title: DDWG Notes 2017-02-16
layout: default
date: 2017-02-16

February 16, 2017
Notes by Debra Kazden

Known Attendees:
M. Banks, M. Gordon, E. Guinness, S. Hardman, L. Huber, S. Hughes, C. Isbell, R. Joyner, D. Kazden, J. Mafi, S. McLaughlin, T. Morgan, L. Nagdimunov, L. Neckrase, J. Padams, A. Raugh, B. Semenov, R. Simpson, J. Stone and Christine from IMG

Notice sent before the telecon in email from R. Joyner - February 14, 2017

CCB/SCR Statuses:

- None

This week's agenda will focus on the following topics.

(1) Please review, be prepared to discuss, and possibly vote -- should the complete TA be ready:

-- CCB-171:Split hardware-compatible ASCII numeric types from the unbounded (L.Nagdimunov)
    -- 20161012: Requested Lev provide cogent statement of the issue to be resolved; send to DDWG to start
    email exchange & discussion
        -- lots of email discussion; inconclusive as to whether issue is converging or diverging ?
    -- 20161026: Can a problem statement be written into an SCR where there is some measure of certainty that this is the issue to be resolved ?
        -- at least one email questioning whether this issue is worth the time / effort to discuss / resolve
    -- 20161109: Lev requested another week to work issue; before additional DDWG discussion
    -- 20170103: Open & Under DDWG review
    -- 20170105: request Steve and DocWritingTeam to TA by end-of-next-week
        -- DWT TA provided; waiting on IM TA
    -- 20170131: Lev to update SCR and resolve liens identified in TA; not ready for vote
    -- 20170202: Resolution dependencies:
        -- CCB-131; resolution has dependency on CCB-171
        -- CCB-170; in wait-state until CCB-131 is resolved; CCB-131 in wait-state until CCB-171 resolved
    -- 20170214: Lev & Simpson not converging; Lev to revise SCR, advise when ready so that TAs can be done by R.Simpson & S.Hughes
    (Discussed - Voted to endorse the SCR as written)

(2) Please review and be prepared to discuss:

-- CCB-172: Add movie format(s) to list of acceptable documents (L.Huber)
    -- 20170126: Open & Under DDWG review
    -- 20170213: R.Joyner sent emails about 2015 version of the "movie" standard -- ISO-IEC 14496-12

(Discussed)
-- CCB-173: Modify Product Update (M.Gordon)
    -- 20161109: Mitch sent out Product Update email; send to DDWG to start email exchange & discussion
    -- 20161129: Mitch to send out example(s)
    -- 20170131: Mitch to submit as SCR
    -- 20170214: CCB-173 - Modify Product Update (M.Gordon)
       -- not fully TA'd.
    (Discussed)

(3) Email exchanges and other stuff

-- PDS4 equivalent for the PDS3 keyword SOURCE PRODUCT ID (S.Slavney / J.Padams)
    -- 20161129: Open; under DDWG discussion; form WG
    -- 20170105: A.Raugh emailed two PDS3 citation examples to DDWG
    -- 20170117: formed WG: Jordan, Ed.G, RJ
    -- 20170214: J.Padams agreed to provide example(s) -- low priority...
    (Not Discussed)
-- Composite Structure (S.Hughes)
    -- 20170202: Open; under DDWG discussion
       -- review email & attachments from S.Hughes; sent 20170129
    -- 20170202: DDWG agreed that S.Hughes can draft SCR
    -- 20170214: SCR as yet not submitted to JIRA
    (Not Discussed)

(4) DDWG(2) -- initial telecom (M.Gordon / R.Joyner)
    -- availability to meet Thurs Feb 21 @ 9:30 ?
    (Discussed)

DDWG Telecon

We have a full house today. Something that is not on the agenda is that JPL is moving WebEx to the cloud. This is the last meeting with this list of instructions. New instructions are coming. We will also be migrating to DDWG2.

CCB-171 - Split hardware-compatible ASCII numeric types from the unbounded See https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-171

People have been working on this - not converging.
~ This would take ASCII Real and ASCII Integer and make two new classes. ASCII Real unbounded etc. The Integers would be strings. Reals could be represented in binary. Thinks what has been hammered out will work, but concerned. Sent email to EN for help/input. Proposed that ASCII Real be bounded. Than there would also be unbounded. There's an issue with the names, classes, subclasses.
~ EN did answer regarding the naming convention. Thinks the team should decide. (Email was sent on the subject, but it did not go to the entire DDWG.) Wondered if the effort is worth the benefit. Doesn't think it's necessary. Doesn't think a class hierarchy is necessary.

Question: So are we happy with the SCR as written?

Answer: It will work, but it makes the model unnecessarily messy.
Another Question: Functional?
Answer: Yes.

