

Subject: Summary of Votes (7/23/13)

Date: Tuesday, July 23, 2013 10:43:07 AM PT

From: Lynn Neakrase

To: Law, Emily S (3980), Showalter, Mark R (7900-Affiliate), Trent M Hare, Joy, Steven P (4600-Affiliate), Todd King, Stein, Tom (6900-Affiliate), Carol Neese,

CC: Crichton, Daniel J (4231), Joyner, Ronald (398J), Rye, Elizabeth D (398J)

Hi CCB,

Thanks to everyone for the votes and the email discussion. This has all been very useful. ATM shares many of the concerns listed here. I'm realizing we are still working out some kinks between the SCR submission/triage/review/voting process. Plus there have been some miscommunications between the CCB and Triage process, where I think we actually need procedures (which through our CCB efforts are becoming better defined) for who's responsibility it is to edit and update the SCRs that we get each week. I was under the impression we would have the new lander definitions before the weekend and that was clearly not the case. I think this worked itself out this week and Emily and I have discussed how to better handle this type of situation for next time.

Stay tuned and Emily and I will continue to evolve our process to get everyone better SCRs for discussion. We'll plan on having the next telecon on 6 Aug 2013, 8:30 am PDT -- unless we don't have sufficient SCR support or simple cases as it was this week. If we have a simple case again, we can vote via email if that works out for everyone here. (I feel this was very successful in my opinion.)

Continue to check JIRA for up-to-date info on upcoming SCRs and we'll see what we can do. I'll send out the next telecon announcement on Thursday, Aug 1.

Thanks Everyone!
-Lynn

SUMMARY OF 7/23/13 Votes

CCB-9

ATM - NO
PPI - NO
RINGS - NO
GEO - NO
IMG - absent
SBN - NO
IPDA - YES

Comments:

SBN - No, because the SCR doesn't have the improved definitions in it, rather it has the old circular definitions which we rejected before. I don't understand why we were asked to look at it again in this state.

PPI - I agree with Mark and Tom. The definitions need to be improved. Dick had drafted new definitions which Lynn included in an e-mail on 7/1/2013. Until they are included in the actual text of the SCR, the vote is "no". Dick's definitions are:

spacecraft: a vehicle designed for travel in outer space ("outer space" is the region more than 100 km above the Earth's surface, a convention accepted in many contexts -- see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Outer_space).

lander: a spacecraft designed for descent to and operation at a single fixed point on the surface of a celestial body.

rover: a spacecraft designed for descent to and mobile operation on the surface of a celestial body.

Earth-based: the instrument host is on or near the surface of Earth (no more than 100 km altitude above the surface).

RINGS - I have to agree with Tom. The definition provided for lander is "Lander - The Instrument Host is classified as being of type Lander". We asked them for a definition and they provided it! However, I would love to see the official PDS definition of "circular".

All snarkiness aside, it gets worse, because the current definitions for "Spacecraft", "Rover" and "Earth based" are all also circular in an identical way.

I vote NO. More seriously, I suggest that the PDS4 team needs to get their act together and write a definition, using normal English words and avoiding circularity, for every keyword value in the entire PDS4 architecture. If the user community ever sees definitions like these, we will all be a laughingstock.

GEO - Either I'm not using Jira right or Dick's new definitions are not online. The definitions as I see them are not definitions at all. I vote NO based on the current reading of the "definitions".

CCB-16

ATM - NO

PPI - NO

RINGS - NO

GEO - NO

IMG - absent

SBN - NO

IPDA - YES

Comments:

SBN - No, because the details of the definition and units are still being discussed and evidently some revisions will be needed.

PPI - For the same reason Mark gives and that the SCR must contain the actual changes . Change from "wave number" to "wavenumber".

RINGS - I see two separate issues.

First, there seems to be an issue with JIRA and/or HTML formatting, so the "***-1" gets clobbered in various presentations of the allowed units. If that is an issue with the software, I am willing to overlook it (but somebody needs to fix the software before anybody outside of PDS sees this.)

Also, responding to a comment that Dick Simpson entered into JIRA, frequency and wavenumber are different quantities with different units, so the two cannot be combined into one. It so happens that frequency and wavenumber are proportional to one another, and differ by a factor of c , but that is beside the point. It would make no sense to tell the Cassini CIRS team to start referring to frequency instead of wavenumber in their data sets.

My personal issue is that, in scientific usage, "wavenumber" is always one word (like "wavelength"). Elizabeth and I had an exchange of emails regarding this matter, and she agreed to make the change. Unfortunately, Elizabeth's change did not get propagated into the proposal that has been presented to us.

I vote NO, but if the term were changed from "wave number" to "wavenumber", I would vote YES.

GEO - I entered a comment in Jira that the proposed values are not properly specified. On that basis, I vote NO.

General Comments about SCRs

SBN - And here are my two cents agreeing with Mark's concern about the quality of material that is coming before the CCB. I had thought that we would be considering well-formed and mature SCRs which we could decide, "yes this should be implemented" and "no, this is a bad idea." But instead we are presented with SCRs which may or may not be a good idea if they were well-formed and mature enough to implement, but we have to troubleshoot the problems with them and send them back and probably see them again later in revised form. It would be better if the SCRs could be in good shape when we first see them, so we are deciding their merits rather than nitpicking their errors.

PPI - I also share Mark's concern regarding the quality of material. When the CCB provides feedback regarding an SCR (we did for CCB-9), no action is taken to update the original SCR. I think we need to insist that the SCR contain the actual changes because non-captured instructions will (most likely) not be implemented.

RINGS - I am feeling discouraged. PDS4 is going up for review in two months. I believe the design is sound, but I could never infer that from the quality of the material being presented to the CCB. If the September review panel is presented with anything resembling the half-baked material that has been coming in front of us, we are all in serious trouble. I suggest that the PDS4 developers should start treating us the same way they would treat an external review board. It will give them practice for what's coming.

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)646-1862
Cell: (602)502-2462