

**Request for Comments on Technical Note  
Updates to the Directory Interchange Format Standard**

The Earth Science Data Systems Working Group (ESDSWG) Standards Process Group (SPG) is requesting comments on a Technical Note describing modifications to the Global Change Master Directory's Directory Interchange Format (DIF) for improved interoperability with the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) Content Standard for Digital Geospatial Metadata (CSDGM) and the International Organisation for Standardisation (ISO) 19115 metadata standards. This technical note will update the DIF metadata specification, documented in an Earth Science Data Systems Request for Comment that was endorsed as a NASA standard in 2008 (ESDS-RFC-012).

An SPG Technical Note is a document that contains important and useful information that is relevant to the domain of NASA Earth Science Data Systems, and does not necessarily describe a "standard" which has additional operational requirements. In order to assure a high level of technical quality, we conduct public reviews of Technical Notes that have been submitted to us for consideration.

You are invited to provide feedback that might make this document more useful, using the review questions below, or providing any additional comments.

1. Please provide your name, organization and contact information, including email address. *(This information will not be shared.)*

2. Are you answering for your entire organization, for a smaller group, or individually?

a) Entire organization

b) Smaller group (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

c) Individual response

3. Are you a data producer, data consumer, or both?

a) Producer     b) Consumer     c) Both

4. Please describe how the DIF is used in your organization.

We have built our internal metadata model for the datasets that we serve to the scientific community to be compatible with the DIF. We provide the GCMD with DIF metadata for almost all our products and intend to provide the rest this calendar year.

Our data discovery on our web site is driven in part by GCMD science keywords (*term* keyword). We use GCMD *variable* keywords in our metadata where possible when describing individual datasets.

5. Does this technical note contain internal inconsistencies? If so, please provide details.

It is very straightforward. I find no inconsistencies.

6. Is any part of the technical note ambiguous or poorly explained? If so, please provide details.

The only part I found ambiguous was that on pg 3 of the RFC it said; “For a detailed description of this modification, see Appendix B – Release Notes 9.8.2.”

But there was no Appendix B. I found a detailed description of the changes in the document Interop\_MD9\_8\_2\_Release\_Notes.pdf. So it was clear what part of the DIF was changing.

7. How will your organization or group respond to the DIF changes documented in this technical note? In particular, do you plan to update existing DIFs to take advantage of the new sub-fields available for publications / references?

We will update our metadata model to account for these minor changes.

8. Should the SPG endorse this RFC as a Technical Note – why or why not?

I think that for these minor changes an endorsement is a no-brainer. I see no technical or logistical challenges for data centers to adapt to the new requirements

in the DIF metadata model. For the data consumers there are some modest benefits of improved metadata.