SCR author would like to thank people for their help with this SCR. Regarding specific issues - class hierarchy - we have one, so followed that. Regarding naming - followed what we had for ASCII non-negative integer. Picked what was short and what author thought people will usually use. Kept most common, simple. Thinks this SCR solves a critical issue because we're looking at more complicated structures and we have a simple type that software can't read. Strikes author as a fundamental issue. All types should be readable by tools.

The TA still has two liens. One was min/max.
~ The issue was original SCR didn't say things were inclusive. Added about a month ago.

Question: Is it okay to remove that lien?
Answer: Think so. Requested changes is what the TA looks at.

Question: Any objections to voting on this? As written or amend to remove the lien?
Another Question: Is everything there?
Answer: Yes, as far as author is concerned.
~ Okay to remove the lien.

Question: Are people ready to vote?
Answer: (Silence)

**The Vote to endorse CCB-171 as written:
RS - Abstaining
ATMOS - Yes** (Comment that ATMOS continues to see this as a solution in search of a problem) **EN - Yes IMG - Yes GEO - Yes PPI - Yes NAIF - Abstain Rings - Yes IPDA - Not Here SBN - Yes**

Clearly, this passes. We are good. Yay for our team.

Product Update

CCB-173 - Modify Product Update. See https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-173

This is another interesting one. There has been a lot of email back and forth on this. The comments in the emails were consolidated. Responses were sent. There were still some objections. Believes it is resolved now, but there are three issues to discuss. They were items 6, 7 and 8 in emails. (See attachment "Email-comments-responses" in email from M. Gordon, "RE: urgent - Product Update SCR 173 is posted", February 15, 2017 11:09 AM). Regarding number 8 - headers required in tables, it's optional. As to limitations on what people can't do - two people said it was impossible and that it is the responsibility of the nodes to keep bad people from doing bad things. The reference list/internal reference are redundant because primary member of the collection.

Question: Leave in? Deprecate? Take out? Comments?
Answer: Someone has lots of comments. Looked at all the documents that were produced and the comments and TA. Thinks this would have a moderate impact on the DPH. We need to tell people when

to use this. Concerned about example that uses phase angel - if we want to think of this as a virtual label and we add something like phase angel not sure it stays valid. Wants to know how we would test that. Also not sure how the system or users would use product updates.

Question: Anyone else?
Answer: A lot of this is better discussed by email, but looked briefly at the revised SCR, thinks some could be revised again with time and effort. The example in the SCR is very long - that's a big problem. Still contend that this should be limited in the SR to say what is required, not just the DPH. Still confused by some of the text and what to do if replacing or adding a keyword that repeats. If we use this, potentially could have a tool to update the whole label and re-post it - not have to download two.
~ Thanks.

Question: Anyone else?
Answer: Someone's issue is that they are not clear on the distinction between metadata that is archival versus service metadata. Not sure which tells you where to find the data. Concerned that there isn't a clear distinction. When you add archival metadata, someone doesn't see a clear path to peer review and no clear binding to the IM when adding new contexts - like new targets. If newly added, might need new contexts in label. Some values might be null and not pass validation. Concerned about provenance, accountability and tracing.

We are not ready to vote at this time, even on if internal reference should be included.
~ Agreement. Some of this has just come to light.

Question: Is there a particular urgency for this?
Answer: No, but it's been around an embarrassingly long time. No mission driving this.
~ You describe a real useful purpose for something - when the team may provide more metadata. Valid reason to have something. Not sure the current IM prevents adding a table.
~ True.
~ Main concern is how this will work in practice.
~ Agreement. This is valuable, but unsure how to write a tailored SCR.
~ Someone likes how this is progressing. Doesn't see the need to tie product update to the labels. Also agrees we need tighter rules for the SR.

Someone hopes that if this is fully implemented that NSSDCA will receive it as part of the bundle.
~ It's a product like any other.
~ Just wanted to make sure.

CCB-172: Add movie format(s) to list of acceptable documents See https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-172

The ISO standard was looked at and found to not be terribly helpful. There have been some ideas on how to improve this. MOV format is in fact a subset of MPEG4, but there are free converters. Easily made more generic. Would modify this to say we only accept MPEG4 - not sure what part of ISO standard to reference.
~ There is a part that specifically defines MPEG4.
~ We need a specific revision. Complicated.
~ Someone isn't sure that's true.

Someone has some concerns - glad we are moving away from MOV since it's kind of tied to Apple, but understands these are containers. Could be video, voice, other things. Concern is we pick something - say it's MPEG4, but not sure how we test for that. Might be nice to have tools to read conversions. Need to document that. MOV is not on the approved list of data formats. That would need to be approved by the MC.
~ This is for document.
~ Still has to go to the MC. Not sure if it should go to them first or to the CCB first.
~ CCB first. They can send it to the MC.

