

CERES Systems Engineering Committee

Members: Tammy Ayers, SSAI (DM)
Denise Cooper, chair, SSAI (DM)
Tonya Davenport, SSAI (ASDC)
Vertley Hopson, SSAI (ASDC)
Lisa Link, SSAI (ASDC)
Walt Miller, SSAI (DM)
Sue Sorlie, SSAI (ASDC)
Scott Zentz, SSAI (SA)

Charter: Serve as a forum for resolving issues which affect more than one working group. Report to the CERES Data Management Team.

September 19, 2007 11:05 am

The following members were present for this meeting: Tammy Ayers, Denise Cooper, Tonya Davenport, Vertley Hopson, Walt Miller, Sue Sorlie and Scott Zentz. Automation Team Members attending the meeting: Jeff Walter.

The team reviewed the Shared Directories for Multiple Subsystems/PGEs issue.

Item 1: There were 3 responses to Jeff's idealized directory structure for automation, one from Walt, one from Scott, and one from Denise and Tammy. The responses from Walt, Denise and Tammy included several questions that Jeff had responded to via e-mail, however more discussion on these questions was required since some of the answers requested more information from the respondent. The major issues brought up at this meeting had to do with the data directories being moved out of the subsystem area and up to a top level. Jeff had suggested that all ancillary data be moved to the higher level, however Walt, Denise and Tammy felt that the subsystem specific ancillary data should remain under the subsystem and not be moved to the higher-level directory. Files like the ephemeris and attitude data files along with snow maps, etc., that are used by multiple subsystems should be moved to the higher-level directory to facilitate their use between multiple subsystems. Decisions on which files should be considered to be moved to the higher-level dynamic data directory still need to be worked out, but Jeff was willing to allow subsystem-specific ancillary data files to stay with the subsystem directories. It became clear that there is a lot of coordination that will need to be done between the individual subsystems and the automation team. Since the automation team will be creating the PCFs, it is important that all possible special considerations are clearly understood by the automation team, so that special cases can be handled correctly. Several other issues such as when runs are considered to be successful or failed also need to be discussed. Throughout the meeting it became clear that the automation team does not care how the source directories will be handled, so the SEC will come up with the "best" directory structure for the source code, which will eliminate the problems that have occurred in the

recent past with deliveries and the inability to recompile existing code when new deliveries for separate Subsystems/PGEs occur. Scott took the action to develop a proposal for a data directory structure on the SCF to mirror as closely as possible the expected directory structure in production to facilitate deliveries and subsystem testing at the SCF. Questions still remain on how CM testing will take place and exactly what changes to the existing Test Plans and Operator's Manuals will be required for automation. It is clear that the current format will need to be revised/enhanced to properly convey the necessary information. Also the delivery and test procedures from the Subsystem through CERES CM need to be revised to allow a sufficient amount of testing to be done within CERES CM to find problems before the delivery is handed off to the SIT team. For several years it has been thought that it would be beneficial for CERES CM to run at least one test case per PGE through a pseudo-operational environment to catch issues related to environment variables, etc. before the software is handed off for operational testing.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 PM.