

Issues and Action Items from the PDS Technical Session April 6-7, 2005

Issues Tabled for Later Discussion

The name in parentheses is the person or node who raised the issue.

1. PDS-D (Mark Showalter): How do new resources get into the system? Can the system query nodes for their resources, rather than have the nodes submit them? Do we need a tool for updating the resources in PDS-D?
2. PDS-D (Mark Showalter): Why is there only one PDS-D query server at JPL, so that all queries have to go through it?
3. Operations (PPI): There's a backlog of data sets that have not been ingested at EN.
4. Architecture (Steve Hughes): How does the traditional PDS volume structure fit into the PDS architecture? In the PPI DITDOS presentation Todd asserted that the volume structure is really for the user's convenience, not for software.
5. Architecture (Steve Hughes): How does the PDS label fit into the architecture? In DITDOS the label is the permanent storage for metadata and the source for search attributes. What about index tables and data bases?
6. Label parsing software (Steve Hughes): We already have two canonical parsers for PDS labels. DITDOS has a parser which EN would like to evaluate for canonical status. Also, the ESA Planetary Science Archive (PSA) has a PDS label parser that perhaps should be evaluated, although it is (a) commercial software and (b) based on an earlier version of PDS standards.
7. Architecture (Steve Hughes): Should each individual product in PDS have a unique ID that is consistent across PDS? What should a product ID look like to be unique across PDS, and what should the URL to request a product (or products) look like?
8. Architecture (Steve Hughes): How would a PDS location service work; that is, how can a user find out where resources are located in PDS? One product may exist in several places.

Action Items

1. The current method for implementing PDS-D builds, according to Erin, is that the development system is copied onto the operational system. Anne suggests that the best practice is to do a clean build on the operational system to avoid introducing any errors that may have accumulated on the development system. Anne and Joel will discuss and report at the Tech Session meeting.
2. Ron will lead a Tiger Team to review and revise the SRD, incorporating the Addendum from the IV&T work into the body of the SRD, and reconciling it with the Level 1 and 2 requirements identified at the MC meeting in December 2004. The group will include Lyle, Todd, Susie, and either Myche or Patty. Ron will develop a schedule that includes an initial review period, a teleconference to discuss the findings, another period for revision of the SRD, and a final check by the group with concurrence by email. The work is to be finished by the week of April 25. The group will assume it's OK to proceed with this work unless directed otherwise by MC after they read these notes. The resulting SRD will be delivered to the MC for approval and signature.
3. Many of us have complained that we don't know what PDS mailing lists exist, who is on them, or how to add, remove, or correct email addresses. Valerie Henderson has an action item to make this information readily available to all PDS members, possibly via the PDS internal web site, by April 15.
4. The Tech Session feels strongly that the EN should not have its work priorities set by agencies other than Management Council. The fact that EN's highest priority tasks are those imposed by NASA HQ and/or tied to JPL award fees (for *all* of JPL, not just within PDS) means not only that tasks important to the nodes may get less attention, but that the nodes can be required to do work to help EN reach its award-fee goals. The MC should shield the EN, and indirectly the nodes, from this kind of interference. Anne has an action item to state our concern in her report to MC.
5. Each node has an action item to fill out Joel's online tool survey at http://pds.jpl.nasa.gov/survey/Tools_survey.html by the end of next week (April 15). There should be one response from each node. In the comment box on the survey form, list the node's three top priority items. Also list in that box any suggestions you have for the "data display" and "label display" survey items, and any other comments you wish to convey to Joel. The responses will form the Tech Session's recommendation to MC on tool development priorities.
6. Ron Joyner has an action item to help the Atmospheres Node resolve its problems with Tomcat software, or to recommend other solutions, by May 31, 2005.
7. Ron Joyner has an action item to work with the Rings Node to resolve specific issues regarding an OODT interface to their catalog by May 31, 2005.