reference types values for *-to-agency) has been rejected by the CCB. We will discuss this more today.

Reports on Action Items
This includes the ones that someone requested be added to the list.

CCB#51 (Add an optional attribute in the Target Identification class to identify Primary/Secondary targets) - Joe - Talked to T.C. He is coming to the Feb 20 meeting.

CCB#28 (As a user, I want validate to allow delimited tables with whitespace-only numeric fields) - Joe - Nothing to report yet.

CCB#23 (XML/schema based files as archival data) - Joe - Heard from Jesse. They found a work around. Still an important issue. Unsure if it should be kept as an SCR for now.

JIRA-364 (Disallow bundles referencing collections by LID) - Joe discussed this with Jordan. This is the one to require the use of LIDVIDs in bundle, Lower priority, but we should keep it in the list. Freeze date definition - Joe - discussed this with Jordan. The freeze date is the date that things need to be passed by the CCB, so the DDWG date is realistically two weeks earlier. That makes our deadline Feb 13, which is very soon.

Question: Any reports on the other action items?
Answer: Steve said no changes for his, except CCB#45. (Steve's are CCB#s 39 (Fixed problem where LDDTool does not include all rules from IngestLDD) and 12 (Document Nuances for Reusability of Generic LDD Classes/Attributes))

John reported that he spoke to Bob. CCB#40 (Change cardinality in Product Bundle to better support PDS3/4 hybrid bundles) can be withdrawn.
~ Bob needs to email Ron and cc Joe and ask that it be withdrawn.

CCB#22 (Display Settings not required for images) - John - Trent is working on it, but he is concerned about backwards incompatibility issues.

CCB#20(Instrument Package Context Products) and CCB#32 (Add Host type to Observing System Component) - Tiger Team is actively working.

CCB#31 (Ensure that dictionary versions are specified in labels) - Matt and Ron will begin discussing this.

CCB#21 (Provenance LDD Using PROV-DM) - This is not on the agenda for today, but we will begin discussing it after we resolve the issues for CCB#45. This is more work than we can finish before the freeze.

CCB#54 (Add modification history for classes and attributes) - Matt said he hadn't heard any objections and wanted to know if we could just do it.
~ We can move forward and start discussing the comments. It's in the queue.

Action Item - Joe is going to move the action items to a sub-category for the agenda. Many are closed now.

CCB#45 - Add reference types values for *-to-agency

This was rejected by the CCB. The CCB response was sent to the DDWG group this morning. Anne's comment was regarding complicated implementation, Lynn wanted use cases. Definitely more work to do if we want to get this past the CCB.

Question: Any thoughts?
Answer: Someone went through the responses. Tried to resolve them in his mind. Not seeing show-stoppers, but there are issues this team needs to resolve. Had understood that these would be added for use in product context and collection and maybe bundle.
~ The original Problem Statement mentioned more. There were concerns with use cases for some of them. Discussions led to thinking better use for context products.

Someone is seeing this for the first time.
~ Not everyone has received the CCB email yet.
~ Joe is re-sending it now.
~ People just got it.

To summarize, someone's take is that Anne complained about the implementation and Lynn questioned why we need this at all. Anne asked why the shorter list and made the point that's not how we have done things before.
~ Someone disagrees with that. We definitely did something to something else context products. The weird one was data, which is represented by product observational. Weird because no data context product. System side is asking it be broadened to product, which is the name of the class. Moving from data to product in this case. So, disagrees with Anne. Think we are following initial guidelines.
~ A very old argument, whether we should be generic or specific.
~ Jordan says we should be more generic, which was a surprise.
~ Anne has a good point we should be more consistent.
~ So would say product context to agency or node.
~ No, frankly that information is elsewhere. It doesn't need to be provided in the new type.

~ Agree, but Jordan is not parsing those. Can usually tell by name.
~ It's important to look at usage for the last decade. If ops is not finding the types useful then we should transition to more generic types, but that's a bigger discussion than this SCR.
~ It's been confusing that Jordan is changing to more generic. Anne hasn't been hearing those conversations.

