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Abstract— Increasingly sophisticated National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Earth science missions have driven their associated data and data management systems from providing simple point-to-point archiving and retrieval to performing user-responsive distributed multisensor information extraction. To fully maximize the use of remote-sensor-generated Earth science data, NASA recognized the need for data systems that provide data access and manipulation capabilities responsive to research brought forth by advancing scientific analysis and the need to maximize the use and usability of the data. The decision by NASA to purposely evolve the Earth Observing System Data and Information System (EOSDIS) at the Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC) Earth Sciences (GES) Data and Information Services Center (DISC) and other information management facilities was timely and appropriate. The GES DISC evolution was focused on replacing the EOSDIS Core System (ECS) by reusing the In-house developed disk-based Simple, Scalable, Script-based Product Archive (S4PA) data management system and migrating data to the disk archives. Transition was completed in December 2007.
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I. INTRODUCTION

In 2005, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Earth science information management evolution shaping forces lined up to permit an evolution acceleration, which was implemented during 2006–2007, that has greatly improved the way NASA Earth science data centers archive, distribute, and manage data and advanced information services. The decision by NASA to purposely evolve the Earth Observing System (EOS) Data and Information System (EOSDIS) was timely and appropriate. Up to this point, NASA’s investment in EOS has yielded dozens of missions, greatly enhancing our understanding of the planet’s land, oceans, and atmosphere [1]. Missions were formulated, and science investigations were selected around six interdisciplinary Science Focus Areas, based on NASA’s Earth science strategic goal, “Study Earth from space to advance scientific understanding and meet societal needs,” and subsequent Earth science questions [2]. Increasingly sophisticated NASA Earth science missions have driven their associated data and data management systems from providing simple point-to-point archiving and retrieval to performing user-responsive distributed multisensor information extraction. To maximize the use of remote-sensor-generated Earth science data, NASA recognized the need for, and needed investment in, data systems that provide data access and manipulation capabilities responsive to research brought forth by advancing scientific analysis, as well as the need to maximize the use and usability of the data, thus providing more scientists with NASA resources for research analysis. The employment of responsive data management systems and information technologies to facilitate science research has been accomplished through the development of the EOSDIS and associated Distributed Active Archive Centers (DAACs), Principal Investigator (PI) processing systems, Earth Science Information Partners (ESIPs) [3], and various NASA Research Announcements (NRAs), seeking the best and most innovative ideas for advancing NASA Earth science data systems and technologies, on behalf of furthering science.

Obviously, in step with science research, science data and information systems will always evolve. Nowadays, at the doorstep of formulating future missions recommended by the National Research Council’s Decadal Study [4], or the like, data and information systems must continue to be responsive to new missions. The objectives of the 2006–2007 evolution of EOSDIS were to “increase end-to-end data system efficiency while decreasing operations costs, increase data interoperability and usability by the science research, application, and modeling communities, improve data access and processing, and ensure safe stewardship” [5]. The information management system evolution that occurred in 2006–2007 will benefit science with the ability to integrate more adaptable data manipulation capabilities. These integrations will occur in response to science needs. "The steps we take today to evolve EOSDIS ... should make it more agile and adaptable to change" [5]. This paper provides a brief history of NASA Earth science data and information management evolution, followed by the shaping forces that ultimately drove the evolution of 2006–2007. With the stage set, a description of the evolution of 2006–2007, which occurred at NASA’s Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC) Earth Sciences (GES) Data and Information Services Center (DISC), one of NASA’s DAACs, is given.
II. BRIEF HISTORY OF NASA EARTH SCIENCE DATA AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

A. Middle Ages

In the 1970s and 1980s NASA’s Earth science data were managed using two distinct approaches. With one approach the data were held by PIs or at specialized data systems. The other approach used a central data system for processing, archiving and distributing the data [3]. In both cases, PIs and their teams became the primary sources of the data. In the former approach, PI teams acquired and processed the raw data, usually holding on to it for long periods of time before offering it to the broader research community. Whereas this was done often to ensure data validation, sometimes, it was to ensure that the science team can perform first science on the data. The result of the first approach was limited data access and science. The second approach, using a central data system for data operations, was not significantly better. For example, in the case of the Upper Atmospheric Research Satellite (UARS), “PIs were required to deliver their product generation software to a Central Data Handling Facility (CDHF) where data were processed and archived” [3]. However, even in this case, CDHF data access was limited to the UARS PI teams for a period of 2 years. In general, no data standards existed, broad distribution was virtually unheard of, and interoperability was not possible.

