

Quality Assurance

Davy Kirkpatrick IPAC/Caltech



WISE Science Data Center CDR - January 29-30, 2008

WSDC Functional Block Diagram





QA Block Diagram



- Quality Assurance (QA) is injected into the data processing flow at many points to monitor data quality.
- QA subsystems are shown in yellow in the WSDC flow diagram at right. These are referred to as -
 - Ingest QA
 - Quicklook QA
 - Scan/Frame QA
 - Multiframe QA
 - Archive QA
 - Final Products QA





WISE Science Data Center CDR - January 29-30, 2008





- Given large data volume and short timescale, quick and efficient QA is vital to success.
- The QA system
 - assesses data through each stage of processing,
 - identifies/flags data that may not meet WISE science requirements, and
 - alerts SOC, MOS, and WISE Science Team of these cases.
- The system must be as automated as possible, allowing the final arbiter of quality (the human reviewing the data)
 - to quickly assess and bless data meeting the specs and
 - to concentrate most of his/her time on the small fraction of data needing detailed scrutiny.
- The QA system collects summary reports from each data processing subsystem and compiles them into a single, concise report. Summaries include
 - software completion status reports,
 - statistical analyses, and
 - tabular and graphical material for use by the QA scientist.
- The goal of the QA system is
 - to compare collected parameters to metrics tied to mission science requirements and
 - to present overall results in a web-based form.





Driving Requirements



- <u>GENERAL QA</u> (L4WSDC-062): The WSDC shall perform quality analysis of all WISE science data and make reports available on a regular basis.
- <u>PRODUCT VALIDATION</u> (L4WSDC-063): The WSDC shall work with the WISE Science Team to validate that, prior to their release, the Image Atlas and Source Catalog satisfy WISE science requirements.
- <u>PRODUCT CHARACTERIZATION</u> (L4WSDC-064): The WSDC shall work with the WISE Science Team to characterize and document the overall data product relative to the mission requirements. This document shall be included in the WISE data product explanatory supplement.
- <u>*QUICKLOOK QA*</u> (L4WSDC-065): A sample of 3% of the science imaging data returned to the ground each day shall be processed in an expedited way to produce a Quicklook report that monitors the routine performance of the flight system as can be determined from the science data, and identifies problems that may require prompt action by WISE Science or Mission Operations.
- <u>SCAN SYNCHRONIZATION</u> (L4WSDC-066): The WSDC shall provide a monitor of the synchronization between flight-system and scan mirror rates to achieve and maintain required image quality as part of Quicklook QA.







- Purpose
 - To check compliance with the FITS standard.
 - To verify that all Level 0 images have been created.
 - To compare the input manifest from White Sands to the actual data received.
- Timescale:
 - Following each data transfer (up to 4 times per day).
- Action:
 - WSDC to inform MOS/EOS and SOC of status and anomalies.











- Check that assembled images meet the FITS standard.
- Compare input manifest to resulting output to check for completeness.
- Verify that all Level 0 images were successfully created.
- Verify that housekeeping telemetry data and PEF (Predicted Events File) were successfully mated with the correct images.
- Summarize QA findings for MOS and SOC.







- Purpose:
 - To check key system performance parameters (on 3% of data) for each downlink via an abbreviated processing pipeline.
- Timescale:
 - Within 24 hours of end of data transfer to WSDC.
- Action:
 - WSDC to post report to web page; SOC to review report.
 - Text based summary report emailed to MOS.





Design: Quicklook QA (1)



- Scan synchronization and image quality
 - Generate matrix of composite star images detected on each frame in each band, where each element is the average star image formed by combining the images of all stars in the corresponding region of the frame.
 - Measure image second moment ratios and position angles for each composite star image in the matrix.
 - Generate table and plot showing the means of these values for all frames in a half-orbit.
 - Trigger warning messages when image elongation has exceeded a predetermined threshold related to the Level 1.5 specifications for image quality. Threshold values are to be determined prior to launch using simulated image data.
- Photometric zero point and system throughput (needs ecliptic polar data for primary and secondary standard star checks.)
 - Tabulate the mean and RMS differences between a priori "true" and measured instrumental magnitudes for standard stars observed in the polar frames.
 - Generate a table and plot showing the mean and RMS of these values for each orbit.
 - Trigger a warning message if the zero point offset in any band falls outside a threshold range.
 The threshold range will be derived pre-launch and updated during IOC.



