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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose and scope

This document provides information on the Rosetta Enhanced (ENH) Science Archive Review with a specific focus on the data and procedures to be followed when reviewing the instrument RPCPIU.

This document complements, and is an Appendix to the Rosetta Archive Enhancement Oct 2018 review procedure document [1], which provides important information on the review as a whole.

1.2 Reference Documents


2 DATA FOR REVIEW

RPC PIU (Plasma Interface Unit) is part of the RPC consortium, acting as instrument control, spacecraft interface, and power management unit. The team in charge of the PIU generated Illumination Maps based on NAVCAM shape model to help other RPC instruments in their science analysis.

For this review, one data set of illumination map (CODMAC L5) data is provided.

The data are described in the User Guide document located in the DOCUMENT directory.

2.1 What data is under review?

They provide one L5 data set.

2.1.1 Level 5 RPCPIU Data:

RO-C-NAVCAM-5-ILLUM-V1.0

2.2 How to retrieve the data

If you are a reviewer from the US, you will be contacted separately by PDS-SBN with details of how you will be provided with the data. For European reviewers, the data can be retrieved as described below.
As the data are proprietary and not ingested in the PSA, you will have to download them from a secure ftp:
‘sftp rospsareview.esac.esa.int’
We will send you the credentials by email.
Should you have any issues retrieving the data you wish to review, please contact us using the details provided in Section 6.

3 REVIEW PROCEDURE

Please check the Sections 2 and 5.2 of the Review Procedure Document [1] for an overview of the review objectives, and the strategy you should try to follow when reviewing the data. It is a good idea to try to replicate a published scientific result using the data provided.

3.1 Special things to look out for

This is a new data set. Please read the User Guide documentation in the DOCUMENT directory for an overview of the data set and how it should be used. The data set is a sample for this review, containing a small amount of data. The DATASET.CAT is currently in a skeleton form and will be updated after this review. As this is a NAVCAM dataset, the EAICD is copied from the NAVCAM deliveries and not the illumination maps. This may be updated at a later stage. For the purposes of this review, please focus on the Illumination User Guide and RPC User Guide documents.

Data should be readable by standard PDS readers such as NASAVIEW (https://pds.nasa.gov/tools/nasa-view.shtml) and READPDS (https://pdssbn.astro.umd.edu/tools/tools_readPDS.shtml).

4 THE RID / LIEN SYSTEM

This review will use the ECLIPSE system to raise, track and manage issues raised. Within ESA, issues raised are known as RIDs (Review Item Discrepancies), while PDS refer to these as liens. A User Manual for the ECLIPSE system is provided, and the Rosetta Archive Team is also on-hand to provide direct support should any issues arise (Section 6). You will receive a separate e-mail with your individual login credentials for the ECLIPSE system, and you can then choose your own password.

When you raise a RID, please click on the document associated with the instrument you are reviewing, and fill in all fields available, including recommendations for how any issue
you find might be resolved to your satisfaction. The following briefly describes each of the fields available and how they should be filled in:

- **The RID Number** is automatically generated by the system.
- In the **Classification** field, please indicate whether the issue being raised is
  - **Minor**: an issue that does not hinder the understanding of the data to an extent by which the data cannot be analyzed by an independent scientist.
  - **Major**: an issue that compromises the understanding/use of the data to an extent by which the data cannot be analyzed without additional support.

  *N.B. Editorial issues (e.g. typographical errors) are not RIDs, and should be raised as described in Section 4.1.*

- In the **Originator Reference** field, please follow the convention (note that you will have to type this yourself)
  - **RPCPIU-AA-XX-YYY** where
    - **AA** is either **EU** for a European RID or **US** for a US RID;
    - **XX** are your initials;
    - **YYY** is a sequential number, starting at 001 for the first of your RIDs.

- **The Panel** is a drop-down selection. If you are a scientific reviewer, please choose **Science Panel**. If you are a technical reviewer (e.g. PDS or PSA), please select **Technical Panel**.

- In the **Title of RID** field, please provide a short title of the RID (max. 52 characters)

- **The Datapack Document** field is filled in automatically by the system.

- In the **Document Page / Section / Para** field, please include the specific DATA_SET_ID and, where applicable, the FILE affected by the issue.

- **The Discrepancy Document** field can be ignored.

- In the **Description of Discrepancy** field, please include a full description of the process you followed to encounter the issue, as well as the issue itself.

- In the **Initiator Recommended Solution** field, please provide a recommendation as to how the RID can be resolved to your satisfaction.

The remainder of the fields will be populated during the panel discussion at the review meeting.

**IMPORTANT:** The RID deadline is September 28th 2018.
The system will close on 28th September 2018 at 23:59 (CET).
You must have all of your items raised within the system by this time.

4.1 Raising Editorial Issues
Editorials are typographical errors and issues that have no impact on the understanding and/or use of the data provided. In case you identify any issues that are editorial in nature, they should be raised using the ‘Editorials’ menu in the blue bar at the top of the screen. As with a RID, please complete all applicable fields when raising an editorial. Note that these will not be discussed in the review meeting, and will be sent to the teams separately.

5 REVIEW MEETING
The panel meeting for this review will take place 9-10th October 2018 at ESAC, Madrid. For US reviewers, a parallel meeting will take place at PDS SBN, University of Maryland. The exact agenda will be communicated to you by e-mail before the meeting, detailing when each instrument will be discussed within each meeting, and when joint discussions between the US and European reviewers will take place.

Further details of the review meeting are provided in Section 5.4 of the Rosetta Science Archive EOM Comet Data Review Procedure [1].

6 CONTACT POINTS
In case of any questions related to the review, don’t hesitate to contact the relevant person from the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review Manager (issues using the ECLIPSE system)</td>
<td>Dave Heather</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dheather@cosmos.esa.int">dheather@cosmos.esa.int</a></td>
<td>+34 918131183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SREM Archive Scientist (specific SREM issues)</td>
<td>Dave Heather</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dheather@cosmos.esa.int">dheather@cosmos.esa.int</a></td>
<td>+34 918131183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosetta SGS Archive Team (general Rosetta review issues)</td>
<td>Rosetta Archive Team</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rsgs_arc@sciops.esa.int">rsgs_arc@sciops.esa.int</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDS Contact (specific US issues)</td>
<td>Tilden Barnes</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tbarnes4@astro.umd.edu">tbarnes4@astro.umd.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>