

SWG Chairs Telecon: 19-February-2019

Meeting notes: Jeff Wagg

Participants: SWGs: Willem van Straten, Gianni Bernardi, Phil Edwards, Sarah Blyth, Mark Sargent, Natasha Hurley-Walker, Cormac Reynolds, Ann Mao, Sebastien Muller, George Heald

Apologies: Lourdes Verdes-Montenegro, Jason Hessels, Grazia Umana, Gemma Janssen, Eduard Kontar, Richard Battye, Divya Oberoi, Laura Wolz

SKAO: Robert Braun, Jeff Wagg, Tyler Bourke

*Topic: Governance*

RB: We will start with governance, but also mention LFAA progress. We now have a date for the signing ceremony, the 12<sup>th</sup> of March. We have 6 confirmed signers at this time, and 1 or 2 more additional possibilities, although the ceremony is also intended to include all of the countries involved in the IGO negotiation process. The 13<sup>th</sup> of March will be the first meeting of the council preparatory task force that will pave the way for the transition to the IGO.

*Topic: CDR Activity*

RB: Looking at the CDR update table slide, most of the CDRs have gone quite well. Both CSP and SDP stand out as having gone very well. LFAA still has some work to do. Other CDRs shown in black are still to come, including the dish consortium which had their pre-CDR. This will all come together for the system CDR to take place in December (slide will be updated). There is still a lot left to do before the system CDR.

RB: Regarding LFAA, this was understood to be a special case as it was acknowledged that there were some open items. The panel report recommended more work be done in the area of station beam calibration through simulations and prototyping work. This work will take place during bridging. The consortium will look at the spectral performance as well as the time stability of the station beams. There were also some CDR recommendations regarding review/relaxation of the Level 1 Requirements, but there will not be any changes to these requirements at this time. I want to reassure you all that we will not consider any change of the current requirements without irrefutable evidence that this is necessary. We have previously undertaken an in-depth scientific analysis of the SKA-Low antenna frequency coverage,

<https://astronomers.skatelescope.org/science-assessment-teams/>

which provided a very clear recommendation, that is reflected in the current Requirements. This is not being revisited.

GB: Are there plans to make a final assessment by the end of 2019? (difficult to hear)

RB: It is difficult to hear, but if I caught the gist of the question, the intent is to have information in hand by September via these bridging activities, but in case that there is not enough data in hand, then a decision would be delayed, rather than arbitrarily forced. If I missed the gist of the question, please send me an email.

*Topic: Science community*

RB: With archival data, we were able to show that the science working group community has grown by more than a factor of 4 over the last few years. We had a very well attended AAS special session on SKA, and Tyler has put the slides online. There was also the PHISCC in Perth last week, Sarah?

SB: The first two days were updates on the HI surveys that are ongoing with the pathfinders. We also had a breakout session on Wednesday for the HI science working group to discuss what the approach will be for the science meeting in April. It was great to have many young people in attendance. It also came out that there is interest in discussing commensal surveys with the other working group chairs. One last thing is that it was good to have Jeff (from the office) so that we can ask questions and provide input directly into the office regarding advances with the pathfinders.

RB: The science team are available to support both international and national science and technical meetings. Please make sure to let us know when our attendance would be helpful.

*Topic: SKA-related meetings and posters*

RB: The next slide shows upcoming meetings. Please continue to pass along updates to this list.

RB: Seven large format SWG banners have been produced and can be downloaded at the link in the slide, but please provide those which are outstanding. All of the banners have turned out very well. If you are interested in having your own full size, roll-out version (about 2m tall) then please let me know.

RB: Regarding the science meeting, there remains intense interest in attending (~300). We will not have enough room in the new headquarters (~160 capacity) even for the breakout sessions. The Alderley park is a good venue. We may be able to have a reception at the HQ on Monday after the talks, but this will be confirmed soon.

RB: Regarding the Thursday and Friday of the meeting, please refer to the slide. We would start with a plenary session on Thursday morning, including an overview of data products as well as definition of the regional centres (including accreditation). In some areas, proto-regional centres have already begun. We will also discuss data challenges, and where to go next. We will then have self-organized SWG break-outs on topics like KSP coordination. There are also plans for a couple of cross-SWG sessions, including a breakout on high-frequency science with SKA1 with the goal of writing of a whitepaper. Finally, for the Friday afternoon wrap-up session, we will invite the SWGs to report on progress that has been made over the last couple of years. If you see anything missing, please let us know. Any questions?

MS: By when do you need information from us regarding the topics to be covered during the breakout sessions, and have you taken a tally of how many members of each SWG will participate?

RB: As soon as possible for your SWG-specific schedules. No, we don't yet have a tally of numbers by SWG, but we will provide a first estimate.

MS: One loop of iteration between the groups regarding the topics would be useful.

RB: Yes, the sooner we do this the better, but if you have already made some progress in your own agenda please send this on.

MS: (1) If you and the LOC could send an email to all of the participants asking who is planning to present at which breakout, that would be useful. (2) With respect to facilities,

we have had requests for remote participation from the SWGS, and (3) those who only wish to come for two days, can this be accommodated?

RB: (1) Yes, that's a good idea and we'll extend that invitation to those that have submitted abstracts, but who could not be scheduled for talks in the first three days. (2) The break-out rooms will not have high-end video conferencing equipment but should have good wi-fi connectivity. So remote participation via laptop is all that can be supported. (3) This is tricky. We have striven to keep costs low and have only charged 200 GBP per person, while the actual cost to us is 300 per person. So, regarding partial participation, unfortunately the answer is 'no'. For future meetings we will investigate this option. Any other questions?

*Topic: Data Challenges*

RB: The first data release took place last year, while Anna has run a couple of sessions with the participants and a couple of issues have already been identified. It looks like the teams may be able to make the March 15<sup>th</sup> deadline. Anna is still refining the scoring. In terms of the next steps, we have recently appointed a new postdoc (from September), and we are still considering the next data challenges. Any other points?