

# GLAST USERS' COMMITTEE (GUC)

## Telecon Minutes

### September 14, 2005

Present:

*Committee members:*

Josh Grindlay (chair), Roger Brissenden, Jim Buckley, Wim Hermsen, Don Kniffen, Jim Ling, Alan Marscher, Reshmi Mukherjee, Rene Ong, Greg Stacy, Mark Strickman, Ann Wehrle

*Ex Officio committee members:* David Band, Neil Gehrels, Rick Harnden, Julie McEnery, Chip Meegan, Peter Michelson, Steve Ritz, Rita Sambruna, Kathy Turner

Start at 11:00 EDT.

1. Introduction—Josh

Open AIs will be the focus of the telecon.

2. Open AIs from June meeting:

A. AI#7,19: Outline of Science Policy Document (SPD)

Steve led the discussion. The current outline (available under AI#19 on website) reflects the input received since the outline was first presented at the last face-to-face meeting. People should now start adding to the document; the contributed text need not be polished and bullets will suffice. A new draft of the outline will not be circulated.

The following points out new items, and discussion of both new and old items.

§2.2—Background information; the EPO program should be included

§2.4—Complaint and appeal process

§3—The section on observing policy was reorganized

§3.5—The TOO section will deal with initiating TOOs and time limits for TOOs

§3.7.4.1—The section on replanning pointed observations aroused a discussion of whether all text about the balance between different observing modes should be pulled together into one section which would have policy that is either hard (set fractions) or soft (general guidance)

§3.8.2—The establishment of the Science Operations Oversight Group (SOOG)

§4.2—Data rights principles (year 1 vs. subsequent years)

§4.3—A section on GBM data releases should be added

§4.3.3—The section on GBM-LAT data sharing should be moved to the “Internal Project Policies Affecting Users” section (§6)

§4.3—In general, the section on data releases should be expanded

§4.5—The process for updating the list of monitored sources should be added

§4.6—The data levels should be defined, at least briefly; therefore this section should be moved up, perhaps to the overview section

New §4.6—The policy on reprocessing data should be described by instrument

§4.7—The section on discarding data is necessary, even if the principle is that little or no irreproducible data will be discarded

§5.1—General statements of the purposes and goals of the GI program, as well as the investigation types (observing vs. funding), are necessary. The consensus is that the investigators should be call GIs, not GOs

§5.3—GI eligibility

§5.4—Including a statement about conflicts of interest for GLAST team members is necessary. For example, the instrument teams will perform technical evaluations of the proposals.

§5.5—Policy with regard to other missions

§5.5.3—This section will provide guidance for funding the analysis of data from other missions relevant to GLAST

§5.7 or §6—How should the GTN be treated? Does it have special status?

§6.1—This section should describe the LAT team's level of membership. These levels will be relevant to funding, and for the data rights of loosely affiliated members

§6.4—GSSC rights

§6.4.1—Since the research time for GSSC scientists is established by the organization that employs them, does the SPD need to discuss this issue. This item will be left as a placeholder

§7—A reference to the press plan is needed

§7.2—The instrument team publication policies are properly the concern of the instrument teams, but a reference to them in the SPD is deemed relevant

The PDMP needs to be revised to remove policy statements

The SPD's audience is: the team for guidance in running the mission; and users for information and expectations about how the mission will be run.

## B. AI#11: Legacy Program

Josh led the discussion. The Legacy Program is currently defined to be 3-4 projects at any time that are: large scope; large team; multi-year; and each costing ~250-300K/year.

Since the legacy projects may involve correlative observations with other facilities, the program needs to deal with the issues of NASA's support of multi-wavelength observations.

Alan suggested that the LTSA program may be the appropriate program for funding multi-year projects, but the consensus is that the GLAST GI program should be able to support such projects.

Even though the projects are multi-year, they must be repropoed in some form each year. Whether the new proposal is merely a progress update or a new proposal needs to be decided. David pointed out that if a legacy program project must submit a new proposal each year, then the program effectively keeps large, ambitious projects (that will not be finished in a year) from being summarily rejected. Ann pointed out that by the time the 1<sup>st</sup> year funding arrives and a post-doc is hired, the first year will have passed with little to show, so perhaps the 2<sup>nd</sup> year should be guaranteed. This AI will be finalized in advance of the first call for GI proposals (Feb. '07).

## C. AI#13: GLAST Symposium Planning

Steve is trying to set up a telecon with the International Organizing Committee. The working assumption is that the symposium will be in Feb. '07 or close in time to the

release of the release of the first NRA for GI proposals. The symposium should include a legacy workshop. There should also be workshops on proposing for the GLAST GI program at the HEAD meeting (10/06) and the AAS meeting (1/07). The GUC will be responsible for organizing the data analysis workshops.

D. AI#16: The List of ~20 Sources to be Monitored During Cycle 1

The list is currently not on the GUC website but should be. Many GUC members could not find the list, and therefore it will be circulated again. Josh commented that more items should be on website and later suggested that these be linked to the corresponding AI number on the AI page on the website. Wim pointed out that we should not finalize the source list now since other missions may discover new interesting sources by GLAST's launch. The consensus is that the list should be finalized by the release of the part of the NRA that will be posted on the GSSC's website. Steve remarked that the update process for this list should be in the SPD.

E. AI#22: GUC Listserve

All e-mail from using the mailing list is archived. The archives will be accessed through a publicly-accessible URL that will not be linked to any website.

3. Report on the SWG meeting at SLAC on 9/2/05 (Josh)

Josh circulated the Powerpoint report. There were two issues relevant to the GUC:

1) The LAT's international partners feel that the GUC is sometimes too focused on NASA issues. Josh explained (at the SWG) that this was largely driven by issues for Users related to NASA support, available only to US-based investigators, but that general science policy formulated by the GUC would indeed be sensitive to the concerns of our international partners. Since there is a slot for a new member, a new international member should be chosen.

2) How should multi-wavelength observations be supported given NASA's rules about supporting ground-based observations? Should the issue be passed to the Astronomy Astrophysics Advisory Committee (AAAC), an interagency committee? Should we attempt to effect changes of NASA policy? Steve pointed out that this is an issue of scale of support: small projects can be supported through the instrument teams; medium projects should be discussed with NASA HQ; but pulling in the AAAC to discuss large projects might put unfunded mandates on NASA and the other agencies. The discussion with the AAAC should focus on the issue of how one agency understands the importance of one of its facilities to the goals of another agency. Rick, Rene, Steve, and Peter will attend the Oct. meeting of the AAAC. Any presentation about the multi-wavelength issue should first be shown to Rick and Anne Kinney. The consensus on the Telecon was to let the issue of multiwavelength support slip into a future AAAC meeting (Feb.), and to provide an update on the LAT status at the Oct. meeting. However, later discussions Josh had with the AAAC chair made it clear the Feb. meeting would not be opportune; a presentation by Peter was prepared (with consultation with Rick and Josh) that introduced some of the multiwavelength observing issues, but mainly provided an update on the project.

4. Julie is now a Deputy Project Scientist.

5. Agenda items for the November 8-9 face-to-face meeting should be sent to Josh, with copies to Steve and David.

Adjourn at 12:45