B. Renaissance

Starting in the mid-1980s, with the growth of Internet communications, allowing the movement of relatively large amounts of data, and the advent of desktop computing, providing data analysis computing power to nonlocal (to the archive) researchers, the need was realized for open data archive and distribution sites. Three pilot programs were born: The Pilot Climate Data System (PCDS), later named the NASA Climate Data System (NCDS), at the NASA GSFC, managed “a large collection of climate-related data of interest to the research community,” providing “uniform data catalogs, inventories, access methods, graphical displays, and statistical calculations” for selected data sets [7]. The Pilot Ocean Data System (PODS) at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL) was developed to “investigate techniques for archiving and distributing ocean data obtained from space” [8]. The Pilot Land Data System (PLDS), was developed at GSFC “to store satellite-, aircraft-, and ground-acquired data; to remotely access this data and information about the data; and to transmit the data to distant geographical locations” [9].

To further facilitate the public availability of satellite-generated data, NASA initiated the implementation of EOSDIS in the early 1990s, “meant to collect, process, distribute, and archive the large amounts of data to be generated by the EOS program” [10]. NASA’s Earth science data would be more publicly available and more conducive to interdisciplinary science. Specific standard Data products derived from EOS instruments, utilizing standard data formats and corresponding documentation, would be archived at one of eight specialized by Earth science discipline, DAACs. Each DAAC would have access to science and data experts and provide data and user services for their discipline. One system, EOSDIS Core System (ECS) would be developed and deployed at all DAACs to perform “core” common data ingestion, archiving, and distribution, and user services. (Note: It turned out that ECS was deployed at just four DAACs.) The “theory” was to standardize data systems. In addition, each DAAC would develop an in-house data management system, called Version 0 (V0), which would archive and distribute existing data sets (e.g., subsume the “Pilot” data sets), and be a prototype for the ECS, until ECS was deployed.

Concurrently, on the data user side, NASA instituted Regional Earth Science Applications Centers (RESACs), selected to innovatively “use NASA’s Earth science results, technologies, and data products to help resolve issues with regional economic and policy significance ... supporting the U.S. Global Change Research Program” [11].

While V0 systems performed and interoperated efficiently and reliably at each DAAC, implementing a data management system of EOSDIS magnitude and generic capability was new to system developers, as well as system users. High costs, increasing system requirements, new technology cycles that were faster than development cycles, and trading innovation for predetermined requirements all pointed to the need for NASA to provide alternate opportunities to further advance the capabilities of data management systems. Internal to EOSDIS, “generation of standard products was moved, in most cases, to Science Investigator-led Processing Systems (SIPS)” [3], as exemplified by Cuddy et al. [12] (SIPS products were provided back to the respective DAAC), allowing DAACs to focus more on archiving, distribution, and data services, and PIs on the data (e.g., validation) itself. External to EOSDIS, the “federation of competitively selected Earth Science Information Partners (ESIPs)” [13], also known as the Federation of ESIPs, was created to foster community involvement in developing special research products, potential commercial products, and new data management technologies.

Also, in the late 1990s, NASA commissioned the “New Data and Information Systems and Services (NewDISS) Strategy Team to define the future direction, framework, and strategy of NASA’s Earth Science Enterprise (ESE) data and information processing, near-term archiving, and distribution ... The main recommendations were to provide smaller, more heterogeneous components than were being developed with EOSDIS” [3]. NewDISS recommendations, the roots for the 2006–2007 evolution, were handed to the Strategic Evolution of ESE Data Systems (SEEDS) group, whose mission was to “Establish evolution strategy and coordinating activities to assure continued effectiveness of ESE data management systems and services” [14]. Four community-based working groups continue to derive information management infrastructure processes in developing standards, planning and reporting metrics, infusing new technologies, and reusing information management assets.

With the open availability of NASA Earth science data, it was recognized that advanced services to facilitate the access and use of the data were necessary for two driving purposes:

1) To expedite the data validation process, thus understanding the behavior of the retrieved remote sensing data and ensuring data processing better. With data being publicly distributed and used for research, decision support, and policy, it was essential that data be validated and understood in a much more timely fashion.
2) To gently introduce a new paradigm to the larger research community: the use of ordered and formatted satellite-generated digital data for the study of Earth science.

From the mid-1980s to the late 1990s, with each successive evolution study and activity, and technology advancement, information managers and technologists revealed increasingly more innovative information management ideas, technologies, and implementations to further evolve the use and access of data.

