

Minutes of Teleconference & Action Items

IPDA Archive Working Group

Date: 8 August 2006, 16:00-17:00 UTC

Participants:

PSA: Joe Zender, David Heather

PDS-Geoscience Node: Susan Slavney, Ed Guinness

PDS-EN,JPL: Steve Hughes, Dan Crichton, Ron Joyner*

1. Action Items

No action items existed before the meeting.

2. Summary

DC summarized the PDS Management Council review of the IPDA charter. In general the PDS MC thoroughly supports the IPDA concept. The PDS MC has formed a working group to define PDS Core Compatibility Standards with the dual goals of improving PDS operations as well as provide a more rigorous source of standards for consideration by the IPDA.

The proposed IPDA Archive Working Group charter was reviewed with specific changes suggested and Action Items assigned.

3. Discussion on IPDA Archive Working Group Charter

JZ mentioned that the name of the working group is not specific enough. An action item was assigned to all members to suggest a better working group name.

3.1 Mission Statement

No suggested changes.

3.2 Scope

EG mentioned that the scope section focused on “archive” and needed to be expanded beyond just packaging data for long-term archive. Accessibility, usability, and validation were other functional areas mentioned for consideration. An action item was assigned to SH to reword this section.

JZ mention the need for high level requirements. An action item was assigned to all members to draft some candidate requirements for review by the group.

3.3 Objectives

3.1 Planetary Science Data Model

It was agreed in general that a “rigorously” defined data model is a useful deliverable. An action item was assigned to SH to define “data model” and give examples.

3.2 Planetary Science Data Dictionary

It was agreed that a data dictionary is an important deliverable. It was recognized that the data dictionary is a key component of the data model. The data dictionary defines terms and the data model puts the terms into context.

3.3 Planetary Science Data Formats

It was agreed that a set of common data formats was an important deliverable. However “data formats” has two different meanings. Both will have to be addressed. 1) PSA/PDS standards describe data objects such as IMAGE and TABLE. These “objects” imply a specific data format but these are not always rigorously defined. 2) Many standardized data formats exist for science data and are in common use by potential data providers, including FITS, HDF, and CDF.

3.4 Planetary Science Archive Processes

In general it was agreed that a high level “best practices” might be helpful. For example, the concepts of peer review and product validation is important for an archive and should be promoted. However common processing standards would be difficult to define and promote. This item will remain as a goal but will be tabled for discussion later.

3.5 Administrative Plan for Managing these Standards and Processes

No suggested changes.

3.4 Membership

SS states that the working group membership seems too open-ended at this stage and that there needs to be a ‘gate’ for allowing new member. This gate would address both the addition of new agencies as well as new members from an existing agency member. SH takes an action item to propose the gates.

Change “committee” to working group in the text.

3.5 Dependencies and Success

No suggested changes

3.6 Intellectual Property

No suggested changes.

4. Schedule

A schedule has not yet been discussed.

5. Next Telecon/Meeting

The next telecon has been set for Tuesday, 8 September 2006, 17:00 EST/EC Time, 08:00 JPL/PDT (16:00 UTC)

6. Action Items Assigned

20060808-01: SH to edit WG Charter document making the following changes / corrections:

- Edit scope section to expand the scope from just “archiving” to include accessibility, usability, and validation.
- Change “committee” to “working group”.
- Include data dictionary and data format as subitems under data model.
- Add “Requirements” as a deliverable under Objectives.

Due 8/22/06

20060808-02: All members to provide suggestions for the Working Group name, taking into consideration the working group's scope and objectives. How about IPDA Data Model Working Group?

Due 8/22/06

20060808-03: All members to provide candidate requirements. Some draft requirements for consideration:

1. The data model shall define all entities within the scope of the IPDA. (Note: Until the IPDA is fully approved by the current member agencies, the working group shall focus on the data model required to support the currently approved prototype development.)
2. The data model shall be documented using commonly accepted notations.
3. The data model shall be independent of any implementation. (I.e. ODL and XML capabilities and limitations are not to be considered during the design of the data model.)
4. The data model shall be mapped to TBD implementation models and languages (e.g. relational, ODL, XML).
5. The initial focus of the data model shall be the entities that are common across the current PDS and PSA implementations.
6. The working group shall identify, analyze, and resolve the differences between the PDS and PSA implementations with the goal of augmenting the IPDA data model.

Due 8/22/06

20060808-04: SH to provide a definition of "data model" and provide examples.

Due 8/22/06

20060808-05: All members to review and comment on proposed membership "gates".

Due 8/29/06

Draft membership gates – feel free to suggest changes.

1. Each member agency shall be allowed one voting member and one proxy member in the working group. Both can participate actively in working group discussions and activities.
2. Each member agency shall be allowed any number of observing members. These observing members may only participate in the working group through the agency's voting or proxy members.
3. Each member agency shall be allowed one vote. All votes are to be decided using a simple majority. The quorum required for a vote is a simple majority.

4. The working group lead shall be from one of the member agencies. The working group lead position shall be held by a working group member for a term of not more than tbd contiguous months. The working group lead position shall not be held by an individual member for two consecutive periods. The working group lead shall participate in a working group vote only to break a tie vote. The working group lead shall not count as an agency member.
5. The addition of a new agency to the working group shall be allowed if the agency has been sponsored by an active member agency and after a favorable working group vote. Items for consideration in the addition of a new agency: a) is the new agency is already implicitly represented by an existing agency member of the working group, b) ...
6. Working group members can loose voting privileges after a tbd period of inactivity and after a working group vote.

*** Observing Member**