

Subject: Results from today's telecon (12/17/2013)

Date: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 10:02:44 AM PT

From: Lynn Neakrase

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

CC: Crichton, Daniel J (3902), Joyner, Ronald (398J), Rye, Elizabeth D (398J), Hughes, John S (3980), Edward A. Guinness

Hi Emily et al.,

Here are the results from today's telecon. Please note there were some comments that have policy implications/suggestions that will probably need to go back to DDWG for discussion. I've tried to note these where they came up. If you need further clarification on anything here let me know, we can chat about it if necessary! ALSO, if anyone feels I've omitted something or misrepresented anything here, please let Emily and I know so we can add to the official record!

Thanks,

-Lynn

VOTING RESULTS

CCB-30 *Create a new Local_Internal_Reference class*

ATM: YES

GEO: abstain

IMG: YES

IPDA: YES

PPI: NO (by email; not present)

RINGS: YES

SBN: YES

Status: PASSED by majority vote (to be queued for implementation)

Comments:

Concerns were expressed about the usage of this class and the directionality of it's use. Elizabeth noted some people may need some other optional classes added to common model to use in the opposite direction to her implied usage as presented here. CCB agreed that this would probably need to be handled in a case-by-case fashion as the need arises and other possible uses would have to be handled with future SCRs to allow potentially needed classes.

CCB-43 *Standard Reference Error on Mission Namespace URI formation*

ATM: YES

GEO: YES

IMG: YES

IPDA: YES
PPI: NO (by email; not present)
RINGS: YES
SBN: YES

Status: PASSED by majority vote (to be queued for implementation)

Comments:

It was noted that this vote was specifically for bringing the Standards Reference into alignment with itself. Examples didn't match the described policies.

Having noted that. There were concerns with the current policy in Standards Reference V4.0.8. Suggestions presented here imply future SCRs that DDWG should discuss concerning the current rules for namespace URIs.

1) Namespace creation for instruments within missions: Is this consistent with DDWG discussions? (several members of CCB recalled that instruments would reside in mission namespaces -- couldn't recall if DDWG agreed to allow instrument specific subdirectories -- THIS should be double checked to make sure everything is aligned between DDWG discussion and what is reflected in the Standards Reference.

2) The use of "standard" 3-digit abbreviations for missions etc. -- Are these "standard"? Why only 3-digits and not the full name of the mission? Is there a standard list we can point to as a reference for these and what they mean? (if there is a standard reference, it should be used across our policy documents).

3) The requirement to use "/mission/" in the namespace formation rules. D. Heather pointed out that alignment of documentation should dictate that this be "/investigation/" to allow for non-mission instrument/observation groupings to also have their own namespaces. Consistency was the concern -- a solution should be found/added to the Standards Reference to rectify this issue. Perhaps /mission/ could still be called out separately but there should be clear rules for non-mission investigations in need of their own namespaces.

General Comment (walk-on):

C.Neese brought up a good point concerning timeframes for commenting on SCRs to be discussed at the Tuesday telecons. This week the CCB was flooded with updates just before the meeting. Although in some instances (like today) this may be unavoidable, the action should be for L. Neakrase to remind participants and interested parties to try to get feedback for scheduled SCRs back to the CCB by Monday before the meeting (~12-24 hrs. before scheduled meeting time). This suggestion will be implemented by L. Neakrase in future telecon announcements. New notification system from E.Law is expected to help mitigate this as well. First test this morning was mostly successful with a few issues that Emily has been contacted about.

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