C. Age of Discovery

The ubiquitous availability of the World Wide Web (WWW), and the opportunities given to technologists and scientists to exploit this and other new information technology advancements, catapulted information management into an era of “discovering” new ways to manage data and information. Technology sharing bred implementation collaborations, resulting in more efficient science data sharing. Tools and services were invented to further facilitate data access, visualization, and analysis. More automated data management processes were implemented. For example, character user interfaces became graphical user interfaces, which later became Web-based user interfaces.

NASA’s solicitation for Research, Education and Applications Solutions Network (REASON) projects resulted in broad community collaborations that brought forth the most innovative ways to utilize NASA Earth science data. REASON was followed by NASA’s Advancing Collaborative Connections for Earth System Science (ACCESS) Program, further pushing the information technology community to integrate more efficient information management infrastructure and science data analysis tools. New ways of bringing data to the research community evolved, and partnerships to further understand the science data access needs developed between data managers and data users.

Currently, over 100 NASA-funded organizations advance data availability to information availability, thus contributing to Earth science information management evolution. Specifically, data centers became data and value-added information service centers. Services were implemented to enable data users to extract information out of the data. Other services included data subsets, mining, visualization, preanalysis, fusion, and exploration, as well as rich meta-data (information about the data, including data history and versioning) and dynamic remote data access. With the free movement of data and information, scientists are able to create long-term Climate Data Records (CDRs) from information generated by several instruments.

Ackoff [15] identifies five categories to define the content of the human mind: 1) data; 2) information; 3) knowledge; 4) understanding; and 5) wisdom (see Fig. 1). Data centers have evolved far from not only providing data (having “no significance beyond its existence” [16]) to providing information (“data that have been given meaning by way of relational connection” [16]) to enable science.

Nowadays, the infusion of more sophisticated information management tools has evolved information management to the next phase: Earth science knowledge management (“knowledge is the appropriate collection of information such that its intent is to be useful” [15]). The rapidly increasing ability to analyze data from constellations of instruments, combining heterogeneous data sets, establishing processes for information management standards [17], enhancing data interoperability [18], integrating affordable disk, and, perhaps, deploying true “knowledge building systems (KBSs)” [19], have all contributed to this further evolution.

III. Evolution 2006–2007 Shaping Forces and Goals

The recent segment of the evolution continuum (2006–2007) represents a large step in the shift for NASA Earth science information management systems from providing information-bearing services to providing knowledge-bearing services. The, 2006–2007 evolution segment was driven by forces that made it one of the largest leaps in NASA information management evolution.

In early 2005, due to shrinking budgets for NASA information management systems unable to sustain ECS, aging ECS equipment, the need to be responsive to the implementation of new technologies, and the desire to make information management more distributed (and more closely tied to PI science teams), NASA embarked on an EOSDIS evolution study to develop a 2015 vision of information management systems. The effort, encompassing the results of previous committees, was comprised of “An EOSDIS Elements Evolution Study Team to provide an external viewpoint and offer guidance, and an EOSDIS Elements Evolution Technical Team to develop an approach and implementation plan that would begin to fulfill the objectives . . . developed by the Study Team. The objectives that were part of the 2015 vision included: increasing end-to-end data system efficiency and autonomy while decreasing operations costs; increasing data interoperability and usability by the science research, application, and modeling communities; improving data access and processing; and ensuring continued safe stewardship . . . . This provided the tenets (and goals) (see Table I) under which the Technical Team conducted its analytical work ” [18].

In what was known as Step 1, NASA approved the evolution of four information management systems as follows [20].

GES DISC: Consolidate GES DISC data holdings into one DISC-unique system. This featured transition of data sets generated by the Earth-observing instruments, namely, the Atmospheric Infrared Sounder (AIRS), the High Resolution Dynamics Limb Sounder (HIRDLS), the Ozone Monitoring Instrument (OMI), the Microwave Limb Sounder (MLS), and the Solar Radiation and Climate Experiment (SORCE), and
model data from the Global Monitoring and Assimilation Office (GMAO) to the Simple, Scalable, Script-based Science Product Archive (S4PA) data management system. Also, phase out ECS in 2007, and reduce archive volume, due to the transfer of the Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) data (see below). (V0 data sets already reside in S4PA due to an earlier migration.)

Langley Research Center (LaRC) Atmospheric Sciences Data Center (ASDC) DAAC: Consolidate ASDC data holdings into one ASDC-unique system, namely, the Archive Next Generation (ANGe). This featured transitions of Cloud and Earth’s Radiant Energy Budget (CERES) data from the heritage LaRC Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission (TRMM) Information System (LaTIS) to the new ANGe archive.

