Operations Feedback for DAL Standards

Mark Taylor (Bristol)

Operations IG/DAL WG IVOA Interop Online

28 May 2021

\$Id: dalissues.tex,v 1.7 2021/05/21 09:35:20 mbt Exp \$

Summary

Operational activities provide feedback on issues with DAL standards

- Validator implementation and resolving validation issues tests details of standards text
- These items come mostly from looking at ESA-VO weather report at last interop

Known standards issues:

- Trailing "?" for accessURL (SSA, other standards?)
 - Standard unclear/contradictory, standard recommendations differ
- Questionable MIME types
 - Standards require/recommend illegal usages
- Use of UCD1s (SCS)
 - Standard requires outdated usage
- SSA 200 error response
 - Standard suggests/requires suprising usage

Trailing "?" in accessURL

Is it responsibility of service registration or client to append "?" / "&" before parameters?

Example: accessURL was: "http://archive.eso.org/ssap" validator requested: "http://archive.eso.org/ssapPOS=0.0,0.0&SIZE=0.000" should have been: "http://archive.eso.org/ssap?POS=0.0,0.0&SIZE=0.000"

- ESA validator was reporting service Errors in these cases

Standards:

- SSA 1.1 (sec 8.3.3) mentions a "mandatory question mark" in "Online Resource URL"; but examples in sec 3.2, 8.3.3, 8.10 suggest no question mark
- SIA 1.0 and SCS 1.03, 1.1 require the trailing "?"
- SIA 2.0 doesn't mention it, but examples don't include trailing "?"

Considerations:

- It's always required for HTTP GET with parameters. It doesn't make much sense for HTTP POST.
- It's always sensible/safe for clients to examine the URL and append "?" / "&" if required

Compliance:

- When I looked, I found 4 services without trailing "?"
- Following contact, 3 changed their registration \rightarrow OK

Actions:

- SSA Erratum to clarify matters?
- Recommend defensive client behaviour? (DALI?)

Mark Taylor, Operations Feedback for DAL Standards Operations IG/DAL WG, IVOA Interop, Online, 28 May 2021

Questionable MIME Types

ESA validation reports many MIME type-related service errors

• .zero.mime-legal, .effc.mime-legal, .metd.mime-legal (mostly SCS and SSA, some SIA)

Relevant requirements in DAL standards:

- SCS 1.03, Sec 3: "text/xml" recommended ("should"); "text/xml;content=x-votable" permitted; "text/xml;votable" discouraged.
- SCS WD-1.1, Sec 3: defer to DALI
- SIA 1.0, sec 4.2: "text/xml;content=x-votable" required
- SIA 2.0, sec 3.1: no explicit requirement
- SSA 1.04, SSA 1.1: "text/xml" recommended ("should"); "text/xml;content=x-votable" permitted

VOTable:

- VOTable 1.2, sec 7.3: "application/x-votable+xml" recommended, "text/xml" permitted
- VOTable 1.3, 1.4, sec 8: "serialization" parameter added for "application/x-votable+xml"

Questions:

- Where does "text/xml;content=x-votable" come from?
- Is it a legal MIME type? I don't think so (RFC 7303) though it probably won't break things (RFC 2046)

Actions:

- Change ESA validator reporting? (ERROR \rightarrow WARNING)
- Erratum for SIA 1.0? (avoid requiring illegal MIME type)
- Relax validation constraints to allow "application/x-votable+xml"?

Mark Taylor, Operations Feedback for DAL Standards Operations IG/DAL WG, IVOA Interop, Online, 28 May 2021

Use of UCD1s

SCS 1.0, 1.1(WD) require use of UCD1s

- SCS 1.0, Section 2, item 2: MUST have UCDs ID_MAIN, POS_EQ_RA_MAIN, POS_EQ_DEC_MAIN
- These are archaic; UCD1+s are preferable: meta.id;meta.main, pos.eq.ra;meta.main, pos.eq.dec;meta.main
- Common validation failure for SCS (see ESA-VO results)

This is a long-running item

Actions:

- This will be addressed in SCS 2.0
- Can we change/relax the requirement in SCS 1.1?
 - probably not, backward compatibility

SSA Error Response Codes

How to report error status in SSA?

- SSA sec 8.10.3 seems to suggest a 200 OK response with VOTable error document
- DALI 1.1 sec 4.2 says to use an HTTP error code (e.g. 4xx) with a VOTable error document
- ESA validator reports an error for 4xx error codes
- By my reading, SSA is woolly on this, so following DALI should be OK
- ... but I think Markus disagreed

What's the recommended behaviour

- for clients?
- for validators?

Do we need an erratum or clarification?