```
Cc: "Michael F. A'Hearn" <ma@astro.umd.edu>, sjoy@igpp.ucla.edu,
       emily.s.law@jpl.nasa.gov, susan.hoban@gsfc.nasa.gov,
       slavney@rsmail.wustl.edu
From: "Michael F. A'Hearn" <ma@astro.umd.edu>
Subject: Re: Some key questions for PDS4
Date: Mon, 12 Nov 2007 15:20:39 -0500
To: pds_mc@nssdc.gsfc.nasa.gov
X-JPL-spam-score: 0.00%
```

Mike

I do NOT think that it is possible to make PDS4 completely backwards compatible and also fix many of
the problems in PDS3. I think that what we really need to do is to look at the areas that are not
backwards compatible and ask whether a) we can tolerate that incompatibility in older data sets, or b)
the number of datasets that would need to be updated is small.

        Mike

On 12 Nov 2007, at 2:02 PM, Mark V. Sykes wrote:

> It seems to me that a basic issue has yet to be decided that provides a
> major constraint on what PDS4 is and how it should be developed:
>
> o Should PDS4 be required to be backwards compatible?
>
> There has been concern expressed about the potential cost and inadequate
> resources for implementing a non-backwards compatible system. To what
> extent do those costs depend upon the details of PDS4? What are the
> benefits of developing PDS4 de novo? Would it be of value even if it is
> not implemented by providing important guidance for the improvement of
> PDS3? Is it possible that a 'clean' PDS4 would offer efficiencies and
> capabilities that would effectively recover its implementation costs over
> a reasonably short period? Could the value of PDS to users (and NASA) be
> so improved by PDS4 that it would be worth the investment even if the
> implementation costs are not recovered? Should this decision be impacted
> at all by the adoption of PDS3 by PSA? If so, are we locked into PDS3
> forever?
>
> Mark