We can't vote or tell our managers to vote for a standard we can't read. If JPL won't share we might need to ask HQ. Not sure we want to require everyone to buy this. Concerned.
~ It would be nice to have the standard. Talked to experts and they suggested we pick raw video and raw audio or pick a very common codex so maybe it will still be in use in the future. One for audio, one for video. Said they wouldn't use the audio standard wave format. They said raw audio is better. Need a copy of the standard.

Question: Is management here?
Answer: Yes.
Another Question: Can you get a copy of the standard?
Answered with a Question: Why can't JPL?
Answer: JPL can't distribute it. Costs 200$ per part. Has about 14 parts. If every node has to buy it's own copy it could be very expensive. Might be cheaper to fly everyone who needs to read it to JPL.
~ Or to Switzerland. Since some of you love to travel. Didn't realize it cost so much. Was thinking of getting a copy, but not sure about getting 11 copies.

JPL is not being intentionally obstructionist. Restrictions are from the document license.
~ If they didn't buy it for PDS, fine. But we still can't vote to adopt a standard we haven't read.
~ Someone would be okay if a technical person read it and said it was okay. Someone who could report to the group.
~ IMG was going to look.
~ IMG will look, but still concerned about it being a container. Thinks picking a codec is reasonable, but concerned over those changing.
~ Someone else is concerned over being able to convert to new tools.
~ Some of this is very complicated.

Question: Is this still the issue from ATMOS?
Answer: Yes.
~ Yes, but it will be an issue for other nodes, especially with PDART.
~ Yes, there's a need as soon as it can be implemented.

Animated GIF is another idea.
~ Thought that would be like a cartoon. Maybe they are more sophisticated then I think.
~ You can make a high quality GIF.

Question: Is there a limit on the color table?
Answer: Unsure. Can get an expert to attend the next DDWG.

Question: Audio? Do we need that alone or just video with audio? That impacts the solution.

Answer: Someone thinks that for one of the Apollo restorations that we have movies with voice from the surface of the moon. Wouldn't rule it out.
~ As document - then it could maybe have video with someone explaining things like geometry or calibrations with a wipe board.
~ It should supplement text form, not replace it.

Question: Is there anything else on this?
Answer: **Action Item - Anne and Lev** will figure out what parts of the standard we need to read and let Tom know what we need.

Technically, the idea of audio doesn't rule out GIF. Could have a GIF and an audio file.

Question: Do we need a face to face?
Answer: That's DDWG2. A new management structure.

DDWG2

DDWG2 was discussed on the MC telecon on Monday.
~ Many of us are not on that telecon.
~ Your bosses were. Not sure what to say. Maybe we need to send the packages from Dan.

Someone can give a brief summary. Several months ago Dan was tasked with looking at ways to streamline the DDWG. Mitch was roped in on the trail balloon. The new DDWG charter has formalized the DDWG again. The function is changing. Emphasis is on the changing process for SCRs and tiger teams. There's lot more. The DDWG won't be a long conversation. Will just meet to monitor progress. One voting member per node - RS and IPDA too. Some non-voting members, PDS projects, NSSDC. A shift in how things are being done. It all changes next week. Invitations will go to node representatives.

Someone read the charter. Non-voting membership is not exclusive. Didn't think this was only going to be for voting members.

This is to control and monitor SCRs. We need someone who can be responsible and be pointed to. You won't be excluded.

Someone thought this was all clear from the MC telecon. The focus is on SCRs and tiger teams. Getting quickness in our responses.

We're ahead in the agenda. Feb 23 will be the launch.

Question: Of the people listed - is there anyone who can not attend?
Answer: Someone wasn't planning on it - unsure.

Question: To clarify, if you are on the list - do you know?
Answer: Your manager should have told you.
~ IMG person is Jordan. That was just confirmed.
~ Someone thought managers would have informed people.

Question: Should the presentation from the MC be sent out?

Answer: No. It will be launched to people who should be in the know.

Question: Anyone on the voting or non-voting list unable to attend? WebEx will have whole new log in.
Answer: IMG can be there at 10:00.
~ We will move the meeting back a half hour. It won't be long.

Question: Is 10:00 okay?
Answer: Fine with GEO, but RS unsure they can attend.

That takes us to the end our hour.

_____

Question: Spectral LDD for the next regular DDWG?
Answer: Yes. In two weeks. Material can be sent to anyone interested.

Action Item - email Anne if interested in receiving Spectral LDD information.

Question: Anything else?
Answer: Someone asked Tom Stein for an extension to get things to the CCB. We voted to have CCB-171 go through. Not sure if there are others.

Someone will tell Tom Stein the final hoops for CCB-171 are being worked.
~ Emily can still say no.
~ Tom has heard - he walked by someone's office. Should still be told.

Question: Everybody done?
Answer: We need to give Ron an honorary gold watch for his service.
~ Ron will take a lollipop.