Question to Ron: Another concern was Anne not seeing any use for node to context product references. Ron, have you addressed this in the updates?
Answer from Ron: Waiting for the final decision, but yes.
Another Question: Node to instrument might make sense, but not all of them. Any idea why we would need product to node for context products?
Answer: (Silence)

Someone proposes we vote on whether permissible values should be restricted to product and node.
~ Wait. We need way more discussion on the whole SCR before we vote on anything. My very first comment on the SCR was that I don't see what the use cases are. Believe it's the EDWG asking for something we don't need.
~ A person is on the EDWG and says we didn't ask for this.
~ Think it was required behind the scenes, but no one needs this. No real use case for this to ever be necessary.
~ The only use case someone else sees is if a user submits a question or request about a specific bundle to EN, so EN can forward it to the node.

Someone is sympathetic. Was irritated by the EDWG. Doesn't think they should have a say on how the IM or system works. Understanding is with the system people that the IM drives the system, so we capture all the information to drive this, but when system needs a something the question is if we can provide it. For this, Jordan needs it to drive the landing pages. Not from the EDWG. Jordan said he needs this. Thought about provenance. Sees this as a provenance or archive issue. Interested in requirements Jordan has.
~ If that's true it needs to be written in the SCR. Not just a vague statement. What we wanted when we asked for use cases. Need to make it more robust. Then maybe we can get it through.

The real problem depends on how far you want to extend it. It won't work without retrofitting everything in the system.
~ Should have been there from the start.
~ Think we rejected it.
~ It makes sense to someone that some context products should be able to (reference?) node to agency who archives them or products to who funds them, but if we want to argue that someone would download products without collection products we would need a schematron pointer to avoid duplicate information.
~ Not for individual products.
~ Then we should have bundle or collection to node/agency.
~ Back to general versus specific.
~ We voted on product to avoid the long list of all possibilities.
~ Someone disagrees with that.

Question: Would we allow people to use it if they came up with a product they wanted this for?

Answer: They would need to come to the DDWG.
~ That's why a person wanted use cases.
~ Maybe it doesn't matter. We need to consider why we would preclude things.
~ The question is why wouldn't we.
~ We can't close every loop hole. Trying to understand why so important.
~ The only legitimate use cases someone sees are for the system.
~ Agreement.

The next thing is that along the way Jordan said we can't include target because no one owns it, but the sample valid product was a target product. The one thing we said we would exclude was the example.
~ That makes the point that people might do things without good guard rails.
~ We should add documentation. Worried about the schematron rules and having an impossible set of requirements to manage. Can write up the guidance in the DPH.
~ The point in bringing it up is that it should never have gone to the CCB. We failed.
~ Someone agrees. Push-back from the CCB is fine.

Question: Was that cited by the CCB?
Answer: Lynn certainly did. Think Anne did too.
~ Clearly we need some additional work on this. Will reach out to Jordan for specific use cases on this. **(Action Item - Joe)**

Don't think it's our responsibility to tell the system what they need. We just provide what they ask for.
~ We need clarification on what they actually need.
~ And why.
~ Don't think anyone here has ever had to do a landing page. You have to constantly make changes.
~ We want use cases so we can try to implement in a way that will work for them.
~ In the EDWG, also want clarification. Just because something might help with the website doesn't mean it has to go in the archive. Just posted a comment proposing collection to agency, collection to node, bundle to agency and bundle to node, to agency for only those context products that are sensibly owned or funded by an agency.
~ We need use cases before we vote.
~ Jordan wanted us to keep it general. I was the one who proposed product.
~ Thought he prefers generic.
~ He does.
~ We can come back to this after Joe checks with Jordan and then vote on this. Agrees that text for the DPH should also be part of this.

These are just names for links. All Jordan really is asking for is the link. Don't think he cares what it is called. He wants product A to product B. Doesn't care what the name is.
~ We still need to know why he needs the link. Unclear why anyone would do some of these searches.
~ Products with DOIs would need landing pages.
~ Someone can imagine people wanting to know what products are curated by a specific node/agency.
~ Someone else can't. Bundle maybe.
_____

We have ten minutes left. We only have about a week to get things to the CCB to resolve before the freeze.

Question: Do we want to meet next week? Is there something we can finish?
Answer: Someone would like to meet more often. A lot on the agenda that isn't getting finished.
Another Question: That's fair. Is there any objection to meeting next week?
Answer: (Silence)
~ It will conflict with the Tiger Team meeting.

