

Subject: CCB Results etc. today.

Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2015 at 11:00:09 PM Central European Summer Time

From: Lynn Neakrase

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

CC: Crichton, Daniel J (3902), Hughes, John S (398B), Joyner, Ronald (398G)

Hi CCB,

Here are the results and impending decisions. Thanks for everyone taking time to look at the 2 SCRs up for review this week.

Thanks,
-Lynn

CCB-91 Change Instrument.type to Not Enumerated

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

* (Hare) Vote YES unless we can change as posted on JIRA, namely:

(1) To support searching, there probably should be an enumerated list of instrument types but much more encompassing (or generic to capture like sensors). The current list is already too large. But making it too small would also defeat the purpose (e.g. just using "Active" and "Passive"). This list presented on this website seems reasonable with maybe a few extra "catch-all" types (e.g. "N/A" or "Unclassified"). The goal would be to try to keep this enumerated list very minimal which is easier to categorize and again supports searching.

<https://earthdata.nasa.gov/data/standards-and-references/nasa-earth-system-science-remote-sensors>

(2) But as Richard said, this would then need a terse definition or description to fill-in the particulars for that instrument. Here they could call it anything they wanted to.

another list of 28 types for comparison: <http://www.wmo-sat.info/oscar/instrumenttypes>

** (Showalter) I think the better solution is that proposed by others--to define a small and well-defined set of enumerated instrument-types, including definitions.

(Heather) I don't have a very strong opinion on this from a user perspective, but purely in terms of easing the implementation of searches, it would make sense to keep it enumerated if possible, and do the extra work to define the restricted set of values.

(Joy/King) At PPI, we went through our entire holdings and mapped everything we have to the limited values that we all agreed upon.

CCB-91 on hold. Move to discussion on telecon tentatively scheduled for 8:30am PDT Tuesday, May 12, 2015. (Formal Announcement TBD on Thursday 5/7)

CCB-106 Move Description Attribute to Field from Its Subclasses

ATM: YES
GEO: YES
IMG: YES *
IPDA: YES
PPI: YES *
RINGS: YES*
SBN: absent

* (King) [from JIRA] Conditional YES votes if the following is incorporated:

The goal of this SCR is correct, however the requested changes need to be restated. Adding <description> to Field will automatically result in (2) since Field is the base class for the Field_* classes. Also the definition of <description> will be identical in all Field subclasses because of inheritance (stated in (3)). The missing change is to remove the <description> from the subclasses so that the <description> is not overridden. In summary, the changes should be:

(1) Add attribute <description> to Field with cardinality 0..1

(2) Remove the local <description> attribute from all subclasses of Field (Field_Binary, Field_Bit, Field_Character, and Field_Delimited).

CCB-106 PASSES with majority vote with inclusion of Todd King's additions. Move to implementation once additions are made.

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