SWG Chairs Telecon
2016-04-12 14:00 - 15:00 UTC
Evan Keane

Agenda

1) SKA1-Mid Band Definition ECP (Michael/Robert)

RobertB: Yesterday Tyler circulated the full CRB report (which was led by M. Rupen) to swg-all.
Proposed changes will not be adopted.

Small net scientific benefit overall (some positives, some negatives, some neutral impact)

RFI - some benefits of moving band 2, but all of GSM band would be in the proposed new Band 2.

Resourcing - nobody has money to fund a new design from scratch.

Schedule - significant delays if this were adopted.

Cost - Also extra cost as Band 1 will not have a cryogenic cooling system. Adding this (if ECP
were adopted) would add expense.

On the whole decided not to go ahead with the proposal.

No comments, questions from Chairs.

2) SKA1-Low Antenna Bandpass Requirements (Jeff/Robert)

RobertB: circulated passband of SKA1-LOW antenna as it currently stands in LFAA consortia.

JeffW: a lot of recent effort to quantify SKA1-LOW calibration. Configuration now finalised.
On the actual antenna design work to be done, which could impact the station size. 2 issues
to point out:
  (i) resonance at 68 MHz due to a mis-match with the LNA and log-periodic antennas
  (ii) gain changes across the band

Unstable bandpass means difficulty in determining the EoR spectrum. issue (i) is to be dealt
with by a new design of antenna and LNA together. LFAA to do this so as to comply with new L1s
that clarify bandpass stabilities etc.

AAVS-1 work also ongoing.

JonathanP: Cath and Randall working on this. Happy with ongoing developments.

RobertB: thought it was important that the SWG chairs knew where we were with this.

JonathanP: would like to be kept informed of the various activities to improve the SKA1-LOW antenna design

all: agreed. That's the motivation for discussing it here today.

3) SKA Regional Science/HPC Centres (Robert)

RobertB: circulated the Data Flow Advisory Panel Report to the SKA board (for last week's SKA board meeting).
Aim to identify additional computing needs, e.g. commensal pipelines, how would you enable this, etc. Also
long-term preservation and how to deliver components to the user community and be VO compliant etc. Plus
a lot more.

More fleshed out numbers for July board meeting and also what regional centres would be.

TylerB: not all the recommendations from the DFAP were accepted. Can you highlight which?

RobertB: The key recommendation is the SRC Coordination Group and that will be what takes this forward.
They will develop the concrete proposals. Gary Davis (head of Operations) to lead that.

IngridS: How will that be set up and the members decided?

RobertB: Member countries will be able to suggest people.

EduardK: What is the timescale for the work of this group?

RobertB: Will have a long-term existence. Policy suggestions to be formed for July board meeting, but will
have an ongoing role into Operations.

4) Upcoming SKA Meetings (Jeff/Robert)

JeffW: EWASS -> those of you who have not yet submitted abstracts have been reminded.
Speakers will each get 15 minutes. Only N x 15 minute talk blocks allowed so that people
can cross between sessions.

The Goa meeting organisation is going well. Have a LOC meeting this Friday. If you, or your co-chair,
are willing to be part of the SOC for this let Jeff know. Reminder that this is a meeting aiming to attract early
career researchers in particular, in addition to more senior researchers with a long history of association.

Meeting website up soon.

JonathanP: if SWGs wanted to invite people to the 2 days of KSP meetings only is that ok?

RobertB: yes, that's ok. FYI: effectively no limit on participation for the meeting. 500 people can be accommodated if needed. Breakout rooms can hold total of about 350 people.

JeffW: participation in person or remote?

JonathanP: are there facilities for that?

JeffW: leaning away from that for the main science meeting.

RobertB: might be complicated to set up a large number of connexions but a smaller number might be doable.

5) AOB

RobertB: after the 2-day board meeting last week, a 1-day science and industry day with Indian colleagues.
Leaders of Indian SWGs (parallel to our general SWGs, almost 1-to-1 mapping) reported on what they were doing, most interested in, and most concerned by. There was a degree of concern that our SWG structure appeared to be too rigid and closed to new people and new ideas. Have also heard this in other countries.

Just wanted to note this as SWGs are a community service and we all probably need to try a bit harder to make sure the communication takes place.

To ensure everyone is in the loop, we propose to have a larger number of mass mailings to swg-all with a regular update of key ongoings.

EvanK: how often, monthly or every 2 months?

JeffW: are the chairs all receiving the monthly bulletin?

Chairs: nodding of heads

RobertB: we could send this to swg-all.