PI-Led MODIS Adaptive Processing System (MODAPS): Transfer responsibility for MODIS processing, archiving, and distribution from GES DISC to MODAPS. This featured on-demand processing of precalibrated (level 1) data and closer involvement and control by the science community.

ECS: In parallel to the independent evolution at the three sites above, rearchitect ECS to simplify sustaining engineering and automate operations, to be deployed at the other DAACs where ECS is deployed. This featured a simplified software architecture.

All the evolved systems above will increase system automation and use online storage and commodity disks/platforms, thereby reducing operation, archiving, and system engineering costs, while providing quicker access to data. Thus, although the overall implementation at the first three sites (the data centers) did not drastically differ from each other, each system now would provide capabilities of specific interest to the community that it serves and would have different approaches to achieving this. ASDC’s evolution approach was to “consolidate LaTIS and ECS, increase automation, leverage commodity hardware, build upon Open Source software, not impose changes to external data providers, and work with (local PI’s) to leverage total resources” [21]. MODAPS’s evolution approach was not to archive voluminous level 1 data, but to generate level 1 data on-demand, permanently archive Golden Month (the data set comprised of data processed for the same observation month/year, but utilizing successive algorithm versions) and higher level data products, provide online search and order capabilities, and install direct access servers to data [22]. GES DISC’s evolution approach was to consolidate data sets into discipline-specific archives, provide direct online access to data, remove Commercial-Off-The-Shelf (COTS) dependences and thus, integrations, reuse existing software, and build in flexibilities for future missions and community-driven enhancements.

With the evolution 2006–2007 underway, a set of information management system requirements to ensure that the evolved systems can perform functionally and efficiently to meet NASA’s needs and commitments was defined [23].

Concurrent with the evolution study effort, many DAACs prepared for technical changes to their information management systems, to varying degrees, based on their knowledge of NASA evolution efforts. The GES DISC also recognized that EODIS at the GES DISC needed a technology refresh, and that the existing core of the EOSDIS, ECS, would not be affordable in its present architecture with drastically reduced budgets on the horizon. In response, the GES DISC evolution strategy was developed and, further, would be implemented with no additional funding by utilizing commodity hardware, exploring requirements retirement, and improving operational processes. The GES DISC strategies were consistent with those of the Evolution Study Team and were accepted as an implementation of the GES DISC approved Study Team recommendations, except for the need to process voluminous data on-demand (virtualize appropriate data), since the responsibility for these data (MODIS level 1) was moved to MODAPS. GES DISC evolution implementation will be discussed in Section IV.

IV. GES DISC EVOLUTION 2006–2007

As specified in the “Earth Observing System (EOS) Program Plan” [6], the EOSDIS is designed to provide a long-term data record for a broad range of environmental parameters. The mission requirements are to produce (or enable production of) standard science data products from EOS instruments (see [24]–[26] for instrument details), provide a distributed information framework supporting EOS investigators and other users,
In addition to EOSDIS-wide search, the GES DISC continued to offer local search interfaces for GES DISC holdings: a Web-based hierarchical navigation tool called the Web Hierarchical Ordering Mechanism (albeit with a nonanachronistic name), an on-line analysis with Giovanni [30], OGC Web Coverage Service, and online analysis with Giovanni [30].

Search Services: Although many users could simply find the data by navigating the directory structure, a number of search services are provided to make this process easier. Prior to Evolution, EOSDIS included the EOS Data Gateway (EDG), which was able to search data at all the DAACs. This required the data centers to deploy a server-based search capability, typically backed by a database. However, with EOSDIS migrating from EDG to the Warehouse Inventory Search Tool (WIST) (which searches meta-data published in ECHO), S4PA has also migrated its EOSDIS search services support to WIST/ECHO.

In addition to EOSDIS-wide search, the GES DISC continues to offer local search interfaces for GES DISC holdings: a Web-based hierarchical navigation tool called the Web Hierarchical Ordering Mechanism (albeit with a nonanachronistic name) and a free-text search tool named Mirador [31]. Both tools allow a user to find the URLs for data matching specific
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Fig. 2. Architecture prior to GES DISC evolution.

Architecture After

Fig. 3. Architecture after GES DISC evolution (same functionality, simpler architecture).

data set, space, and time criteria, as well as access to on-the-fly services such as subsetting and format conversion. Furthermore, the Giovanni data visualization and analysis tool has become popular for data exploration and access. These services are hosted on machines separate from the main data servers (albeit connected via a high-speed network) so that processor-intensive queries and services do not interfere with the task of providing the actual data via FTP, and vice versa.

