

PDSE SMALL ENHANCEMENTS SURVEY

Name:
Email (provide if we may contact you):
Company:

For each item identified below, circle the number to the right that best fits your judgment of its value to your business. Use the rating scale Very High, High, Medium, Low, Very Low, or No Value to select how beneficial it would be to you. Then use the categories Performance, Scalability, Space Utilization, Usability, or Other to indicate the type of value you expect to gain from the requirement. Select as many as apply. For "Other", use the space provided to write-in the type of value. **Please return completed surveys to Sheraton 4th Floor, Boren Conference Room, by Wednesday, March 3rd or send to bawhite@us.ibm.com.**

Small Release Enhancements	V E R Y H I G H	H I G H	M E D I U M	L O W	V E R Y L O W	N O V A L U E	P E R F O R M A N C E	S C A L A B I L I T Y	S P A C E U T I L I T Y	U S A B I L I T Y	OTHER
1. PDSE V2 Health Checks	5	4	3	2	1	0					
2. Externalize indicator for PDSE V1/V2	5	4	3	2	1	0					
3. PDSE V1 to V2 Bulk Conversion Utility	5	4	3	2	1	0					
4. Multi volume PDSE	5	4	3	2	1	0					
5. Allow PDSE Member Level Security with RACF Data Set Profiles	5	4	3	2	1	0					
6. PDSE data compression of the individual member in the data set	5	4	3	2	1	0					
7. PDSE REORG Function - capability to reorg a PDSE directory non-disruptively and release the over-allocated, unused space in a PDSE that is no longer required, after members have been deleted.	5	4	3	2	1	0					
8. PDSE Cross Sysplex Sharing to Avoid Corruption - avoid accidental PDSE corruption due to improper sharing	5	4	3	2	1	0					
9. PDSE Full Cross Sysplex Sharing – read/write integrity across syplexes	5	4	3	2	1	0					

SSMVSS13008



- **PDSE V2 health checks**
 - **Response: Uncommitted candidate**
 - Comments from development: *Agree this is potential candidate for a future release once the adoption of PDSE V2 is more widespread. What timeframe is required?*
- **Description**
 - The release of PDSE V2 did not come with any health checks. Health checks for IGDSMSxx, the SMS dataclass parms, etc. should be created with the recommendation to allocate PDSE V2 by default.
- **Benefit:**
 - Users benefit from labor savings converting PDSE V1 to V2. IBM benefits by expediting the conversion from V1 to V2 PDSE's so that V1 can be deprecated as soon as possible.
- **Solution**
 - Left to the developers, but a health check for IGDSMSxx, and for the SMS dataclasses seems like a minimum requirement.
- **Impact**
 - Customer may not take the actions required to convert to PDSE V2, delaying the eventual deprecation of V1.

Complete your session evaluations online at www.SHARE.org/Seattle-Eval



SSMVSS13009



- **Externalize indicator for PDSE V1/V2**
 - **Updated Response: Uncommitted Candidate**
 - Comments from development: *Adding an indicator in the VTOC or catalog will create an incompatibility with existing PDSE V2 data sets which would require explicit migration action on behalf of customers.*
 - *Discussed in Pittsburgh and the majority agreed what IBM should provide is support in DCOLLECT. There did not appear to be any major concern that DCOLLECT would need to have the PDSE opened in order to get the version indicator. However, the comment was made that we needed to make sure the last reference date was not getting updated in this case where the PDSE was opened by DCOLLECT.*
 - *Also, need to add support in HSM to have an indicator in the migration record for V2, so that DCOLLECT can retrieve the information about migrated PDSEs without a RECALL.*
- **Description**
 - There is no indicator available to show if a PDSE is V1 or V2. Currently, the only way to get this data is to use the FAMS OCO interface. A non-OCO service or a flag in the catalog or VTOC is necessary to provide this information.
- **Benefit:**
 - Users benefit from being able to potentially expedite converting PDSE V1 to V2. IBM benefits by from expediting since V1 can be deprecated as soon as possible.
- **Solution**
 - Perhaps a catalog or VTOC indicator. A separate requirement has been submitted for the LISTDSI service.
- **Impact**
 - With inability to easily identify PDSE V1 and V2 datasets, customer may not be able to take the actions required to convert to PDSE V2, which will delay the eventual deprecation of V1.

Complete your session evaluations online at www.SHARE.org/Seattle-Eval



SSMVSS13005



■ PDSE V1 to V2 Bulk Conversion Utility

– **Response: Uncommitted candidate**

- Comments from Development: *DFSMSdss COPY would be the preferred solution as it already supports generic qualifiers (ie wildcards), the RENUKC keyword to avoid duplicate catalog entries, and the DELETE keyword if customers wanted to “convert in place”. Also would like input on MIGRATE / RECALL options.*

■ Description

- The upcoming PDSE V1 to V2 conversion did not provide a utility to convert PDSE's in bulk. While IEBCOPY can convert a single PDSE, this is not feasible for site with hundreds or thousands of PDSE's.

■ Benefit:

- Users benefit from labor savings converting PDSE V1 to V2. IBM benefits by expediting the conversion from V1 to V2 PDSE's so that V1 can be deprecated as soon as possible.