Question: Why this hard deadline for a build? Seems like the last build just came out.
Answer: It did. How it works. They need time to implement and test.
~ The real question is if we need two builds a year.
~ Jordan is trying to do a build when we want to, trying to move past this.
~ The IM has barely come out.
~ We really screwed up last time. Almost all the implementation happens after the deadline. Huge problem.
~ It was more than a month past the freeze date.
~ Not efficient. We don't even know what's in the IM model.

Question: What is driving this? A lot of time. Why do that?
Answer: A fair question. Think we have three queued for implementation this time. Don't see any others that will make it.
~ Someone thinks there are several we could do if we had a few more weeks. There are a bunch of loose ends, so not sure why we need a new build.
~ We need Jordan to answer. It's a system management question. Not sure.

Someone's opinion on the last one is that there is more content there than in a long time. Prefers builds with small changes. One a year would be horrendously difficult.
~ The question is why the hard schedule. We could do more without the hard deadline. It's what we have always done, but unsure what's keeping it to that. we can ask Jordan for clarification and if there is any flexibility in the build dates. **(Action Item - Joe)**

Don't think there's much we can do for this next build. Think our deadline for this current build is next week. Agree with what everyone has said. The last freeze dragged on.

We are out of time. We will discuss CCB#52 and CCB#53 next time.

Action Item - Joe will send a request to Vivian to set up a meeting next week.

Question: Any last thoughts?
Answer: For 52 and 53, unless we think they can be implemented right away, we should work on things that have a chance to pass. Suggest CCB#s 54, 31, 20 and 32.
~ CCB#52 does have a chance, CCB#53 is more complicated.
~ Someone agrees about CCB#52 and that we should work on things we have a chance to pass.
~ Trent is currently working on CCB#22. He's concerned about backwards incompatibility issues.
(Action Item - John will check in with Trent.)

Here is the list again for next week: CCB#s 52, 54, 31, 20 and 32.

~ Yes.

The Tiger Team members can stay online now and try to figure out our next meeting time.
~ Agreement.

Next DDWG Meeting February 13.

title: DDWG Notes 2025-02-13
layout: default
date: 2025-02-13

February 13, 2025
Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees: A. Bailey, J. Blalock, K. Crombie, B. Deen, B. Hirsch, L. Huber, S. Hughes, R. Joyner, D. Kazden, A. Knight, P. Lawton, S. Loftin, J. Mafi, S. McLaughlin, E. Schaefer, B. Semenov, M. Seritan and M. Tiscareno (*'s indicate people who voted during this meeting - if applicable)

DDWG Agenda

(Included in email sent February 11, from J.Mafi, Agenda for 2025-02-13)

We will have a DDWG telecon this Thursday, February 13 at 9:30 PST (12:30 EST, 10:30 MST). For this meeting we will consider a series of the more straightforward SCRs, that there may be a possibility of getting through the full DDWG and CCB approval process prior to the freeze date (27 Feb). We will cover the following issues:
1) Action item reports.
2) CCB#52 – Enable cross-namespace validations in sch files
3) CCB#54 – Add modification history for classes and attributes
4) CCB#20 (JIRA-CCB-358) – Instrument Package Context Products
5) CCB#31 – Ensure that dictionary versions are specified in labels

Front-matter/What's new
1) Submitted to the CCB (none)
2) New issues in GitHub (none)
3) Ready for vote (none)
4) Build 15.1 freeze date: 2/27/2025. The following SCRs are queued for implementation: CCB#13, CCB#48, CCB#49.
5) Withdraw by author: CCB#40 – Change cardinality in Product Bundle to better support PDS3/4 hybrid bundles **(Brief Discussion)**

Action Items
a) CCB#39 – S. Hughes to update SCR
b) CCB#28 – J. Mafi to research
c) CCB#12 – S. Hughes to verify whether this is subsumed by CCB#52 and CCB#53
d) CCB#20 & CCB#32 – Tiger team formed and working the issue
e) CCB#31 – Ron and Matt working the issue

Tier 1 issues
• CCB#55 – Funding Acknowledgement class enhancement (funding source and funding acknowledgement text)
• CCB#54 – Add modification history for classes and attributes
• CCB#53 – Improve cross-namespace validations in sch files
• CCB#52 – Enable cross-namespace validations in sch files

