NOTE

ON

SUGGESTED ARCHIVAL SCHEME

FOR SMOS' LEVEL 3 AND HIGHER

Project code SO-TN-CBSA-GS-0002-01.a

Version 1

Date 01/04/2003

	Role	***Name***	***Date and signature***
Written by :	Lead investigator and project scientist	Yann Kerr CESBIO Philippe Waldteufel SA	
Approuved by:	CNES Project Manager	Michel Moulin	
Approved by :	SMOS Project Manager	Achim Hahne	

DOCUMENT STATUS SHEET

version / Rév.	Date	Pages	Changes	Visa
0.a	17/02/2003		Firs issue	
1.a	01/04/2003		formatted	

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Achim Hahne for distribution at project level

Michele Zundo

Christophe Caspar

Michel Moulin for distribution at CNES level

REFERENCES

1	System Requirement Document	2.1	Feb 2000
2	SMOS Proposal (COP16)		Nov 1998
3	Mission Requirement Definition	5.0	Mar 2001
4	EASE GRID definition		
5	SO-TN-CBSA-GS-0001	1.b	Mar 2003

ACRONYMS

CESBIO	Centre d'Etudes Spatiales de la BIOsphère
CFC	CNES Centre
CNES	Centre national d'Etudes Spatiales
ESA	European Space Agency
ESL	Expert support Laboratory
ESRIN	
PDPC	Payload Data Processing Centre
SA	Service d'Aéronomie
SAG	Science advisory Group
SMOS	Soil Moisture and Ocean Salinity Mission
SRD	System Requirement Document
TB	Brightness temperature
TBC	To be confirmed
TBD	To Be Determined
TM	Telemetry

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Context ____ *7*

2. Proposal ____ *8*

3. Conclusion ____ *9*

1. CONTEXT

Following a discussion around the ground segment for SMOS we were asked to consider what would be the optimal approach for the archiving of SMOS level 3 and eventually 4. This very short note aims at giving the very first considerations on this point. It is a very first consideration on the topic.

All the following is based upon the following assumptions:

The centre located in Villafranca (Spain) called hereafter PDPC (Payload Data Processing Centre) will process all data up to level 2 included. The relevant products will be distributed and archived as per specifications

The CNES Centre (CFC) will, among other tasks, process data up to level 3 and 4 and disseminate according to specifications the question is to decide where the products will be archived.

2. PROPOSAL

It seems more rational to centralise the long term archive in one place if only to reduce costs.

So we would suggest that the archivable[1] level 3 and 4 products would be, after a TBD period (between 3 months and 2 years[2]) and when these products are considered as "frozen", transferred to Villafranca archiving facility for long term storage. Archivable should be understood as of sufficient value and of sufficient potential use to be archived. The rationale for transferring the archive is that it is better to have only one long-term archive for homogeneity and consistency and probably costs saving. Moreover, such and approach would force a common format etc between the PDPC and CFC, and thus some form of harmonisation, which would be at the great joy and benefit of the average user.

Obviously there will have to be a formal agreement between both parties and the option should not be detrimental to the users' community.

Such a solution would require most probably that the only distribution centre for level 3 and higher would remain (for a given period?) the CFC and that after that period the source of the data is well acknowledged.

It seems also necessary that the CFC be the only point of contact for the users. As the role of the CFC to improve products, it would be a pity if the PDPC distributes obsolete products when better ones are available at the CFC for instance.

At the end of the mission when everything is transfered to ESRIN, this part of the archive would also be transferred.

[1] Assuming this word exists in English!
[2] I have no clue of the optimum but I am pretty sure that some have experience about this

3. CONCLUSION

It is probably to early to reach a final decision on this point (end of phase B) but it seems reasonable to envision dimensioning the PDPC for archiving at least "final" level 3 products.