Design: Quicklook QA (2)



- Image backgrounds and noise (requires polar data to use as bellwethers of background level)
 - Compute the mean pixel values along with total and point-source-filtered noise values for each frame.
 - Generate a table and plot of mean pixel values and noise levels for each frame in a half-orbit and for each quadrant (for Si:As arrays) or stripe (for HgCdTe arrays).
 - Compare the measured mean pixel values and noise values in each frame to threshold values, band by band.
 - Trigger a warning message if the mean pixel values and noise values exceed predefined thresholds. These thresholds will be determined pre-launch and updated during IOC.
- Visual checks
 - Generate jpegs of a few frames in each band and check by eye. Purpose is to look for unexpected fixed pattern artifacts, odd noise signatures, and other oddities not predicted a priori.
 - Generate three-color jpegs of a few registered framesets (if possible) and check by eye.



Demo of Scan Synchronization Monitor (1)



- Image quality (via PRF) will be monitored as part of standard scan/frame QA.
- Same tool will be used to support IOC task to synchronize spacecraft/scan mirror rates.
- Simulated IOC image data (with scan rate adjustments provided by Ned Wright) used to demonstrate tool.







Demo of Scan Synchronization Monitor (2)



• Composite PRF generated by "stacking" high SNR point sources detected on one or more images.





Demo of Scan Synchronization Monitor (3)



Quality Assurance

- PRF "shape" characterized and plotted as a function of frame, scan rate, etc.
- Optimal image shape occurs when scan rates are matched.
- Tool will be extended to incorporate noise pixel metric.





WISE Science Data Center CDR – January 29-30, 2008

Functionality: Scan/Frame QA



- Purpose:
 - To check for successful completion of Scan/Frame pipeline processing.
 - To scrutinize output of processing pipeline.
 - To compare achieved performance to science metrics tied to mission science requirements.
- Timescale:
 - Within 6 days of receipt of data at IPAC.
- Action:
 - WSDC to assign quality scores to each scan and produce QA report; PI or his designee responsible for signing off.





Design: Scan/Frame QA (1)



- Summary of input data
 - Report log file and results of ingestion QA.
 - Report QA results for quicklook processing.
- Instrumental image calibration
 - If new flat fields computed, compare flat-fields to ground flats.
 - Monitor dynamic bad-pixel masks changes in masks, # of pixels masked.
 - Flag outlying noisy frames; plot noise histograms.
 - Flag outlying point-source-filtered noisy frames; plot histograms.
- Scan synchronization
 - Monitor point source shape, scan mirror synchronization.
- Band detection statistics
 - Monitor percentage of sources seen in all bands vs. single-band missing sources, two-band missing, etc.



Design: Scan/Frame QA (2)



- Astrometric calibration
 - Plot histograms of astrometric deltas between WISE-computed and 2MASS All-Sky PSC positions; scrutinize outliers.
 - Modulo solar system object identifications, tabulate and follow up -
 - » sources (at least in W1 and W2) with no 2MASS match.
 - » 2MASS sources lacking a WISE counterpart.
- Photometric calibration, accuracy, and sensitivity
 - Monitor mean aperture photometry curves-of-growth.
 - Tabulate/plot mean/RMS differences between truth and derived photometry for standard stars in the orbit.
 - Tabulate/plot mean/RMS differences between stars in this orbit and those observed in previous overlapping orbits (trending via other Level 1 data).
 - Tabulate/plot mean photometric offsets from in-scan overlaps.
 - Plot number of objects with noted source confusion as function of galactic latitude; spot check image data for selected clean and confused sources.
 - Plot saturated star mag/flux estimates against ramp saturation flag.
 - Compare color-color diagrams for objects saturated in any band and compare against fiducial color loci to check saturated mag estimates.





