

**Subject:** CCB Results from this week.

**Date:** Tuesday, January 27, 2015 at 3:25:57 PM Pacific Standard Time

**From:** Lynn Neakrase

**To:** Law, Emily S (3980), dheather@rssd.esa.int, Ed Shaya, Joy, Steven P (4600-Affiliate), Todd King, Showalter, Mark R (4500-Affiliate), Trent M Hare, Stein, Tom (6900-Affiliate)

**CC:** Crichton, Daniel J (3902), Joyner, Ronald (398G), Hughes, John S (398B), Richard Simpson, Susan Slavney, Martinez Sanmartin, Santa (3266-Affiliate), Mike Martin, Mafi, Joseph N (4600-Affiliate)

Hi CCB,

Here are the results from today's e-votes.

-Lynn

CCB-99: Remove Array\_1D from model.

ATM: YES  
GEO: YES  
IMG: YES  
IPDA: absent  
PPI: YES  
RINGS: YES  
SBN: NO

Passes by Majority Vote. Move to implementation.

-----  
CCB-101: Remove ASCII\_Date, ASCII\_Date\_Time and ASCII\_Date\_Time\_UTC from the Field classes.

ATM: NO\*  
GEO: NO\*\*  
IMG: YES  
IPDA: absent  
PPI: YES  
RINGS: NO  
SBN: NO

\* ATM votes no because of the omission of appropriate, clear, reasoning... Included below is suggested modification from (Huber, Hughes, Joyner, Neakrase)  
"By removing ASCII\_Date as an option, both formulations for values are not allowed in a single column. However the provider can still choose between ASCII\_Date\_Time\_DOY or ASCII\_Date\_Time\_YMD bringing the model back into reasonableness. See [https://pds.jpl.nasa.gov/pds4/doc/im/v1/index\\_1301.html#class\\_pds\\_field\\_character](https://pds.jpl.nasa.gov/pds4/doc/im/v1/index_1301.html#class_pds_field_character). The case for ASCII\_Date\_Time is similar. However for the case of ASCII\_Date\_Time\_UTC the specialized data types do not exist and must be added. E.g., ASCII\_Date\_Time\_YMD\_UTC."

\*\* GEO votes no without addition of Dick Simpson's comments from JIRA.

Rejected by Majority Vote. — Return to Steve Hughes/DDWG for updating — Requires clearer statement of reasoning behind problem to be solved and incorporation of Dick's comments from JIRA

-----

Given the discussion over email today about CCB-101, implementation can't happen without the SCR having more clarity. Suggestions above.

Let me know if we've omitted something — we'll revote once the changes are made — Included below is the email discussion (up to 2:30pm MST):

Hi all -

I'm a little mystified by the date format discussion.

Are we comparing dates as simple strings? That doesn't seem to be the right way to do it. Especially since math on date strings is very awkward.

The reason ISO8601 allows a lot of variations (MM-DD, DOY and truncations) is because that is what you find in common string expressions of dates. The expectation is the string will be parsed. Most database systems can parse ISO8601 during a load, storing the data internally in a binary form (which makes calculates possible and comparisons faster).

There's also a distinction between dates in the PDS4 label metadata and that in a data product. For the PDS4 label (I believe) we have only one form YYYY-MM-DDThh:mm:ss.sss. In the data file a variety of forms should be allowed provided that the form can be specified clearly.

SCR-101 was addressing that there are three date types that are polymorphic. That is, more than one form was allowed. It is right to eliminate this. It's not right to go further. The impact is much too big, especially for migrations.

With regards to the PDS4 registry, it contains only PDS4 label type metadata, so there's only one form for dates, but if they are stored as date data types the form doesn't really matter.

-Todd-

On 1/27/2015 11:31 AM, Mark Showalter wrote:

Or we can say that MM-DD is required. DOY can also be provided if a team uses it internally, but if so, they must also include a translation to MM-DD.

On Jan 27, 2015, at 11:06 AM, Ed Shaya <[eshaya@umd.edu](mailto:eshaya@umd.edu)> wrote:

Mark,

I agree with you 100%. One solution would be to require both. But that is really radical.

Ed

On 1/27/2015 1:57 PM, Mark Showalter wrote:

I agree that many missions prefer DOY over MM-DD, but I must say that having two different standards for how to specify a date makes cross-comparisons extremely difficult. On Cassini, half the teams use DOY and the other half use MM-DD. The confusion has been unceasing. I truly wish we could standardize on just one format for dates. However, it may be out of our hands.

