2021-02-17 Meeting notes

Date
17 Feb 2021

Attendees

Agenda
- Anton Koekemoer on community survey definition process at STScI

Minutes

Julie McEnery

New Roman science slack space. The RSIG channel could be invitation-only for privacy.

New confluence discussion forum: Roman SIG discussions
Advantage of this forum is that it is easy to curate, go back to old discussions, and organize.

more meaningful, content-heavy discussions can go in the confluence forum, while quicker chats can go in Slack

reminder about the Roman virtual lecture series. Next one tomorrow 4pm ET. Suggestions for speakers very welcome.

Today is the 2nd day of the Roman-Subaru synergy workshop. The meeting time is 7pm-10pm ET. If you're interested, contact Julie for the zoom link.

DOE issued an RFI on Rubin + Roman + Euclid science. Julie is organizing a meeting for next Wednesday at noon to discuss proposal ideas. Look out for an announcement.

Anton Koekemoer on Frontier Fields survey definition process

community initiatives at STScI: both HST Ultra Deep Field and Frontier Fields relied on external scientific advisory committees.

The HDFI working group solicited white paper input (2012). Then STScI became responsible for implementation, calibration, distribution

Frontier Fields had additional coordination with Chandra and Spitzer, and solicitation of theoretical model work by external community Lens-model teams

Some of the long term benefits to the wider user community: improved scheduling to reduce impact of bright source persistence, calibration improvements, improved archives

Implementing these observing programs as community initiatives helps to level the playing field. Community-led papers appeared immediately after data release.

color comment from Julie: for Roman, community-defined surveys will be the norm rather than the exception.

Roeland: For all the Roman imaging data, expect a larger suite of products than you would get in a GO paradigm.

importance of community stewardship.

Q: these scheduling/calibration/pipeline improvements came out of these programs (as compared to GO programs), because of STScI’s involvement in the data processing?
A: some improvements in pipelines came from innovations shared by science users.

Q: Can we ask the project to pay for these things?
Julie: What we're discussing is already part of the baseline, except the resources to conduct the community process itself.
Roeland: The views on this within the project have changed since 5 years ago - previously, the SITs owned the survey definition and data analysis.
SOC is responsible for most WFI imaging catalogs (except microlensing catalogs), but not survey-level calibration.

Q: Can you comment a little bit more about how the ultimate form that the Frontier Fields took (i.e. cluster lensing observations) was determined, as opposed to other potential types of large observing programs? (I'm looking for the 2012 working group report but can't seem to find it right away.)

Q: how was the early universe deep field chosen in the first place?
Roeland: The director chose to dedicate part of their discretionary time to a deep field, with guidance from user committees.

General discussion
Jessica: Suggestion for a future meeting topic - go over the project’s timeline and how the group’s activities fit in.

Next meeting we will try to hear about the Rubin survey definition process. What about SDSS? Suggestions for contacts welcome.

Suggestion: what if we changed format, instead of spending half the time on a presentation, spent a full hour on discussion.