

WGIII Meeting Minutes

Hyderabad, India (virtual conference)

August 24rd 2021

Chair: Chad Trabant

Attendees

Name	Organization	Email
Javier Quinteros	GEOFON/GFZ	javier@gfz-potsdam.de
Chad Trabant	IRIS	chad.trabant@iris.edu
Philip Crotwell	South Carolina	crotwell@seis.sc.edu
Peter Danecek	INGV/MedNet	peter.danecek@ingv.it
Wayne Crawford	IPGP/CNRS	crawford@ipgp.fr
Tim Ahern	EarthScope-Oceans	tim-ahern@comcast.net
Luděk Vecsey	IG CAS	vecsey@ig.cas.cz
John Clinton	SED/ETHZ	jclinton@sed.ethz.ch
Rob Casey	IRIS	rob@iris.washington.edu
Marcelo Bianchi	IAG/USP	m.bianchi@iag.usp.br
Joel Simon (observer)	EarthScope-Oceans	jdsimon@princeton.edu
Nick Ackerley	CHIS/CNSN	nicholas.ackerley@nrcan-rncan.gc.ca
Claudio Satriano	RESIF	satriano@ipgp.fr
Hugh Glanville	Geoscience Australia (GA)	hugh.glanville@ga.gov.au
Carlo Cauzzi	ORFEUS	carlo.cauzzi@sed.ethz.ch
Niko Horn	ZAMG / Vienna	nikolaus.horn@zamg.ac.at
Wen-Tzong Liang		
Mario Locati	INGV	

Presentation

Presentation slides will be made available from: <https://www.fdsn.org/wg/wgIII/>

Review of Proposed Agenda

The proposed agenda was reviewed verbally. There were no other calls for items to be added.

Review and Approval of Minutes from the previous Meeting in Montreal 2019

The minutes from the last meeting were addressed. The minutes were approved without objection.

Status of 2019 Action Items

There were 6 previous action items reviewed. 2 are complete, 4 are incomplete.

John inquired about whether there is a timeline for the first two action items. It is indicated that there is nothing set at this time. The group agrees that current action items, while delayed, should remain and be revisited at the next meeting. There was expressed confidence that some progress can be made in the next couple of years.

John brought up the question of funding brought up in 2019.

ACTION ITEM: (Chad) Write the chair and executive committee that discussion of funding possibilities for FDSN based on end of 2019 meeting to brought up at second plenary.

John expressed concern that our email outreach to institutions to register in the FDSN registry may not reach all of the centers we want to reach.

Authentication for all FDSN web service specifications

Chad presents a proposal to generalize authentication for all web service specifications.

Peter suggests that there is coordination with Javier in their work to support federated identity management within EIDA.

Tim expressed concern that a center with 100% authentication requirement at a data center opens the door to exclusion of data being exposed to the public, even as it helps the CTBTO to make its data available.

Javier indicates that authentication and authorization are different, and currently the primary goal is to monitor usage patterns through user IDs and generate usage statistics for funding agencies. First question, do we want to see authentication for all data access methods at a data center? Philip asks whether data that is to be freely available should require any kind of authentication. Marcelo wonders if the "queryauth" method is being misused for open data requiring login, instead attach authentication for the query method for open data.

Tim indicates that it is very important for schools that a login requirement to access data is not complicated and does not impede access to data repositories.

Peter comments that this proposal to expand the use of queryauth should not encourage all centers to begin requiring logins, but instead let this open the door for CTBTO to expose their data using authentication.

Philip indicates the complication of machine to machine connectivity to information when harvesting from other data centers.

Nick proposed that if "queryauth" is optional, perhaps the standard "query" can be made mandatory. Chad responded that a datacenter can implement query, but return nothing.

Status of Data Center Registry

Chad provided a presentation on the Data Center Registry on the FDSN.org web site.

John commented that it will be good for the FDSN to reach out to known data centers to encourage them to get themselves entered into the registry. Philip points out that there are four data centers not showing in this new registry. It is acknowledged that they have been contacted numerous times. Tim suggests calling attention to the registry in EOS. John Clinton thinks that both options should be taken. Hugh can encourage engaging with this in Australia and New Zealand.

