**Subject:** Re: CCB Telecon Announcement

**Date:** Tuesday, June 25, 2013 12:00:26 AM PT

**From:** Mark Showalter

**To:** Lynn Neakrase

**CC:** Law, Emily S (3980), Stein, Tom (6900-Affiliate), Joy, Steven P (4600-Affiliate), neese@psi.edu, dheather@rssd.esa.int, Showalter, Mark R (7900-Affiliate), Trent M Hare

CCB colleagues,

I am at a Cassini meeting in Sweden this week. I am not sure I can call in today, so I will pass along a few comments.

Regarding the proposal to add "Lander" to the list of enumerated Instrument_Host types, I vote yes.

Beyond that, I have several procedural comments.

(1) I frequently encounter MS Word incompatibilities across versions and platforms. This document gives me a long and confusing error message when I open it. I propose that Change Requests be distributed via PDF instead of (or in addition to) MS Word.

(2) Every enumerated type must have a clear and concise definition. I know what a lander is, but I am sure there will be cases where the precise meaning of a new enumerated value is not obvious. All future proposals for new enumerated values should include the definition. They should also include the definitions of all the pre-existing values, because that provides necessary context for discussing the change.

(3) Every Change Request should include a sentence or two explaining why the change is needed in plain English. "GEO and IMG both use Instrument_Host of type Lander" is not really an explanation. In this case I can figure out the need for the change, but that will not always be the case.

(4) We need to develop a clear vocabulary for how to categorize proposed changes. This document says "Priority: Trivial". "Trivial" is not a priority, it is an impact assessment. A priority would be something like "Urgent". In addition, it would be helpful to be given a target date or some explanation of the priority. The CCB could not be bound by a target date, particularly if a CR turned out to be contentious, but it would help us to prioritize.

(5) Overall I find the layout of this Change Request template impenetrable. The form should be designed to make the job of the CCB members as easy as possible. Key information should come first. All necessary background and context information should be provided in the document. Fields purely for internal bookkeeping (like "Remaining Estimate"?) can be moved to the bottom.

(6) The form provides a box for votes, but not for comments. If the CCB turns down a request, there ought to be a box on the form where we can explain the reasoning behind our decision, and/or offer a recommendation for how the CR could be modified to make it acceptable.

(7) Ideally, all CRs deemed "trivial" should be handled via an email vote. Time on the telecon should be reserved for issues that are truly difficult or controversial. In fact, it would not be a bad idea for the CCB members to provide a preliminary yes/no/abstain vote on every CR, prior to every telecon, just

so we can allocate our time on the telecon efficiently.

(8) Finally, I urge the CCB to consider a later start time than 8am Pacific. However, I do realize that this must be balanced against the needs of our European rep.

--Mark