

# 2021-03-17 Meeting notes

Date

Attendees

Julie McEnery, Alice Shapley, David Spergel, Dimitri Mawet, Dominic Benford, George Helou, Gisella De Rosa, Harry Ferguson, James Rhoads, Jeffrey Kruk, Jessie Christiansen, Jessica Lu, John Mackenty, Joshua Schlieder, Karoline Gilbert, Kenneth Carpenter, Megan Donahue, Neill Reid, Peter Melchior, Rachel Akeson, Rachel Bean, Roeland van der Marel, Sangeeta Malhotra, Saurabh Jha, Zeljko Ivezic, Neil Zimmerman

Agenda

- [survey discussion](#)

Minutes

This will be our last meeting on the topic of pre-definition of some general astrophysics surveys.

Takeaway from last discussion: A two-phase process. First, solicit the scientific motivation for defining a survey at this stage. Lightweight. Avoid the potential confusion of too many calls out to the community at once.

## Comments/questions

When we frame the white paper call, make sure to differentiate from the ROSES call.

How will the white papers be assessed? This will be worked with the science center.

Rachel Bean - have experience thinking about white papers for survey prioritization. It helps the authors if you lay down guidelines, metrics, criteria, and what the actions are.

Want people to make the science case and not spend lots of time on a detailed evaluation.

We will keep it scripted, "fill in the box" responses

If there is no clear case for early definition, then it would tend to support holding off on allocating time until a GO call 1 year before launch.

## Next meeting topics

Future calls for scientific funding.

How Roman is going to engage with the community over the next 2 years, and role in RSIG?

More suggestions welcome.

Coronagraph topics? Interested in status of participating program.

How are we maximizing archive science potential? Core survey proposals will be evaluated on their optimization of broad science.

Computing infrastructure is related to this.