

2022-05-16 Meeting notes

Agenda

- ROSES draft solicitation for Roman

Minutes

The ROSES Roman opportunity announcement "draft for community comment" is out:

https://nspires.nasaprs.com/external/viewrepositorydocument/cmdocumentid=860786/solicitationId=%7B1BD0AA55-40BB-1419-EEA1-64FF5B4269D3%7D/viewSolicitationDocument=1/D.14%20Roman_Amend14.pdf

Please share widely!

Jessica - We need some kind of roadmap or figure (without specific group titles) to show all the points of input the community has (WFS teams, PIT teams, community science consortia, and technical working groups). Ultimately having a page where these are all listed and having a "want to join?" link for those that are open.

Also, create a "Getting involved with Roman" webpage that has some schematic views of how all of this stitches together.

Schematic with boxes for: WFS Grants, PITs, community science consortia, technical working groups, science implementation teams, all the project offices, etc.

Keith - I am currently helping to organize an in-kind contribution program for the Vera Rubin Observatory, and it is hard to imagine how we would have been able to do this without a large and established community with some existing relationships to have some understanding on the nature of the contributions

Jessica - One of the benefits of getting this process going so early is that we (the community) will use the first round to learn more about Roman and how all of these processes will work. I would guess that the first round will mostly attract those that are somewhat familiar with Roman but aren't part of the SITs today. Nothing restricts totally new people... but I agree it is a big leap to make at the moment. But as the community consortia get going, it will become easier to connect to Roman.

Keith - the more independent researcher model works better when there is abundant data available to go forth and do science immediately. At the current stage of the process, it seems that most of what needs to be done is more in the infrastructure category that would more broadly benefit the community.

Megan - concern of the efficiency of these things getting done, the way "research time" is eaten up at universities. Would like to hear more about these community consortia, bylaws and processes.

Julie - Not all groups expected to work together in the same way, but there can be best practices. We preferred to wait until the new teams to begin defining the science consortia

Jeff - The Rubin working groups can serve as a useful reference point

Jessica - confusing whether the PITs organize the science consortia, or the PITs organize around the science consortia.

Julie - There is not a 1-to-1 mapping. Could have many PITs supporting one cosmology consortium.

Don't want project to be prescriptive, could discuss a strawman

John - selection committee will have a tricky time, because the community organization is poorly defined. Could be something the RSIG sketches at an in-person meeting, get something down in paper.

Keith - difficult for someone coming in cold to understand where they can make a technical contribution.

Megan - question about required time investments, like telecons, etc

Julie - key difference in expectation between WFS and PIT - WFS is more flexible, less reporting burden, meeting attendance

John - still should make clear to the WFS grant recipients is that they have the option to plug in to WGs.

Julie - we'll start working on this ("getting involved") page immediately. Next RSIG meeting is after the deadline for comments.