

Subject: CCB Results, 27 May 2014.

Date: Tuesday, May 27, 2014 9:57:19 AM PT

From: Lynn Neakrase

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

CC: Crichton, Daniel J (3902), Joyner, Ronald (398J), Hughes, John S (3980), Hardman, Sean H (398J), Mike Martin, Susan Slavney, Martinez Sanmartin, Santa (3266-Affiliate), Stephanie A. (GSFC-690.1)[TELOPHASE CORP] McLaughlin, Simpson, Richard A (6020-Affiliate), Richard Simpson

Hi CCB et al.,

Here are the results from today's meeting. Good discussion on everything. We've found some holes in the process. Emily and I will get to work to plug them.

I've included a summary of some of our discussions today. As always, please review and let me know if we need corrections if I have captured something incorrectly.

Thanks for continued support!

-Lynn

——RESULTS——

CCB-57: Require Co-location of Labels and Associated Digital Objects

NOT a bug-fix.

ATM: YES

GEO: YES

IMG: YES

IPDA: YES (email)

PPI: absent

RINGS: YES

SBN: YES

Passes by majority vote.

Discussion determined that this is more or less the attempt to capture standard practices in a formal sense.

Everyone agreed this was a good idea — and recognized the fact that there may be more of this type of SCR coming in the future.

CCB-61: Metadata for Data Collections

Not ready for CCB — kick back to DDWG for more technical discussion.

No Vote.

Lengthy discussion about the process for this type of SCR — many aspects of this SCR were discussed at length by DDWG in the past and voted down. This combination of issues hasn't been discussed specifically by the DDWG and Mike Martin presents some new insight in to the problem he has described. A more lengthy technical assessment should be conducted to make this SCR votable by CCB. Concern was raised that this wasn't ready to go to the CCB and should have been flagged by triage process.

Lynn and Emily took an action item to discuss with triage members a more efficient way to handle routing SCRs that come through with dissenting opinions — Clearly in such cases more discussion is necessary before CCB vote, but there is a tight line of dealing with what is already handled by the DDWG and what could use more technical discussion.

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