--Mark

On Jan 27, 2015, at 10:50 AM,  
Richard Simpson <[radiosci@att.net](mailto:radiosci@att.net)>  
wrote:

... the new ASCII\_Date  
should not be allowed  
to have DOY.

Many missions and support  
organizations prefer DOY.

From: Ed Shaya <[eshaya@umd.edu](mailto:eshaya@umd.edu)>

To: Mike Martin  
<[tahoe\\_mike@sbcglobal.net](mailto:tahoe_mike@sbcglobal.net)>; Mark  
Showalter <[mshowalter@seti.org](mailto:mshowalter@seti.org)>

Cc: Lynn Neakrase  
<[lneakras@nmsu.edu](mailto:lneakras@nmsu.edu)>; Emily Law  
<[emily.s.law@jpl.nasa.gov](mailto:emily.s.law@jpl.nasa.gov)>;  
[dheather@rssd.esa.int](mailto:dheather@rssd.esa.int); Thomas C.  
Stein <[stein@wunder.wustl.edu](mailto:stein@wunder.wustl.edu)>;  
Trent M Hare <[thare@usgs.gov](mailto:thare@usgs.gov)>;  
Steven Joy <[sjoy@igpp.ucla.edu](mailto:sjoy@igpp.ucla.edu)>;  
Todd King <[tking@igpp.ucla.edu](mailto:tking@igpp.ucla.edu)>;  
4231 Crichton  
<[Daniel.J.Crichton@jpl.nasa.gov](mailto:Daniel.J.Crichton@jpl.nasa.gov)>;  
398J Joyner  
<[Ronald.Joyner@jpl.nasa.gov](mailto:Ronald.Joyner@jpl.nasa.gov)>;

Steve Hughes  
<[john.s.hughes@jpl.nasa.gov](mailto:john.s.hughes@jpl.nasa.gov)>;  
Richard Simpson <[radiosci@att.net](mailto:radiosci@att.net)>;  
Santa Martinez  
<[Santa.Martinez@sciops.esa.int](mailto:Santa.Martinez@sciops.esa.int)>;  
Susan Slavney  
<[slavney@wunder.wustl.edu](mailto:slavney@wunder.wustl.edu)>; Joe  
Mafi <[jmafi@igpp.ucla.edu](mailto:jmafi@igpp.ucla.edu)>

Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2015 9:53  
AM

Subject: Re: CCB for next week -- E-  
Vote request.

But, if we had this structure, then  
people would ask, can't we shorten

ASCII\_Date\_YMD to ASCII\_Date and  
ASCII\_Date\_Time\_YMD to  
ASCII\_Date\_Time.

It seems to me that  
ASCII\_Date\_Time\_YMD and  
ASCII\_Date\_YMD are the ones

that we should be doing away with  
and the new ASCII\_Date should not  
be

allowed to have DOY.

To make it just right, we would want  
ASCII\_Date\_DOY to become  
ASCII\_DOY

and ASCII\_Date\_Time\_DOY to  
become ASCII\_DOY\_Time.

Ed

On 1/27/2015 12:39 PM, Mike  
Martin wrote:

Hi Mark

Table fields definitions  
can still use  
ASCII\_Date\_DOY,

ASCII\_Date\_Time\_DOY,  
ASCII\_Date\_Time\_YM  
D, ASCII\_Date\_YMD  
and ASCII\_Time.

Thanks, Mike

On 1/27/2015 9:08  
AM, Mark Showalter  
wrote:

I vote  
yes on  
CCB-99,  
eliminati  
ng  
Array\_1  
D as a  
separate  
subclass.

I am  
very  
confuse  
d about  
CCB-  
101, and  
therefor  
e must  
vote no.  
Because

I have  
construc  
ted  
PDS3  
tables in  
the past  
includin  
g ASCII  
dates, I

can't  
quite  
wrap my  
head  
around  
the idea  
that  
dates in  
tables  
would

be  
disallow  
ed.

The  
problem  
stateme  
nt says  
that the  
Informat  
ion  
Model  
does not  
define

separate  
data  
types  
YYYYDO  
Y and  
YYYYM  
MDD.  
Maybe it  
should.

--Mark

---

Lynn D. V. Neakrase, Ph.D.  
Senior Research Scientist  
Science Infusion Manager  
PDS4 CCB Chair  
NASA Planetary Data System  
Department of Astronomy  
New Mexico State University  
P.O. Box 30001, MSC 4500  
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Office: (575)646-2566

Cell: (602)502-2462