

## Member Nodes - Support #8654

MNDeployment # 6485 (Operational): The Digital Archaeology Record (tDAR)

### tDAR Packages Not Resolving

2018-07-12 22:19 - Thomas Thelen

<b>Status:</b>	Closed	<b>Start date:</b>	2018-07-12
<b>Priority:</b>	Normal	<b>Due date:</b>	
<b>Assignee:</b>	Monica Ihli	<b>% Done:</b>	100%
<b>Category:</b>		<b>Estimated time:</b>	0.00 hour
<b>Target version:</b>			
<b>Story Points:</b>			

#### Description

While investigating an issue on another project regarding tDAR packages, I noticed that it looks like the objects may be deleted on the tDAR side, but not on DataONE.

As an example, consider the following package

[https://search.dataone.org/#/view/doi:10.6067:XCV8QF8WRQ\\_meta\\$v=1530135257548](https://search.dataone.org/#/view/doi:10.6067:XCV8QF8WRQ_meta$v=1530135257548)

While resolving the object from

<https://doi.org/10.6067/XCV8QF8WRQ>

The following message is given

"The URL for this identifier cannot be resolved."

Amy, is there any way you can follow up on this?

#### History

##### #1 - 2018-08-07 12:25 - Monica Ihli

- Assignee set to Monica Ihli

##### #2 - 2018-08-08 15:11 - Monica Ihli

- File *tdar\_pids\_not\_on\_CN.csv* added

I have contacted the node operator Adam with an example `10.6067:XCV8GH9MV1_meta$v=1533165864386` in the record found at [https://search.dataone.org/view/doi:10.6067:XCV8GH9MV1\\_meta\\$v=1533165864386](https://search.dataone.org/view/doi:10.6067:XCV8GH9MV1_meta$v=1533165864386) to ask if there is a delay in activating new DOIs. Adam indicates that the example `"10.6067:XCV8GH9MV1_meta$v=1533165864386"` isn't a valid DOI. It's a DataONE identifier. the valid DOI for that record is: `10.6067:XCV8GH9MV1`. For DataONE we changed the / to a : and added the suffix with the type ("metadata") and the creation date (the \$v=...)."

This suggests a flaw in the assumption that the appearance of a DOI in the PID will indicate that the PID is a DOI, and the assumption that the value of the PID will be equal to the value of the DOI as provided in the metadata record.

A second point: I did happen to also run a diff report finding 222 pids on the MN not on the CN. Due to that tDAR is a custom build node which does not retain immutable copies of metadata records, once a record is "versioned", all old versions are lost. There are sometimes hiccups in how their system translates in this way to DataONE reality. Have notified Adam of the attached pids and he'll take a look when he can.

##### #3 - 2018-08-08 15:13 - Monica Ihli

- Parent task set to #6485

**#4 - 2018-08-16 15:56 - Monica Ihli**

Provided guidance via email on synchronizing pids using curl.

**#5 - 2018-10-02 16:46 - Monica Ihli**

- % Done changed from 0 to 100

- Status changed from New to Closed

**Files**

---

tdar_pids_not_on_CN.csv	15.9 KB	2018-08-08	Monica Ihli
-------------------------	---------	------------	-------------