

Subject: CCB-29, Voting Results (1/28/2014)

Date: Tuesday, January 28, 2014 10:07:29 AM PT

From: Lynn Neakrase

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

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

Hi CCB,

Today's Votes are as follows. I've included most of the pertinent comments regarding concerns with today's SCR to try and help Elizabeth decipher the discussion. Remember most of this has been captured on JIRA for review. Let me know if something is not represented correctly here.

Thanks,

-Lynn

CCB-29: Deprecate Display_2D_Image class

ATM: abstain

GEO: NO

IMG: NO

IPDA: NO

PPI: NO

RINGS: NO

SBN: abstain

Result: CCB-29 does NOT pass due to majority vote "no".

Comments: (from email and JIRA)

PPI: Including the line display direction (Up/Down) and the sample display direction (right) in the description of the image is the correct place. It is a characteristic of the data. It is not a discipline specific characteristic. If it's moved to the Discipline_Area we will then need to require elements in the Discipline_Area which are not part of the core model and therefore not under the same level of configuration control. This could lead to conformance problems.

RINGS: I echo Todd's concerns. Mike A. also raised the issue that the Default_Display_Settings class only deals with *recommendations*, and the display orientation of an image is substantially more than a recommendation, because other key geometric parameters, like orientation angles, depend on getting the display orientation right. Nevertheless, we need to distinguish between structural and scientific information about a product, and the scientific information belongs in the discipline area. The format and content of the geometry information for 2-D (and 3-D) images is still TBD, but it makes sense to me for image orientation parameters to appear alongside the other geometry information.

In summary, I believe the reasoning given for the CCB-29 is faulty, because the Default_Display_Settings class is NOT the proper place to record critical scientific information. Nevertheless, I agree that Display_2D_Image should be deprecated. Unfortunately, I need to vote "No" because I disagree with the second part of the proposal, containing revised text for StdRef section 4A.5. If the vote were just about the deprecation of Display_2D_Image, with the solution TBD within a new subclass of the Discipline area, I would have voted "Yes".

IPDA: I share the concerns from both Todd and Mark.

In addition, it would be useful to see the Display dictionary with the classes indicated so we can better judge the request. Where can I find this? It would be very useful if links to such items mentioned within the CCB could be made available from JIRA by default for future requests.

I agree in principle with the deprecation, but for the above reasons, and in agreement with the concerns raised by Todd and Mark, I vote "No".

ATM: I agree with previous comments that having the proposed solution included with this SCR, namely the Display Dictionary (or at very least an example of how this would be handled) would have probably made the argument stronger for this SCR. I would like to see examples of how this would be handled for comparison. Atmospheres admittedly handles less imaging data than the other nodes. I think we're fine with going with the tiger team's recommendations, but given the concerns presented here I think Atmospheres will have to abstain on this vote until further documentation/examples are provided.

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