Design: Scan/Frame QA (3)



- Completeness and Reliability
 - Determine fraction vs. magnitude of "truth" sources in ecliptic polar fields.
- Artifact identification -- Perform semi-automated visual spot checks of a few examples of each of the following:
 - Latents.
 - Dichroic/filter glints.
 - Diffraction spikes.
 - Bright star halo contamination.
 - Optical ghosts.
 - Electronic ghosts.
 - Non-uniform stray light.
 - Scattered light patches from bright objects.
 - Radiation hits (?).
- Frame statistics
 - Plot log(N)-log(S) and check against mean frame noise level.
 - Measure frame-to-frame overlap to assure overlap is sufficient.



Design: Scan/Frame QA (4)



- Astrophysical checks
 - Plot color-color and color-mag diagrams of "good" sources.
- Solar system object identification
 - Plot number of solar system objects vs. ecliptic latitude.
 - Perform checks to make sure that identifications include asteroids, comets, planets, and planetary satellites.
 - Inspect color-color plots of identified objects.
 - Check detection fraction vs. visual magnitude?
- QA summary
 - Report successful/unsuccessful processing completion.
 - Provide web-accessible page with tables and plots listed above.
 - Generate auto-filled QA report along with quality scores as starting point for human review.
 - Review by QA scientists to finalize report.





Scan/Frame QA Report Design (1)



Online Ready for Review Being Reviewed 2MASS Final Processing QA Review Status Submitted Ready for Cleanup Pending Queries • Modeled closely on 2MASS Nightly QA. Northern Nights Southern Nights All Nights • Concise web-based summary with drill-down capability. Review Status approved 011001 approved 011102 Other Notes Night Rev Prod Status Reviewer raymond 010924 davy 011029 **2MASS Pipeline 3 QA Report** raymond 020206 hurt 010926 approved orig rev davy -----position reconstruction problems PMASS approved 01092 QA approved 011001 archived 02020 nelson 020204 orig rev raymond 010926 **OA Web Index** nelson 011031 approved 011102 archived 011031 approved 011001 archived 010927 davy 010926 0929s hurt 011101 981017s archived 011101 approved 011105 QA QA QA QA QA QA QA nelson 020206 archived orig rev davy 010928 approved 011001 81001n archived 01103 cxu 011029 approved 011101 approved 011001 archived davy 010926 981002n 981002s archived 011031 CXU 011029 approved 011101 archived 01092 davy 010926 approved 011001 **Scan Grading** Astrometry Log File 81003n archived 011031 cxu 011030 approved 011101 cxu 010926 approved 011002 981003s archived 01092 approved 011105 approved 011002 archived 011030 cxu 011029 priority Photometricity Tracking/Stepping Observers Log archived 010929 vandyk 010927 981004s 981005n archived 011031 cxu 011030 approved 011105 archived 010927 archived 011031 approved 011002 981005s vandyk 010926 **Bkg/Seeing/Focus** Jumps/Airglow V2 QA Web Pages approved 011105 davy 011030 priority orig rev davy 010928 981006s 981007n archived 02020 nelson 020206 approved 011002 QA QA QA QA QA QA QA QA QA archived 011031 nelson 011030 approved 01110 **Nightly Overview** Galaxies V2 OA Review 981007s archived 011011 archived 011031 raymond 010927 approved 011015 cxu 011030 approved 01110 81008n nelson 020206 approved 011002 approved 011106 orig rev raymond 010928 archived 011031 cxu 011031 archived 020206 nelson 020206 approved 011002 orig rev davy 010928 **Diagnostic Plots** 981010n 981010s archived 011101 nelson 011031 approved 011106 archived 010928 cxu 010927 approved 01092 priority 981011n 981011s archived 011106 approved 011106 raymond 011102 archived 01100 hurt 011001 approved 01100 pproved 011106 981012n 981012s archived 011102 hurt 011101 priority approved 011002 archived 01100 hurt 011002 approved 011106 981013n archived 011101 nelson 011031 burt 011101 Hess Plots Pos Reconst. Qual Chisa/Sig Plots <u>Galaxy Moni</u> 981014n archived 01110 approved 011107 981014s hurt 010927 approved 01100 rerun after dropping scan 098 from 981015n archived nelson 011104 approved 011107 approved 01100 davy 011002 × 981016n 011106 nelson 011104 approved 011106 priority V2 Deltas 0110 vandyk 010928 approved 01100 R1:R2 Diff M PSF/Ap Mags In/Cross Scan Color 981017s archived 01092 davy 010928 approved 011004 approved 01100 cxu 011002 81019n 0A 0A 0A 0A 0A 0A 0A 0A 0A archived 011102 hurt 011102 approved 011107 priority archived 011002 raymond 010928 approved 011004 981019s archived 011102 nelson 011102 approved 011107 archived 01100 cxu 011001 approved 011004 davy 011003 cxu 011001 approved 01100 archiv approved 011004 81022s 81023n archived 011002 01110 hurt 011105 approved 011107 priority Error summary 981023s 981024s archived 011003 davy 011002 hurt 011001 priority priority approved 011004 approved 011002 archived 011003 filename line # error type error message archived 011002 archived 011003 approved 011008 cxu 011001 81025s input.c 2169 scan number not in list data in updatesit for unknown scan#75 v2 grade=0 approved 011008 981026s hurt 011002 981027n QA archived 01110 nelson 011105 approved 011106 input.c 2169 scan number not in list data in updatesit for unknown scan#76 v2 grade=0 <u>981027s</u> 981028n davy 011003 <u>QA</u> QA archived 011003 approved 011015 archived 020205 hurt 020204 approved orig rev nelson ----approved 011018 some star halo meteor blanking art 981028s archived 01101 hurt 011003 hurt 011102 approved 011107 archived 01100 davy 011003 approved 011009 Return to Main Index 981029s archived hurt 011001 approved 011009 archived 011001 archived 011106 cxu 011001 hurt 011105 981031s 981101n approved 011002 Last run: Wed Oct 31 15:38:25 2001 approved 011106 raymond 011001 hurt 011105 approved 011015 approved 011106 archived 011003 101s Version 010829 (3.1); more info is at SCANSCI Notes Mail comments/bug reports to hurt@ipac.caltech.edu