- CCB#51 – Add an optional attribute in the Target Identification class to identify Primary/Secondary targets
- CCB#50 – Clarify Ambiguous Author Information in Product Document
- CCB#46 – Disallow multiple versions of the same LID from occurring in a single collection
- CCB#45 – Add reference types values for *-to-agency
- CCB#44 – Issues caused by the failure to expose pds: attributes that are referenced in an LDD.
- CCB#41 – Create a way for classes or attributes to be exposed to other LDDs but not to data providers
- CCB#40 – Change cardinality in Product Bundle to better support PDS3/4 hybrid bundles
- CCB#39 – Fixed problem where LDDTool does not include all rules from IngestLDD
- CCB#37 – Add List Author, List Editor, and List Contributor to the Modification Detail class
- CCB#36 – Add Mission Phase to the Investigation class
- CCB#35 – Add Alias Index and Acronym Index to the Investigation class
- CCB#32 – Add Host type to Observing System Component
- CCB#31 – Ensure that dictionary versions are specified in labels
- CCB#28 – As a user, I want validate to allow delimited tables with whitespace-only numeric fields
- CCB#23 (JIRA-CCB-211) – XML/schema based files as archival data
- CCB#22 (JIRA-CCB-164) – Display Settings not required for images
- Trent will take another look at this
- One issue was the one-to-many reference to make sure it made sense for multiple image objects
- CCB#21 (JIRA-CCB-367) – Provenance LDD Using PROV-DM
- CCB#20 (JIRA-CCB-358) – Instrument Package Context Products
- Tiger Team: M. Tiscareno (lead), B. Deen, B. Hirsch, S. Hughes, R. Joyner, J. Mafi, E. Schaefer.
- CCB#13 – Ensure file name and directory path name adhere to SR
- CCB#12 – Document Nuances for Reusability of Generic LDD Classes/Attributes
- CCB#5 – Move to V.2.0.0 for June 2025 Release
- CCB#4 – Backwards Incompatibility policies
- -Presentation: Backwards Compatibility
- CCB#3 – Adopt Semantic Versioning with version 2 transition
- The CCB returned this, requesting that it be resubmitted as part specific proposal to transition to IM V2.0.0.
  (Some Discussions)

Tier 2 issues
- Product Metadata Errata?
- Create a supplemental label to live next to original label, that can add aliases and supersede metadata **(Not Discussed)**

Parking lot – need a driver!
- JIRA-CCB-326 - Inconsistent Direction on How to Use Discipline Facets
- RS: 259/281 (see new attachment to JIRA-CCB-281) (on hold)
- JIRA-CCB-364 – Disallow bundles referencing collections by LID **(Not Discussed)**

Historical links:
Export of history: https://github.com/NASA-PDS/PDS4-CCB/tree/main/data
Backup: https://nasa-pds.atlassian.net/jira/software/c/projects/CCB/issues (limited seats)

Next meeting: 20 Feb 2025

DDWG

Front Matter

There are a number of SCRs to review today. There have been developments on some, even the need for some of them may have changed.

Tier 1 issues

CCB#54 - Add modification history for classes and attributes

Basically, the request is to add a modification history class to DD class and DD attribute class so that changes in the ingest LDD file can be tracked.
~ Someone suggested we use comment. That's okay if it's easier for EN.
~ That would mean updating the documentation.
~ Comment is already allowed for DD class, but not DD attribute, so an SCR is still needed.

There is something at the file level. If we want it at the individual attribute level that can be useful in bigger LDDs.
~ Hard to keep it all in a change log. Would be better to capture in that class or attribute.

The SCR has been updated.

Question: Any comments?
Answered with Another Question: Can we update the Requested Changes, if it's already in one?
Answer: Yes.
~ Someone said it is already in attribute, not class.
~ A person is trying it in Oxygen now, Oxygen doesn't like it.
~ Schema has attribute, not class.
~ We should also have it in DD rule for completion, but they don't have version.
~ Should also put the definition for comment that we have been using all over.
~ That will be inherited.
~ Okay.

Someone is making the SCR changes in real-time.
~ The title should be updated too.
~ Done.

Question: Other thoughts? Do we need a test schema or test labels or can we go forward like this?
Answer: There is a change to schema, so there will need to be a test.
~ And a proper TA.
Another Question: Any objections to being able to submit this to the CCB if we get this done?
Answer: (Silence)

The freeze is in two weeks. We could try to get this together and get it reviewed and do an evote early next week. Think this is fairly straight forward. Not a huge impact. Would be nice to get this into the next build. We will try to evote Tuesday. Hopefully that is enough time for the CCB to review it and vote.

