

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: PDS CCB: One new SCR for us to consider (CCB-335) (Jan. 6th, 2022)

Date: Monday, January 17, 2022 at 8:49:08 AM Pacific Standard Time

From: Mark S. Bentley

To: Tang, Vivian (US 398B), Joyner, Ronald (US 398G), EXTERNAL-Stone, Jesse V (US 398A-Affiliate), Ineakras@nmsu.edu, EXTERNAL-Mayer, David P (US 398B-Affiliate), matt@seti.org, EXTERNAL-Joy, Steve P (US 4900-Affiliate), Stein, Thomas, EXTERNAL-Hare, Trent M (US 398A-Affiliate), Tang, Vivian (US 398B)

CC: EXTERNAL-Hare, Trent M (US 398A-Affiliate), Joyner, Ronald (US 398G)

Dear Vivian,

The CCB would like clarification on CCB-335 before being able to vote on it:

1. Whilst we appreciate that the IM should support the SR, is there a clear need to have collection inventories use only commas, rather than updating the Standards reference to say "any valid delimiter" instead of "a single comma"? If not, why not update the Standards Reference to match the model (allow all valid delimiters)?

2. If for some reason (to be clarified), comma is the only delimiter to be allowed, why is the Inventory class re-defined, rather than (for example) adding an additional Schematron rule?

3. If for some reason (to be clarified), the Inventory class should be re-defined, why not incorporate other existing Schematron rules into the definition, rather than leaving them in place, so as to keep all the relevant rules in a single place?

4. If the SCR is resolved using a Schematron rule, how can this rule -- and the other rules governing the inventory -- be made visible in the information model, so that data providers will know they are in place.

Regards,
Mark

On 07/01/2022 00:06, Tang, Vivian (US 398B) wrote:

> Dear Mark,

>

> The following 1 SCR is ready for CCB to review/vote:

>

> CCB-335 <<https://pds-jira.jpl.nasa.gov/browse/CCB-335>> Inventory

> Specification Allows Too Many Delimiters

>

> Thanks,

>

> Vivian

>

> On 1/6/22, 2:40 PM, "Hare, Trent M" <thare@usgs.gov>

> <<mailto:thare@usgs.gov>>> wrote:

>