WISE Science Data Center CDR - January 29-30, 2008



Scan/Frame QA Report Design (2)







WISE Science Data Center CDR – January 29-30, 2008

Scan/Frame QA Report Design (3)









WISE Science Data Center CDR - January 29-30, 2008

JDK - 21

Scan/Frame QA Report Design (4)



Quality Assurance





WISE Science Data Center CDR – January 29-30, 2008

Functionality: Multiframe QA



- Purpose:
 - To check for successful completion of Multiframe pipeline processing.
 - To scrutinize output of processing pipeline.
 - To compare achieved performance to science metrics tied to mission science requirements.
- Timescale:
 - Within 15 days for multi-orbit pipeline with >18 coverages.
- Action:
 - For ultimate (not intermediate) coadds, WSDC to assign quality scores to each coadd and produce QA report; PI or his designee responsible for signing off.







Design: Multiframe QA



Same as the Scan/Frame QA design, with the following additions/deletions:

- Summary of input data
 - Summarize QA grades for each scan considered for image stacking.
- Source characterization
 - Perform semi-automated visual checks of registered coadds.
- Astrometric calibration
 - Plot deltas with respect to 2MASS and individual scan astrometry; scrutinize sources with large deltas.
 - Plot astrometric error per axis as function of source SNR.
- Photometric calibration
 - Tabulate/plot zero-point differences for scan-to-scan overlaps.
 - Plot Level-1 photometry vs. deep coadd photometry to check for photometric self-consistency and depth of extractions.
- Artifact identification
 - Check additional artifact flagging from extra-scan info.
- No solar system object checks needed







- Purpose:
 - To validate accuracy of source/metadata database loadings.
 - To verify integrity of database tables and images (using, e.g, checksums and RTB queries).
- Timescale:
 - After each database load (roughly once per week).
 - Run periodically on static tables.
- Action:
 - WSDC reports status of checks and responds to problems (in concert with IRSA, where applicable).











