2021-07-23 Meeting notes

Agenda

- Project news
- discussion on white paper call postponed
- revisions to GSFC Roman webpages - James
- minutes

Attendees

Cristina Oliveira, Dara Norman, David Spergel, Dimitri Mawet, Dominic Benford, Harry Ferguson, James Rhoads, Jason Rhodes, Jeffrey Kruk, Jessie Christiansen, John Mackenty, Julie McEnery, Joshua Schlieder, Keith Bechtol, Lee Armus, Megan Donahue, Neil Zimmerman, Neill Reid, Peter Melchior, Roeland van der Marel, Ryan Hickox, Sangeeta Malhotra, Saraubh Jha, Vanessa Bailey

Minutes

Project News

Had 'reset' meeting with Ball. Moving from design to execution. Ball team restructured. WFI team from GSFC went to meet Ball counterparts.

Ground Systems CDR completed this week, passed with no RFAs (requests for action). This was an unmitigated success. No actions, but some observations to help out.
The WFI Calibration engineering peer review (EPR) was also held a few days ago.

EPRs like these are the 'real review work'. Had 50-60 of these up to this point, and almost done. Modeling system of optics; how to validate models. Calibration is mostly engineering not science. On Roman, almost every calibration involves scientists conducting scientific analyses on science data.

Who is responsible for calibration?
Calibration responsibilities are distributed across the Project, science centers, and the science teams. For basic data products, the project is responsible. But calibrations unique to a particular survey are the responsibility of science teams requesting the data. Custom observing projects have a need for specific work to include in processing.
The Calibration Working Group involves representatives from Goddard, SOC, SSC, and wide field science teams.
Meeting L1 requirements is ultimately the responsibility of the science teams.
Roeland: a lot of imaging mode calibration is purview of STScI, and for spectroscopy of IPAC.
Science Centers provide tools to the community, but meeting L1 criteria is responsibility of scientists.
Catalogs are a mix of algorithms & software from science teams and SOC/SSC.
Julie: have to make sure all these tools are well organized and coordinated.

Based on experience, it seems possible that members of the community (even outside the science teams) produce their own algorithms and software that may provide new capabilities for Roman science or calibration. Will there be avenue for those resources to be included as standard in pipelines, etc.?
The SOC has set up an environment is a clone of the operational environment, which facilitates adding features. Cloud-based science platform - users bring software to data. Much more flexible for invention.
The upcoming ROSES call will support infrastructure and key project teams, and also smaller preparatory science teams who could work on algorithm development.
SOC/SSC will pay attention to community research, but new features can be expensive to implement to meet NASA software standards.
Lee: If the science centers make available the intermediate data products and pipeline modules, it helps users to experiment and apply new techniques.

Julie - postponing discussion of white paper call for next week. Will send out doodle poll to check on Wednesday and Friday availability.

James Rhoads / Goddard web page updates

Revised pages describing surveys: https://roman.gsfc.nasa.gov/observations.html ; and subsidiary pages from there.
Those pages are not presently linked from elsewhere, so that at the moment it is in a semi-draft state.
Feedback and suggestions welcome.
"General Astrophysics" is still a stub page; considering adding more material from 2015 SDT report.

John: suggest making an explicit statement on each page that these are concept surveys and that the actual definition will be created by the community process.
Ryan: Agreed that some nice images would be useful!
Keith: I wonder if it would be helpful for each page to have a common template/structure, e.g., with headings.
Keith: Suggest to have a summary table or visual that encompasses all the observing programs.

other comments

John: Regarding future calibration reviews, the series of reviews in more depths. Think about how to structure those, it could be a good opportunity to involve wider community outside of the teams.

Jessie: I like the website, agree with the point of making it sound the right amount of settled, and wonder if there's space on the website to mention the potential GO program and solicit feedback?