WInSAR EC Telecon April 24, 2015

On the call:
Zhong Lu
Franz Meyer
Gareth Funning
Ingrid Johanson
Christelle Wauthier
Chris Crosby
Scott Baker
David Sandwell
Piyush Agram
Eric Fielding

Notes taken by Gareth Funning

1) Forthcoming InSAR short courses

These have been endorsed enthusiastically by Donna Charlevoix at Unavco, and preparations are going ahead.

GMTSAR course: San Diego, August 10-12,

- Instructors: David Sandwell, Paul Wessel, Kurt Feigl, Rob Mellors, Xiaopeng Tong [Several of the instructors will already be in town, so no travel expenses will be required, except for Xiaopeng.]
- Half a day of general GMT training, 1.5 days of GMTSAR, participants make presentations
- Participants will be required to do some homework in advance – learn Unix, make a GMT topo map
- They should bring their own computers, the course will include learning to install the software

Advanced InSAR course: Unavco, last week of June

- Instructors: Piyush Agram, Andy Hooper, Eric Fielding
- Piyush has provided a proposed agenda, as has Andy. One day for Giant, two days for StaMPS, 1.5 days for ISCE
- With the Earthkit setup that they trialled last year, there is no long software installation phase, you can get straight into the training
- It may be helpful to include some information on 'ISCE for ROI_PAC users'?

Travel support for both courses is covered by Unavco – send Donna an e-mail with dates, instructors, number of students, and she will get started with arranging the logistics

Questions were asked about the possibility of remote participation and/or recording the courses:

- Demand is high, only 25 people can fit in the room at Unavco
- WebEx broadcasting is an option (30 people logged in remotely last year, Matt Pritchard was working full time to support the remote people).
- Scripps can handle more people in their space, but 25 is a good number. David wasn't sure about implementing WebEx, but perhaps it could be filmed and posted to a website later. David made a recording of how to install GMTSAR in the past. Maybe he could ask UCSD to send someone to do the recording.
- Franz needs the dates to post to the ASF website, to try and attract a broader audience.

2) Data access for all WInSAR members: ERS and Envisat

ESA are on board for distributing ERS data to all WinSAR members. (Wolfgang Lengert has approved it in principle he said, when Scott talked to him at Fringe.) Henri Laur needs to sign off on Envisat access. (He was on vacation recently, Scott is following up with e-mails.) If confiirmed, this would mean that we could simplify adjunct memberships within WInSAR – there would be no need for the distinction between the adjunct 1 and 2 classes. We would just have a single group of adjunct members, and any member would be able to download data from Unavco.

3) Sentinel-1 matters

Sentinel-1 data archiving at ASF is in the works – how soon will we be able to get data from ASF? We are awaiting the final negotiations and signatures, but on the technical side, ASF is ready to go. There was no mention of data sharing and storage at ASF at the Fringe meeting, since we were waiting on the agreement.

Clarification on the availability of Sentinel SLC data – the aim is to process SLCs from every RAW scene that the satellite(s) acquires. ESA have said they will be enacting the rolling of the archive in October 2015; all of the SLC data that is produced will be archived somewhere at ESA, but data that rolls out of the rolling archive will not be available for immediate access and download.

Scott Baker confirmed that he is still archiving all of the data over North America at WInSAR in the meantime.

Scott is also archiving the Sentinel-1A precise orbit information, since this is deleted after 180 days(!) It was asked if ASF was planning on archiving precise orbits? Franz will check. It was agreed that a web orbits service would be very valuable. The orbit data would take up somewhere in the range of 5-10 Gb per year – not much to host at a data center, but it would be a pain to have to deal with locally. ISCE grabs orbit information somehow, automatically, so any such archive could easily be added.

4) ALOS-2 data

It would be a good idea to start encouraging PIs to uploading their ALOS-2 data to WInSAR. It would have to be voluntary, the uploading. But we have the spreadsheet of everyone who said they would be interested in coordinating, the shared Google Document. We could ask people to update their information in that document.

A question was asked about JAXA's sharing policy – is it sImilar to TSX? Sharing only between approved PIs. New co-PIs can be added. And JAXA are OK with these things. At present, PIs have to send the data back to Unavco, Scott can't access it from JAXA like he is able to for TSX. At the very least, we should ensure there is not duplication of ordering.

SCANSAR files are 50 GB each – that's a huge size of data file. Could we have a script that automatically uploaded stuff to Unavco?

Scott Baker has downloaded a copy of the whole ALOS catalog, and he could mark it up with what has already been ordered.

Christelle said there might be a new call in July? Shimada-san said so at the WinSAR meeting.

There is a work around to the Silverlight issue with accessing the ALOS-2 search tool. Scott and Chris could work on something to send out to the WinSAR community.

Can WinSAR make a request to JAXA for permission to pull the data from there? We could make a case based upon bandwidth?

Do co-Is have any ability to access the downloads? Many PIs added Chris Crosby to their proposals as a means of getting UNAVCO access to the data.

5) Terrasar-X and negotiations with DLR

TSX tasking review – we should look at what is being tasked. Check if people are getting the data, and review tasking on that basis? Scott has a spreadsheet of the tasking, success rate, quota use rate, produced for the last EC. He could distribute an updated version.

DLR's current policy on data access is a touchy subject. The last line of the new TSX agreement states that we have to delete data at the project completion. Mark Simons expressed concern about this; may be in contravention of NSF data policy.

It is not clear that we had to do this before. The new licence agreement, though, says that data can only be used during the duration of the project. Can we share the processed products at least?

The conflict with NSF data policy is in their clause 4b, that data used in a project are “expected to be shared at no more than incremental cost and in a reasonable time frame”. It is an issue of reproducibility for NSF-funded science results.

Either everyone would need to sign a new licence agreement, or we would need to get an exemption from the program officer.

Scott mentioned that we haven’t had a request to delete data yet, even though some projects ended some years ago.

Zhong will draft a letter to DLR to express concerns – if data cannot be shared, that is a problem regardless of the deleting issue. The committee discussed possible workarounds:

- DLR could say you can get the data for free under this archive proposal mechanism – you just have to write another proposal. Would that satisfy the NSF, though?
- Adding people as additional PIs to proposals gets you access, but the two year deletion clause will be a problem, and administering it would be difficult.
- We could ask if PIs could automatically be allowed archive access to data they originally ordered.

We should communicate to DLR the NSF problem. And if they hold firm, explore alternative approaches.