- Perform checksums on the following:
 - Working databases.
 - Source catalogs.
 - Image archives.
 - Image metadata.
 - Any ancillary archives such as QA score archive or calibration archive.
- Perform range checking of the same databases, catalogs, and archives.
- QA summary
 - Report status of each check.
 - Provide web-accessible page with summarized results.



Functionality: Final Products QA



- Purpose:
 - To assess properties of the Atlas Images and Source Catalogs relative to mission Level 1 and 1.5 science requirements.
 - To check integrity of the products via range checking on all parameters.
 - To give overall characterization of public data products.
- Timescale:
 - After Final Product Generation but before public release.
- Action:
 - WSDC and Science Team to provide analyses; final release approval given by PI.







Design: Final Products QA (1)



- Source Catalog
 - Plot histogram of N-out-of-M (N/M) statistics for multiple epochs for internal checks of completeness and reliability; scrutinize cases with low N/M values.
 - Check photometric variability statistics; scrutinize outliers.
 - Check astrometric variability statistics (moving objects); scrutinize outliers.
 - Perform cross-correlations with other catalogs; scrutinize sources in each catalog that have no association in the other.
 - Perform range checking on all columns.
 - Using deeper Spitzer Space Telescope data at similar wavelengths (IRAC-ch1, IRAC-ch2, IRAC-ch4/IRS-blue-PU, and IRS-red-PU/MIPS-24um) and multi-repeat WISE scans at the ecliptic poles, determine completeness of catalog as a function of SNR and check with respect to science requirements.
 - Using the same data sets as above, determine reliability of catalog as a function of SNR and check with respect to science requirements.
 - Plot log(N)-log(S) against mean scan noise level or SNR.
 - Plot saturated star mag/flux estimates against ramp saturation flag.
 - Compare color-color diagrams for objects saturated in any band and compare against fiducial color loci to check saturated mag estimates.
 - Plot astrometric error per axis as function of source SNR.





Design: Final Products QA (2)



- Image Atlas (data images, depth-of-coverage mags, noise maps)
 - Confirm FITS standard.
 - Confirm that photometric zero points are correct.
 - Overlay images on outside image source data (2MASS All-Sky Atlas Images) to check astrometry.
 - Perform range checking on header values; check that pixel grid is the same for all images and all wavelengths.
 - Determine areal coverage for 8+-deep coverage areas and check against science requirement. Build up survey coverage statistics.
 - Using header info, determine epoch difference between first and last observation and check against science requirement.
 - Summarize reports of QA analyses for Explanatory Supplement.