Data Processing: In addition to data management, the GES DISC also processes science data for some missions (Terra,
Aqua, and Aura), as well as valued-added products. S4PM continues to be the software system that runs this processing. The evolutionary change in this case is the migration of the processing from large Unix-based silicon graphics servers to multiple small commodity-class Linux servers. The low cost of individual commodity servers supports a more flexible provisioning strategy as well as more frequent technology refreshment. Processing is run on dedicated machines (or machines with negligible user access rates) so that unpredictable and uneven user loads do not interfere with standard processing.

**Discipline-Specific Archive:** Now that GES DISC resident data are archived on disks, data types can be broken out on different disk groupings and be sized accordingly. In fact, rather than support all missions and instruments in a single system, the S4PA architecture actually consists of several small standalone systems, each of them supporting a particular mission or set of measurements. This flexibility allows for discipline-specific services to be applied on certain data sets, which would be an unnecessary burden to support for other data sets. Thus, the one-size-fits-all paradigm is avoided. Furthermore, this enables tools to be developed that bring information together from multiple missions, thus contributing to enhancing knowledge and knowledge management. In addition, this "mini-data-center" approach has the effect of spreading out the user access load among multiple hosts, providing a certain level of load balancing and shielding the performance of individual systems against heavy loads resulting from high demand for any one data set. (In any case, individual systems have shown the ability to respond to demands of over 500 GB distribution per day with no noticeable effect on system operations.)

**Operational Support:** The S4P operator interface is markedly simpler than previous operator interfaces. There are fewer components to track, hardware will be relatively uniform, there are no tape silos to monitor, and there are no orders to manage. Operations staff need only be present 8 x 5, and are on call 24 x 7. In addition, preventive/corrective maintenance can be performed on each standalone system independent of the others. Thus, "system maintenance" need not affect all systems at once. Also, S4PM hardware is oversized to allow processing to catch up if downtime occurs during off hours.

**Community Interaction:** During 2006–2007, GES DISC interaction with the research community also evolved in response to the Evolution Study Team Vision Tenet, "User Community Support." The GES DISC, through conference and science team presentations, has proactively developed relationships with the research community seeking to initiate the use of information management tools to further advance Earth science knowledge. The flexibility and responsiveness of S4PA to implement new services has greatly facilitated support to the user community.

The benefits of GES DISC information management system evolution include reduction in operations costs due to elimination of multiple systems and reduction in sustaining engineering costs due to use of simpler scalable software, as well as reduction in the dependence on COTS products and their integration, increased system automation due to singe system, simpler operational scenarios, and improved, more efficient, and less cumbersome data access. Perhaps the most significant benefit is the ability to layer information extraction services on top of the archived data.

**V. Conclusion**

According to GES DISC stakeholders (NASA Headquarters, the Earth Science Data and Information System (ESDIS) Project at NASA GSFC, and PIs), the GES DISC information management system evolution 2006–2007 successfully met the objectives approved by NASA. Maturated and new technologies, and their dropping costs, have enabled the GES DISC to utilize the implementation paradigm successfully used for V0. This includes having experienced Earth science information management personnel develop an information management system that specializes in specific data sets, and thus, focuses on the needs of its community (with whom personnel are already familiar). The new ESDIS at the GES DISC provides opportunities for improved system and operational efficiency, as well as enhanced data and information responsiveness and services. The ability of the new ESDIS to integrate cutting-edge technologies and information management tools enables researchers to focus on science research, rather than on pre-science data preparation. This is exemplified by the A-Train Data Depot Project that provides services to bring together and coregister heterogeneous data sets, thus freeing researchers from individually repeating these tasks [32]. The feedback of more sophisticated prescience tools facilitating more advanced science research, which, in turn, would demand even more sophisticated tools, indicates that the knowledge management age has just begun. "Having a program requirement for continuous technology assessment establishes a culture of innovation... Flexible management processes accommodating innovation, speed and efficiency are essential for increasing agility in development despite the higher perceived risks" [5].

Evolution continues at the GES DISC, after 2007, consistent with the Evolution Study Team Vision Tenet, for the continued purpose of enabling knowledge in Earth science. In addition to Mission Support, the GES DISC will focus on lines of business that include science data and information services, technologies that enable information management, multisensor data management, measurement-based information management systems, and community-requested data-brokering opportunities.
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