

Subject: CCB Voting Report from today.

Date: Tuesday, March 25, 2014 11:38:56 AM PT

From: Lynn Neakrase

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

CC: Crichton, Daniel J (3902), Joyner, Ronald (398J), Hughes, John S (3980), Rye, Elizabeth D (398J), Martinez Sanmartin, Santa (3266-Affiliate), Simpson, Richard A (6020-Affiliate), Richard Simpson, Mike Martin, Susan Slavney, Mafi, Joseph N (4600-Affiliate)

Hi CCB and Interested Parties,

We had our telecon and vote today. Thanks to everyone who called in. I think we had a great discussion and I think the result was prudent choice today. We should expect to have some other SCRs on the agenda in two weeks. As always (and importantly this week) check and see if I've captured the discussion well enough through paraphrasing. Let me know if there need to be changes that can be added to the official record when Emily posts this.

Thanks again to everyone!

-Lynn

--- RESULTS ---

CCB-50 (descoped) Add Three New Array Subclasses

ATM: YES

GEO: NO

IMG: YES

IPDA: NO

PPI: NO

RINGS: absent

SBN: NO

Does NOT pass on majority vote.

Comments:

Rye: The real issue discussing differences in philosophy behind the subclass specialization here is where do we implement the complexity of the data. The current method puts the complexity on the PDS with subclasses and schematron files to govern the specialized rules. Mark Showalter's suggestion puts the complexity at the mission level using more generalized classes but still requires schematron files to handle the rules. The outcome is that specialization will have to be done for each mission that uses the general classes.

ATM: Need to make a decision on this quickly. MAVEN-IUVS is behind schedule and needs a solution to the Array_3D_Spectral_Movie subclass to finish data product development and ultimately SIS as soon as possible. If there is a major change in the structure of these classes we will need to lock MAVEN to V 1.2.0.0 and make adjustments after end-of-mission.

PPI: Specialization of classes is not the preferred way to go on this subject. Short term fix is ok for now but this should be revisited.

SBN: Agrees with PPI's assessment. Understands the need for a solution for MAVEN and would be ok with quick fix but this is not the preferred solution.

IMG: Agrees with PPI's assessment as well -- is worried about the proliferation of specialized classes.

IPDA: Again agrees with specialization arguments but would support getting something done for MAVEN under current plan.

Rye response to GEO questions:

A. YES. Array_3D_Movie supports only single band images.

B. Name is a bit arbitrary, we could change the name of these subclasses.

C. We're concerned with the MAVEN specific answer at this point, we should determine the philosophy/policy later.

D. Additional rules vs. holes in the existing rules.

E. The rules would be modified to ensure 1 spatial, 1 spectral, and 1 temporal etc.

F. DDWG has discussed this and many philosophical discussions were had... no real consensus at this point.

Rye response to ATM question:

Hughes and Rye have agreed to pursue the Showalter approach and test for comparison. The timeline for said testing is around 2-3 months [this is beyond needed timeline for MAVEN]. For MAVEN use of the generic Array_3D should pose no new complexity -- more or less a name change at this point. ATM has agreed to this.

*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