2MASS Heritage: Final Products Analysis



g. PSC Bright Source Photometric Precision Category Requirement Performance The Level 1 Specifications place three requirements on saturated star photometry (specifically "Read_1" photometry). Point Source Catalog 1. 5% photometric precision for K_=8.0 mag (meaning just above the "Read_2 - Read_1" 1.3 s exposure saturation threshold (designated by rd_flg=1)). 10-σ at 15.8, 15.1, 14.3 mag at J, H, met for full unconfused sky; Photometric K, respectively for lbl>10° exceeded for most of sky 2. 10% photometric precision for at Ks=4.0 mag (meaning just below the "Read_1" 51 ms saturation threshold (thus, also sensitivity rd_flg=1)). <4% maximum bias in photometric Photometric <2% achieved zeropoint around the sky uniformity 3. No more than 2% bias for K_>4.0 mag <5% 1-σ for bright stars unsaturated Photometric There are no Level 1 requirements associated with sources that saturated even the 51 ms "Read_1" exposure (designated by rd_fg=3) <3% achieved precision in the 1.3 s exposure These sources do have large uncertainties significantly in excess of the Level 1 Specifications for fainter sources. Astrometric <0.5" 1-σ relative to the reference Bright Star Photometric Precision achieved accuracy frame Requirements 1 and 2 are addressed in the Photometric Precision subsection (see $VI_{1,C}$), which discusses uncertainties derived from repeated observation across virtually the entire flux range observed in 2MASS. The relevant diagram is reproduced in Figure 1 and shows that the uncertainty in the magnitude range $4.0 < K_s$ [mag] <8.0 is substantially better than the 10%/5% requirements in items 1 and 2 above. >0.99 at 10-σ sensitivity limits Completeness met 0.9997 demonstrated in test areas; no >0,9995 Reliability known source of unreliability in excess of specification % bias at Read_1 saturation limit <4% at worst (K.~4.0 mag) Bright star <5% 1-σ repeatability at Read_1 faint limit (K₂~8.0 mag) photometry 2% achieved (Read_1, rd_flg=1) <10% 1-o repeatability at Read_1 2% achieved saturation limit (K,~4.0 mag) Figure 1 Extended Source Catalog ii. Bright Star Photometric Bias 1.0 10-o at J<15.0, H<14.2, K <13.5 0.40 **Photometric** met A means has not been found to rigor sensitivity mag mag) regime -- from internal Survey \odot 0.75 Ω. **Photometric** <10% 1-o repeatability for H<13.8 .cmsig) 7-10% achieved Bias can be addressed at the "faint' II I precision mag and the 51 ms Read_1 photometry Ä 0.30 Read_2-Read_1 saturation threshold 0.5 Photometric <10% maximum bias around sky <4% achieved magnitude. Figure 2 shows a typical uniformity transition to saturated 1.3 s detection Ł diagrams show deviation, because th >0.90 for lbl>30° Completeness met deviation, because the singly-correls error 0.25 >0.80 for 10°<lbl<20° achieved 0.93-0.95 Although this result does not bear di 0.20 Reliability tied to the 1.3 s frames at the crosso >0.99 for lbl>20° achieved 0.992-0.995 linear right up to the saturation three band General Survey 99.998% imaged; 0.10 Ks->95% 99.5% coverage in point sources; Sky coverage σ=0.054. maa 98% coverage in extended source Other Information 0.00 Galactic Plane No Requirements performance Ο 5 10 15 Ks-band magnitude (k_m)



WISE Science Data Center CDR - January 29-30, 2008

QA V&V Matrix: Scan/Frame QA



	Source Catalog														Image Atlas							
Requirement→ QA check↓	Completeness	Reliability	Characterization	Artifact Flagging	Flux Meas/Upper Limits	Flux Uncertainties	Flux Quality Flag	Phot. SNR=5 Limits	Phot. RMS Error	Saturated Photometry	Saturation Limit	Near-Moon Performance	Astrometric Measures	Astrometric Uncertainties	Astrom. RMS Error	Sky Coverage	Coverage Maps	Time Sampling	Common Pixel Grid	Photometric Calibration	FITS Standard	Image Quality
SCAN/FRAME QA												X										
Band detection stats					X																	
Source confusion vs. glat							X															
Saturation vs ramp flag										X												
Color-color plots										X												
Artifact ID checks		X		X			X															
Log(N)-log(S) plots	X																					



QA V&V Matrix: Multiframe QA



Source Catalog **Image Atlas** Astrometric Uncertainties Near-Moon Performance Flux Meas/Upper Limits **Photometric Calibration** Astrometric Measures Saturated Photometry **Requirement→** Phot. SNR=5 Limits Astrom. RMS Error **Common Pixel Grid** Flux Uncertainties Flux Quality Flag Phot. RMS Error Artifact Flagging Saturation Limit Characterization **Coverage Maps Time Sampling** FITS Standard Image Quality Sky Coverage Completeness Reliability QA check↓ **MULTIFRAME OA** Scan detection Х stats Astr. Error vs. х SNR Source confusion Х vs. glat Saturation vs Х ramp flag **Color-color plots** Х Artifact ID Х х Х checks Х Х Х Log(N)-log(S) Х plots



QA V&V Matrix: Final Products QA (1)



