

**Subject:** Official Tally for CCB-36

**Date:** Thursday, September 26, 2013 8:55:05 AM PT

**From:** Lynn Neakrase

**To:** Law, Emily S (3980), Trent M Hare, Stein, Tom (6900-Affiliate), Joy, Steven P (4600-Affiliate), Todd King, Carol Neese, dheather@rssd.esa.int, Showalter, Mark R (4500-Affiliate), Crichton, Daniel J (4231), Simpson, Richard A (6020-Affiliate), Anne C. Rough, rough@fred.net, Hughes, John S (3980), Joe Mafi

Hi Emily,

Here is the official tally with comments at the end.

-Lynn

-----  
CCB-36 Redesign of the Primary\_Results\_Summary Class

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

*Comments:*

**IPDA:** - it appears that the PRS is now optional everywhere, while it was mandatory before in the Product\_Observational. No rule exists to ensure that it will be present either in the product or bundle / collection level so it could be left out completely.

- it is possible to repeat science facets and attributes as much as you want, potentially resulting in very cumbersome and long label, and potentially complicating the implementation of search mechanisms.

In light of this, I would request that the Standards Reference and DPH at least be updated with clear examples of how the PRS should be used and the schematron rules for ensuring it is present/in the right place and that it is not abused.

**RINGS:** Among the proposed standard values, the American spelling of "greyscale" is "grayscale". I recommend that one change.

**ATM:** Is there a way to accept both spellings for both US and international use?

**Dick Simpson:** Dave raises an important point and one which the Board may also see in CCB-39. The Information Model is not well-suited to 'conditional' requirements; this is one of the reasons Schematron files were added to the set of standards tools. If the Board feels that requirements should be included in Schematron files, those requirements should be documented somewhere; Schematron itself is not a good choice because the files are very difficult to read. But the Standards Reference is an option.

A new SR chapter was approved in CCB-35 called "Special Constraints," which is a good place to include these odds and ends in a readable (albeit somewhat randomized) format. If the Board feels that PRS should be included in at least one of bundles, collections, or basic products (but not necessarily at any single level), it will help tremendously in management of the standards if appropriate wording is included in the SCR which can be added to the new SR Chapter 9. It is too late for PRS/CCB-36 (except through a separate SCR), but authors of future SCRs should be encouraged to do this. Schematron code which cannot be traced to the IM or SR is on shaky ground.

**ATM:** In light of Dave's comments, I think his are right, which means that we should denote the best practices for the use of this class. Optional everywhere is necessary because this class could be used at the Bundle, Collection, and/or Product level for flexibility where it makes sense. For the PDS documentation/implementation will have to be handled by best practices at the nodes... with a possible inclusion in the SR Constraints chapter as Dick mentions. In any case the IPDA solution may need to be a tighter document as we've been discussing for other issues as well.

2

---

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