

Standards Change Request

Title: Resolve Documentation Requirement Inconsistencies

SCR 3-1118 v.4

Submission Date: 2008-03-12

Submitter: Dick Simpson

E-Mail: rsimpson@magellan.stanford.edu

History:

2007-05-22	Issue was submitted through on-line interface by Rye
2007-??-??	Working group formed
2007/2008	Approx bi-weekly telecons in 2007, monthly telecons in 2008 Consensus: PAG requirement that ICD be archived inappropriate
2008-03-05	Revised PAG drafted by Simpson
2008-03-12	Revised PAG approved by WG with minor changes SCR drafted by Simpson
2008-04-16	Revised APG drafted by Simpson
2008-05-07	Telecon: changed lead; minor improvements to APG, PAG; updated impact; prepare for TG vote 2008-05-21
2008-05-21	Approved by Tech Group, but then held for resolution with SCR 3-1137
2008-05-22	Made additional minor corrections to APG, PAG; added impact on PDS SR; updated history

Problem: The *Proposer's Archiving Guide* (PAG) was written at a time when ESA's Planetary Science Archive (PSA) was promoting Interface Control Documents (ICDs) as the primary archive documentation. ESA's ICD included descriptions of file formats, contents, and organization and the processing history of archived data products. A single ICD could cover the entire archival output of an instrument or a mission. PAG authors expected that this interpretation of the ICD would spread through the NASA community and included a requirement (PAG Section 3.5.1) that ICD's be delivered to PDS with each archive. Instead the older, narrower view of the ICD persisted — that an ICD specified delivery schedules, data volumes, and (in some instances) roles of various people in the archiving process. Since the PDS Standards Reference (PDSSR) does not include any requirement for an ICD, either the PDSSR needed to be revised or the requirement in the PAG deleted. The situation is complicated by the fact that terms such as Interface Control Document (ICD), Software Interface Specification (SIS), Data Management Plan (DMP), and Archiving Plan (AP) all mean slightly different things across discipline, mission, agency, and other boundaries. The *PDS Archive Preparation Guide* (APG) also includes language that is similar; though the APG does not say that the ICD is required in the archive, the document plays a central role in the archiving process. The APG does say that SIS documents are required, which is not true if one reads the PDSSR carefully.

Milestones: None

Immediacy: Data Providers and PDS staff are confused by the PAG's requirement of an ICD in each archive — especially since the contents of an ICD remain ambiguous. Ditto the conflicting requirements in the APG. The problem can and should be solved as soon as possible; but there is no immediacy.

Proposed Solution: Since the problem originates in the PAG, the easiest (and recommended) solution is to remove the PAG requirement that the ICD be delivered. Since the underlying problem is that terms such as ICD, SIS, DMP, AP, etc. may be misinterpreted (or have different meanings in different environments), it is further recommended that the PAG be revised to de-emphasize specific documents (by name) but to explain the types of documentation that are needed. The *Archive Preparation Guide* (APG) also needs to be revised for consistency.

Impact Assessment:

PDS Standards Reference: Review Chapters 8, 10, and 19 for consistency (Tech Group)

Planetary Science Data Dictionary Document: No impact (Working Group)

PDS Tools:

intra-Node, PDS-wide: No impact (Working Group)

legacy, in development, proposed: No impact (Working Group)

PDS web site, product servers, profile servers:

No impact on data handling is expected; but web sites which advise data providers will need to be updated (Working Group)

other PDS documents (*e.g.*, *PAG*, *APG*)

PAG: modest revisions completed (Working Group)

APG: modest revisions completed, sent to WG (Simpson)

external agencies (*e.g.*, NSSDC, ESA, IPDA): No impact (Working Group)

external interfaces (*e.g.*, NSSDC, ADS): No impact (Working Group)

compliance/compatibility with ODL and ISO standards: No impact (WG)

Priority (OPTIONAL): This should be (3) allowed to flow through at "normal" speed

Recommended Approval Authority: The original PAG, APG, and subsequent revisions have been approved by the Management Council; these revisions should also be presented to the MC.

Working Group: Simpson (lead), Joyner, Slavney, King

Additional Information: None

Dependencies/Contingencies: None

Requested Changes: The revised versions of the PAG and APG have been posted under "Supplementary Material" at <http://pds-engineering.jpl.nasa.gov/index.cfm?pid=2&cid=63&scrid=3-1118>