	Source Catalog														Image Atlas								
Requirement→	eteness	ility	cterization	ct Flagging	feas/Upper Limits	Incertainties	juality Flag	SNR=5 Limits	AMS Error	ted Photometry	tion Limit	Moon Performance	netric Measures	netric Uncertainties	n. RMS Error	overage	age Maps	ampling	on Pixel Grid	netric Calibration	Standard	Quality	
QA check↓	Compl	Reliab	Chara	Artifa	Flux N	Flux U	Flux (Phot. §	Phot.]	Satura	Satura	Near-N	Astror	Astror	Astror	Sky C	Cover	Time	Comm	Photor	FITS S	Image	
FINAL PRODUCTS QA – Source Catalog																							
Range checking of columns					X	X	X						X	X									
Completeness via truth fields	X		X																				
Reliability via truth fields		X	X																				
Log(N)-log(S) plots								X	X		X												
Saturation vs ramp flag										X													
Color-color plots										X													
Astr. Error vs SNR															X								



QA V&V Matrix: Final Products QA (2)



		Source Catalog														Image Atlas							
Requirement→	teness	ity	terization	: Flagging	eas/Upper Limits	icertainties	ality Flag	NR=5 Limits	MS Error	ed Photometry	ion Limit	oon Performance	etric Measures	etric Uncertainties	. RMS Error	verage	ge Maps	ampling	n Pixel Grid	etric Calibration	andard	Quality	
QA check↓	Comple	Reliabil	Charac	Artifact	Flux M	Flux Ur	Flux Qu	Phot. SI	Phot. R	Saturat	Saturat	Near-M	Astrom	Astrom	Astrom	Sky Co	Covera	Time S ²	Commo	Photom	FITS St	Image (
FINAL PRODUCTS QA – Image Atlas																	X						
Confirm FITS standard																					X		
Phot. Zero point check																				X			
Range checking of headers; pixel grid check																			X				
Build survey coverage stats																X							
Compute epoch diff via headers																		X					



Tracking QA Results



We will maintain two tables, one for individual scans and one for coadds, that summarize QA results.

- In 2MASS we had
 - Scan Information Table for normal survey data
 - Cal Information Table for calibration data.
- These contained concise info for each scan
 - Basic scan info (e.g., ID, sky location, date)
 - Telescope telemetry (e.g., dewpoint, temperature)
 - Summarized characterizations of the data (e.g., point source shape parameters, calibration zero-points, mean source density)
 - Quality assessments and final quality scores
- Tables were useful for
 - Performing trending analyses (e.g., seeing shape vs temperature)
 - Deciding which scans to include/exclude as part of final data release.







Anomaly Response Plan (1)



During the QA process, anomalies and problems will be detected that may need response from the EOS, MOS, SOC, WSDC, or WISE Science Team.

- Ingest QA
 - Action: WSDC to inform MOS/EOS and SOC of successful ingest or anomalies via web-accessible report.
 - Tracking: (TBD) MOS/EOS and/or SOC to acknowledge receipt of anomaly report via web form; results of subsequent analyses to be archived by WSDC and made web accessible.
 - Resolution: WSDC will note anomalies on web summary pages; issues may need to be closed with MOS/EOS and/or SOC.
- Quicklook QA
 - Action: WSDC to inform MOS/EOS and SOC of Quicklook runs and anomalies via web-accessible report.
 - Tracking: MOS/EOS and/or SOC to acknowledge receipt of anomaly report via web form; results of subsequent analyses to be archived by WSDC and made web accessible.
 - Resolution: WSDC will close the issue and note it on web summary pages once parties agree that resolution has been reached
- Scan/Frame and Multiframe QA
 - Action: WSDC to report anomalies as part of the normal assigning of scan/frame QA grades. This report will be posted on the web for review by the PI and SOC.
 - Tracking: On the web summary pages, WSDC will mark reviews having outstanding issues and add subsequent analyses by WSDC or SOC to the QA review for curation.
 - Resolution: WSDC will close the issue and note it on web summary pages once the PI or designee concurs that resolution has been reached.