ACTION ITEM: (Chad) - Generate a message to be circulated by the FDSN via email.

A follow-on action may be to write an article to broaden awareness. Suggested journals were SRL and EOS. EOS in particular has a broad range and support for multiple languages.

Peter sought clarification on a DOI for the data center. The data center must mint their own DOI and it does not reflect the entirety of the data sets that they provide: the DOIs for datasets, with network allocation granularity, are separate.

Marcelo calls attention to the limits of where this messaging could reach. Language barriers, being one. Also, would we accept registration of a data center that offers no open data?

Javier and Marcelo are offering to conduct translations suitable to Latin America and other Spanish and Portuguese speaking countries. John indicates that EOS publishes articles in multiple languages.

Javier suggests a soft approach when contacting data centers. We must not push an imperative that the data center gets itself registered.

Potential JSON standardization for fdsnws-event

A review of an issue raised in WG II regarding a standard JSON representation for event metadata from fdsnws-event.

Florian indicates that this issue has an EPOS context. A desire to translate from specific formats collected from other sites to GeoJSON.

Mario was thinking of two options. A simplified GeoJSON output format derived from text output (beneficial for search displays), and another being a translation from QuakeML.

John asks whether this opens the door to exploring needs like this in other services.

ACTION: - Form a small group to investigate the options for alignment across the FDSN and potentially generate a proposal for standardization.

Marcelo cautions that we should not pursue a standard without having clear use cases and requirements. Peter indicates that this would be an initial thinking stage to determine such use cases and requirements and propose it to the working group.

Philip wonders if this should not be pushed back to WG2. Chad indicates that WG3 and WG2 could coordinate on this.

SeedLink v4 specification proposal

Angelo Strollo was going to present this overview, but was not present. Chad presented in his stead.

A formal submission will be provided to the FDSN as the new standard real-time protocol.

Marcelo asked about the authentication process, is it plaintext? Chad indicates that seedlink4 would only permit authentication connections over an SSL port.

Marcelo asks about equipment in the field that currently run SeedLink. Chad indicates that he has been in contact with major manufacturers to get their buy-in and implementation.

John indicates that there could be broad interest in this. A six member review team is a small number of people. Javier points out that broader feedback from manufacturers and the public should also weigh in as a part of the process.

Next steps for the presented proposals

1. SeedLink4 proposal. For a Proposal Review Team in the next 2 weeks. Chad will submit the proposal and muster a review team.
2. Optional authorization capability in all FDSN web services: Chad will summarize the issue from the minutes and submit it to the WG mailing list for further discussion.
3. Specifying one or two JSON standards for event web services. Chad will call for the formation of an ad hoc committee to investigate the options for alignment across the FDSN and potentially generate a proposal for standardization.

Philip raises the issue that a review team should have a proposal in hand to review. A concern that the proposal before the review team is not also visible to the public. Chad indicates that this is not a requirement, but a wider release of the proposal for feedback would require a process for handling outside feedback. Javier provides clarification on the time frame for reviews and discussion as per FDSN rules.

Calling for a vote on optional authorization in web services: not sure how to even do this. What are the voting rules? Chad asks if we want to consider this proposal at all. Philip indicates that this proposal represents a revision to the standard, so do we follow a review process for these amendments? Chad thinks not. A simple vote would be better. Javier wonders if this is a simple revision or the larger question needs to be revisited. Philip suggests that a revision to the standard document be mailed to the WG for deliberation, edits, and approval. Nick says Because ease-of-authorization will determine how many people vote, I think the proposed authorization mechanism has to be clear before we can vote. Tim indicates confusion about whether there is anything in this proposal that helps the FDSN or even enables the CTBTO.

Javier asks that we consider existing ecosystems when thinking about a standard JSON representation for event catalog metadata. There is a wide audience that may make use of this data, so all of these audiences should be taken into consideration.

A.O.B.

No other business was raised.

Adjourn