Question: Comment is currently optional, assuming it will remain optional?
Answer: Yes. Adding that to the SCR in real-time now.
~ Excellent.

CCB#31 - Ensure that dictionary versions are specified in labels

This one was discussed about a month ago. There was a suggestion on documentation. Think this is becoming a documentation fix. A change so DPs and users know where to look in labels to find what dictionaries were used.

This fell off the table. It hasn't been worked on yet.
~ Then there is nothing to do for this today.

CCB#52 - Enable cross-namespace validations in sch files

Someone is going to speak from their car. There are two issues, this and CCB#53 (Improve cross-namespace validations in sch files). CCB#52 is the easy one, so it can be a rule, but it turns out, from the comments yesterday that there is already a way to do it in LDD ingest. Just need to add a few lines. It seems to work, so not sure we need this since there is that other mechanism.
~ Another person wasn't aware it was already possible.
~ It's useful to know that.
~ People are glad Jesse knew how to do it and described it for us (in GitHub).

Maybe we just need a document change to say how to do this. Don't think we need any substantive changes.
~ Good point, but not sure documents talk about LDDs much.
~ Don't know if they do, but maybe they should. CCB#53 is easier way to write the rules (Breaking up while driving...) With CCB#53, a better way of doing this. If we are contemplating doing that we could hold off on CCB#52 for now.

We will hold CCB#52 open for now, but it becomes a documentation issue.
~ Okay. Maybe we should discuss CCB#53.
~ We are trying to hold today for things we can finish today.
~ It's ready for a TA.
~ We can put CCB#53 on the agenda for an upcoming meeting.

Question: Is it worth doing a TA now to inform the discussion, to get ahead of the game?
Answer: People haven't looked closely yet to understand the issues.
~ On CCB#52, the question is if we want to keep it open, but the focus is changed, so we should change the title.
~ Yes, but not sure of the details yet.
~ It could be changed from enabling to documenting.
~ Yes.
~ The author can change it. **(Action Item - Bob D.)**

Question: Any other comments?
Answer: (Silence)

CCB#20 (JIRA-CCB-358) – Instrument Package Context Products

The Tiger Team had a fairly extended meeting yesterday. There are some questions to answer.
~ (Matt is sharing his screen) This has been discussed for a long time. It goes back to Jira 358. The original use case was New Horizons Ralph, with instrument group LEISA and MVIC. We didn't have a place in our hierarchy for that. Since then, more use cases have come to light. We need the hierarchy to be flexible. Not all of the discussion is captured in GitHub. One idea was to have several levels. It's something we can do, but it gets very complex, especially with all the pointers. On the other hand, we could just have instrument group point to instrument group. It could be recursive. But people didn't like that because we lose the hierarchy. People want to know that so people would know if Ralph is a child of New Horizons and not the other way around. What the Tiger Team is now suggesting - could name every level versus a flexible recursive approach. Suggest a compromise - extra levels, instrument group and instrument component. It's clear about relationships in context products.

If you have a group with a group, label doesn't know the relationship. Understand that's in the context product implemented by type names. Documentation would need them listed with parent and child relationships so they are implied in the label. Requested Changes would be to add instrument group and instrument component. SCR has draft definitions. Suggests that we add context to parent context and context to child context products and deprecate the previous instrument to instrument. A new approach, but not backwards incompatible. Also suggest add reference types is instrument group and is instrument component. That's the proposal from the Tiger Team, but they also want to allow for the possibility that people don't like the flexible approach, so the Tiger Team also produced a substitute motion in GitHub, called the Minority Report. It's not what the Tiger Team recommends, but it's an alternate so we don't have to sink the whole thing. the Tiger Team all came to consensus.

Question: Comments?
Answer: Someone is not sure where to start. Deprecating types makes it backwards incompatible. Full stop. Don't try to hide behind how the registry interprets it.
~ We don't have to deprecate it.
~ Whatever. By making a backwards incompatible change that makes this a hard no. A very convoluted set of solutions. A much simpler one was suggested in the past. This is far beyond the scope of what is necessary. MVIC and LEISA are instruments, Ralph is not, it's MVIC plus LEISA. We don't need all of this. Neither option here is good. We just need to point to Ralph in a way that can be found.