Anomaly Response Plan



- Archive QA
 - Action: WSDC to report problems on web summary pages and to assign action items to internal WSDC or IRSA personnel via those project's ticket systems.
 - Tracking: Tracking will be handled by each project's existing ticket systems.
 - Resolution: WSDC will close issue and note it on web summary pages after concurrence of WSDC/IRSA personnel.
- Final Products QA
 - Action: WSDC to report anomalies to WSDC/IRSA via ticket systems or to SOC via e-mail.
 - Tracking: WSDC to note status of anomaly checking via ticket systems (for WSDC/IRSA-related issues) and via web summary pages.
 - Resolution: WSDC will close the issue and note it on web summary pages once the PI or designee concurs either that a solution has been found or that the anomaly should be characterized and documented for the Explanatory Supplement.
- Anomaly collection via other routes
 - Collect anomalies from WISE Science Team.
 - Collect anomalies from the astronomical community.





- Jun 19, 2008 (version 1.0)
 - Ingest QA prototyped
 - Quicklook QA prototyped
 - Parts of Scan/Frame QA prototyped
 - Scan synch monitor in preliminary state
- Dec 17, 2009 (version 2.0)
 - v1.0 pieces matured
 - Parts of Multiframe QA prototyped
 - Archive QA prototyped
- Jul 7, 2009 (version 3.0)
 - Ingest QA, Quickook QA, Scan/Frame QA, Multiframe QA, Archive QA ready for launch
- Dec 30, 2009 (post-launch)
 - Post-launch tune-ups of the five QA subsystems above
 - Final Products QA prototyped
- Dec 20, 2010 (post-cryo)
 - Final versions of all six QA subsystems mature









- Who is responsible for providing calibration products and tuning parameters from IOC results?
- During IOC will we be able to respond quickly enough to in-orbit differences so that processing timescales stay on schedule?
- Coordination of the parties needed to make anomaly tracking work will need the attention of upper management.











IOC: QA Tasks w/ Cover On



- Although some of the data acquired during IOC will be non-standard with respect to normal operational data, QA tasks will be needed on resultant data products as the integrity of both the data and the pipelines are tested. Such tests will be largely manual activities using custom software and analysis tools.
- Cover-on: Before the cover is released, the temperature of the inner shield of the aperture cover will be high enough that data in W3 and W4 should be saturated. Nonetheless, there are tests that can be made for W1 and W2 data:
 - Test Ingest QA pipeline.
 - Test those portions of the Scan/Frame QA Pipeline that monitor darks, hot pixel masks, and frame noise (for W1 and W2 only).
 - Test saturation pixel flagging (for W3 and W4 only).
 - Check noise characteristics in W1 and W2 for orbits with SAA passages to determine noise thresholds to use during routine QA.





IOC:

QA Tasks w/ Cover Off



- Cover-off: After the cover is ejected, a series of planned tests will evaluate the performance of the instrument to actual astronomical sources. These data will allow (a) threshold checking needed for nominal QA operations, (b) collection of inputs needed for pipeline tuning, and (b) thorough testing of the scan synchronization monitor:
- Scan Synchronization monitor
 - Test fully.
 - Derive warning thresholds for QA.
- Detector calibration
 - Derive fiducial on-orbit flats. Derive and monitor "low-frequency" flat/responsivity.
 - Derive fiducial on-orbit masks (low-response pixels + hot pixels).
- Photometric calibration initialization
 - Monitor orbit-to-orbit pole passages to check zero-point stability of standard stars.
 - Monitor photometric stability using orbit-to-orbit overlaps.
 - Verify that each standard is still appropriate for use.
 - Derive linearity correction and check (refine?) against ground calibration.
 - Check/refine saturation limits and on-board thresholds.
- Source detection initialization
 - Determine optimal SNR thresholds for detections to meet completeness requirements.
 - Set deblending parameters.
- Bright source artifact mapping
 - Set thresholds for flagging latents, diffraction spikes, dichroic glints, electronic ghosts, and optical ghosts.
- Annealling characterization
 - Check image statistics before and after anneals.
 - Check behavior of latents before and after anneals.
- Avoidance limits
 - Determine practical background limit for processing data near the Moon.
 - Determine SAA charge rate limits for W3 and W4.

