

Subject: CCB-96/98 Vote Results.

Date: Wednesday, December 31, 2014 at 10:07:33 AM Pacific Standard Time

From: Lynn Neakrase

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

CC: Crichton, Daniel J (3902), Joyner, Ronald (398G), Hughes, John S (398B), Mafi, Joseph N (4600-Affiliate), Simpson, Richard A (6020-Affiliate), Richard Simpson, Mike Martin, Susan Slavney, Martinez Sanmartin, Santa (3266-Affiliate), GSFC-6901 (GSFC-6901) Morgan

Hi CCB and Interested Parties,

Thanks to everyone for considering these 2 SCRs over the break. Hope everyone is having a good break and happy holiday season.

Here are the results:

CCB-96: Include the Array class in File_Area_Observational and File_Area_Observational and File_Area_Browse

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

CCB-96 PASSES by Majority Vote.

CCB-98: Add a Special Constraint section to the Standards Reference on class selection.

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

CCB-98 PASSES by Majority Vote.

**** NOTE: YES votes from GEO and RINGS with the lien of making wording consistent in both SCRs. (See below)**

Showalter (and Stein via JIRA): The text in 9F requires the most specific subclass that "is available in the class and is appropriate". However, in CCB-98, the "and is appropriate" clause is missing from the change to Section 6.1.1 of the Data Providers Handbook. We should use consistent wording in both places. I suspect this is just an oversight.

Regarding the open issue of the lingering Array_1D class, I think we can resolve MAVEN's issue based on appropriateness. If a data object logically comprises a set of interconnected arrays of different ranks, all embedded in the same file, then I think it would arguably be "appropriate" to label all of these objects consistently, using the Array

class, rather than to call some of them Array and to call others Array_1D, Array_2D and Array_3D, merely based on rank.

My answer would change if a file contained, for example, an actual 2D image in addition to the other arrays. However, I gather that this is not the case for MAVEN.

Thanks again to everyone! Once the consistent wording is incorporated, these are ready to move to implementation.
-Lynn

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