~ That may be all you need for Ralph, but there are other use cases. This is not a radical change, adding instrument group and component and group of group or component of component. Not a radical change.

New Horizon describes Ralph as an instrument.
~ This would allow DPs to decide about the children.
~ Someone understands.
~ Ralph is a simple example. Other examples are not simple. CADRE is a very complex example.
~ CADRE is an investigation with instrument host and group of three rovers, with a bunch of instruments and instrument groups. Several levels. Instrument hosts with instrument components.
~ Lunar Vertex is very similar. Rover and stationary part with very different instruments. CLPS examples are very complicated.
~ CLPS are a paradigm change.
~ Good point.

Back when we originally discussed this I was in the camp that said we didn't need this, but now, as a DP for LUCY, very hesitant in making this more complex, but getting into CLPS instruments might make me change my mind. Very complicated and different from what we have dealt with in the past.
~ Someone appreciates that. The way we did things in the past fits with this.
~ The context products noted the relationships, they just weren't machine actionable.
~ This would provide more clarity.

One Tiger Team member admits to pushing for the Minority Report because with like with CCB#45 think that trying to streamline reference types is a bigger issue and could increase possibility of rejection by the CCB. Don't like adding all the permissible values, but it reflects the standard approach.
~ Political expediency is reasonable, but it doesn't hurt to try.
~ Someone doesn't like rejection.

Question: Any last thoughts? Would like to get some straw-man polls on an approach.
Answer: Main thing is to have a straw-man to have EN do a TA. Should do it on both options.
Answer and Another Question: Okay. Steve, is that okay?
Answer and Another Question from Steve: Yes. Both should be discussed. Didn't attend the Tiger Team meeting. Will there be another meeting?
Answer: The Tiger Team is done.
~ At least until we get feedback from the DDWG.
~ The DDWG isn't done yet. Not ready to send this to the CCB.

The TA is not done until the DDWG agrees.

Question: If I put instrument Ralph in search, would I find it?
Answer: In product context there is a title. Can search on that, but can't wild-card.
~ If I read an old article on Ralph and go to PDS search I wouldn't find it.
~ Search would make use of aliases of instruments that are members of Ralph.
~ But we lose all of the hierarchy. Strongly against that. As far as searching - that was discussed. Think that the only practical way to support search is to have a combined search. It's not the ideal solution, but the best option I see.

~ Someone also wants to note that if someone says instrument group, that might confuse people.
~ That's something for nodes to consider. Don't think there will be a lot of retrofitting for what's been archived, but it will address complex relationships in CLPS missions.
~ Someone wants to re-emphasize that nobody is suggesting we re-do the context products. The diagram in GitHub is an example. Documentation says Ralph is an instrument. New ones would say it's an instrument group. It's less of an issue than people think.

We need to figure out what to do to unlock the TA process. Confused.
~ EN is not hearing a consensus. As soon as there is one then we can do the TA.
~ So we should do a straw-man poll to see if we can get consensus so the TA can be done.
~ There are two main approaches. Two new types of context products or specific list versus generic list of reference types.

Question: Can we take a straw-man poll now?
Answer: The DDWG is just seeing the Minority Report for the first time. We can't vote on this. We need more time.
~ Fair. We won't hold the straw-man poll now. We will do it in the upcoming weeks to give everyone a chance to think about this.
~ Sorry. We could do a straw-man poll to see if we think we are moving in the right direction.
~ Not sure that would improve anything. The Tiger Team is done until they get feedback from the DDWG.

_____

Our time is up. We will try to get samples for CCB#54 and send that out and do an evote on Tuesday.

Someone has a last thought - feeling frustrated. EN is about to spend a bunch of resources with very little change on a new build when we have a bunch of stuff that is very close. Want to know how firm the deadline is. Want to begin a discussion on the build cycle.
~ That is above our pay grades, but we can discuss it in the future.
~ Nodes also have to put out a lot of effort. If the build is just going to be one small change we should put the breaks on.

We can discuss this again. Our time is up today.
_____

The DDWG voted as follows:

CCB#54 - Item Passed: 7 Yes (ATM, EN, GEO, IMG, PPI, RMS, RS); 0 No; 1 Abs (NAIF); 2 NV (IPDA, SBN)