

**Subject:** CCB Results TODAY.

**Date:** Tuesday, May 12, 2015 at 11:03:47 AM Pacific Daylight Time

**From:** Lynn Neakrase

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

**CC:** Crichton, Daniel J (3902), Hughes, John S (398B), Joyner, Ronald (398G), Richard Simpson, Mike Martin, Martinez Sanmartin, Santa (3266-Affiliate), Susan Slavney, Morgan, Thomas H. (GSFC-6901)

Hi CCB and Interested Parties,

Thanks to everyone who contributed to the discussion today. Whether you were on the line or not, the discussion both on the phone and on JIRA was very useful.

The votes and discussion have been summarized below. For those on the line today, please let me know if there need to be corrections or additions to what I've captured today.

Thanks as always,  
-Lynn

-----  
CCB-106: Move Description Attribute to Field from Its Subclasses

This was returned to the CCB after CCB Passed last week. During Queuing for Implementation, several other connections were found that impacted the IM and ultimately the implementation. Upon return to the CCB, the submitter with EN discussion decided that the requested changes were not worth the impact to the model and this SCR was withdrawn.

Discussion of the CCB process post-CCB voting. Once the CCB passes something it moves to "Queued for Implementation"

CCB agreed.

**Closed - Withdrawn by Submitter after further technical assessment.**

-----  
CCB-107: Make Steward Duties in Setting LIDs for Archival Products More Specific

The node issues that generated the concern addressed by this SCR have been internally resolved with the EN for now. Submitter has withdrawn this SCR; impact on IM in light of the internal solution makes this SCR not needed at this time.

**Closed - Withdrawn by Submitter.**

-----  
CCB-91: Change Instrument.type to Not Enumerated

VOTE: (5/5 evote), **5/12 telecon**

ATM: (YES), **NO**

GEO: (YES), **NO**

IMG: (YES), **NO**

IPDA: (NO), **NO** (email)

PPI: (NO), **NO**

RINGS: (NO), **NO**

SBN: (YES (late)), **NO**

**Closed, Voted Down by Majority Vote, Sent back to DDWG for more work (see discussion below).**

In general the CCB was concerned that the current enumerated list was not the proper approach for the Instrument.type field because of the growing nature of the already long list of enumerated values.

The discussion revolved around usefulness of Instrument.type for search capabilities. Consensus within CCB was that as a single value, Instrument.type has limited use as an enumerated list because of the length of the current list and the potential for more values over time. The Instrument.type field should probably be not-enumerated or free-form text if left as a single value. Mark Showalter and Todd King posted different suggestions on JIRA for other ideas. Of particular interest to the CCB was Mark's suggestion for a multivalued approach. Under some approach like this, Instrument.type would be replaced by or broken down into multiple values similar to the Primary\_Results\_Summary, where data providers (and DNs) could use some enumerated lists in specific combinations to better describe the instrument producing the data. Some sort of tiered approach like this would be more useful for faceted searches, but still provide the flexibility to deal with ever-more-complex compound instrument types moving forward.

Votes were split in the initial voting on this SCR and many different viewpoints were presented today.

PPI: Has done the initial work with the long enumerated list and has reduced PPI instruments in that list to a small list of types that they could use currently.

RINGS: Was concerned about compound instruments that don't fit into current list and would require more additions in the near future

ATM: Wondered if there was a way to make Instrument.type not-enumerated but preserve node expertise by allowing schematron-type regulations (enumeration) at the node level, but this would probably not address cross-node instruments very well.

PPI: Noted that the majority of problems with this SCR would stem from the PDS3 to PDS4 migration efforts involving mapping of PDS3 to PDS4 values

Hardman: Search on single list of enumerated values is an easy approach that works, but search could also work with multivalued or discipline-managed approach.

Upon discussion today, the CCB decided it would be useful for DDWG to try to rework this problem and decided to vote the SCR down, closing it out today.

The outcome is that Instrument.type remains an enumerated list for now, but should be reworked because the current list is not optimal as a long enumerated list.

CCB acknowledged that DDWG work on this might take some time, but cautions that this shouldn't take too much time (i.e., aim for inclusion in the next build release (Fall 2015)) before migration efforts get too far along with more nodes beginning work on this now. Any future solution to this issue will require a new SCR reflected in the closing of CCB-91 at this time.

-----  

---

  
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