■ Solution

- DFDSS seems the most logical utility to use. It already provides the CONVERT PDSE syntax, so a CONVERT PDSEV2 or something similar seems logical. If DFDSS is used, you should also provide selection keywords, such as PDSEVER,EQ,1, PDSEVER,EQ,2, etc.

■ Impact

- If IEBCOPY remains the only means to convert PDSE's from V1 to V2, conversions to V2 will be significantly delayed due to the labor-intensive effort required to run IEBCOPY for each individual V1 PDSE.

Complete your session evaluations online at www.SHARE.org/Seattle-Eval



SSMVSS09008

- **DFSMSdfp - Multi volume PDSE**
 - **Response: Uncommitted Candidate**
- **Description:**
 - Support multi volume PDSE.
- **Background:**
 - It's quite simple to keep the storage group utilization high by simply utilizing multi volume datasets where the allocations span to overflow (QUINEW) volumes when needed. We have seen no performance problems despite we use multi volume datasets quite much. But, when there is a PDS or a PDSE they will suffer in a setup like this. They often can't grow as wished within its single volume. I.e. we have to setup specific low utilized storage groups for PDS and PDSE because they can't grow by the multi volume model in a highly utilized storage group.
- **Benefit:**
 - Higher storage group utilization. Less PDSE expand outages.
- **Solution:**
 - Possibility to grow over several volumes like multi volume supported VSAM and PS. Details is up to the developer.



Member Security



- **Allow Permissioning at the PDSE Member Level of RACF Data Set Profiles**
 - **Response: Uncommitted candidate**
- **Description / Use Case**
 - Several business areas current utilize the same partitioned data set for their requested universal command(ed) user ID/passwords for FTP. Would like to have the ability to segregate access at the member level. I don't want to administer multiple DSNs and would like to keep the profile as it is with one data set.
 - Member security for PDSs and PDSEs to control security separately for each member. The customer acknowledges that for a PDS this will be advisory security meaning that there will be simple ways for an assembler programmer to bypass it.
 - Client requests the option of protecting individual members of a PDSE. It would allow RACF administrators more control of PDSE members. Also instead of telling the customer they need to set up a new library and move all their members over if they wish to make security tighter for certain members a new RACF data set profile could be added instead which would be much less work.



RFE51899: PDSE Data Member Compression

- **PDSE compaction or compression of the data in the data set (ie via zEDC)**
 - **Response: Under Consideration**
- **Description / Use Case**
 - Customer wants to have an enhancement. PDSEs should be able to handle compressed (compact) data; especially when most of them are for source code or reports where over 50% data compression could be achieved and save disk space.
- **Benefits**
 - To manage and save more efficiently the space on dasd.



RFE51897: PDSE REORG Function



- **PDSE REORG Function**
 - **Response: Uncommitted candidate**
- **Description / Use Case**
 - A REORG function/utility is required for a PDSE which provides the capability to reorg a PDSE directory non-disruptively.
 - Ability to release the over-allocated, unused space in a PDSE that is no longer required, after members have been deleted. DFSMS should be able to reduce the size of the pdse after the space have been used and then released.

Complete your session evaluations online at www.SHARE.org/Seattle-Eval



PDSE Sharing

- **PDSE Cross Sysplex Sharing to Avoid Corruption**
 - **Response: Uncommitted Candidate**
- **Description / Use Case**
 - PDSE was not designed to be shared outside a SYSPLEX and depends on the Sysplex Infrastructure. To enable cross-sysplex sharing, z/OS needs to provide cross sysplex messaging (XCF enhancement).
 - A PDSE will become corrupt when a system outside of a sysplex updates a PDSE while the PDSE is being updated by systems within the sysplex. The systems within the sysplex are abiding by PDSE extended sharing rules, and the system outside the sysplex is not.
 - Usability problem for only-readers outside the sysplex where members disappear and abend0F4s occur because of dirty caches. This later problem, referred to as in-storage corruption, is caused by legitimate changes to the PDSE within the sysplex where the outside the sysplex reader will not be signaled about the PDSE data set changes.
- **Benefits**
 - Improved reliability to avoid accidental sharing resulting in PDSE corruption.

Complete your session evaluations online at www.SHARE.org/Seattle-Eval



PDSE Sharing



- **PDSE Full Cross Sysplex Sharing**
 - **Response: Uncommitted Candidate**
- **Description / Use Case**
 - PDSE was not designed to be shared outside a SYSPLEX and depends on the Sysplex Infrastructure. To enable cross-sysplex sharing, z/OS needs to provide cross sysplex messaging (XCF enhancement).
 - User wants to be able to create executable programs in PDS using COBOL V5.1; however, the program modules, which are compiled by Enterprise COBOL V5, must use PDSE. The customer faces a problem for the development and the test environment because they cannot share PDSE. Each test environment, the compiling system, some regression test systems and long-running test systems, is MONOPLEX or individual SYSPLEX separately. Additionally, to release the programs into the production systems, the libraries are shared between the compiling system and the production systems.
- **Benefits**
 - Improved flexibility, such as sharing PDSE between production and test environments.

Complete your session evaluations online at www.SHARE.org/Seattle-Eval

