

Meeting of the Steering Committee

Present:

Madhulika Guhathakurtha

Takeo Kosugi

William Liu

Richard Marsden

Hermann Opgenoorth

Anatoli Petrukovich

Jean-Yves Prado

HO Lists European registrants. Ireland delegates full responsibility to ESA, Portugal is hard to contact. Hungary, Russia, Ukraine, Canada, Brazil, US NASA, and NOAA will come. China will send two people as an exception due to an English problem - unclear if India will attend, No answer from Poland or Czech Republic. Spain cannot send an agency representative, will instead send a scientific observer. Denmark will send an additional observer - there is a problem of two competing institutes. Neubert is the representative, an observer will come from the other institute to keep them informed. We can consider this a major accomplishment. 29 people representing 23 agencies.

HO Should we invite Behnke? MG- ILWS is a coordination of space agency activities. Therefore as discussed in the earlier Steering Committee meeting, NSF should be represented through the GB task group.

HO. It may not be wise to break into scientific subgroups when the participants are not scientists. It would be better to organize this meeting in a different way. Task groups should be defined and start work. Don't mess with them in the working groups. Enunciates JYP proposal to split into only two subgroups: (1)

programmatic/political to discuss the requirements and unwritten rules required to introduce ILWS into their decision making process (letter, contact, etc), and (2) scientific to discuss a long term program including cornerstone, midsize, small missions. With this done it should be possible to name known and identify further holes, for example emphasizing the need for an imager. That information could be fed back to some agency.

HO gets contacted several times a month by people with mission ideas who are seeking endorsements. WL. We don't have a rigorous process, and therefore need to be careful. Send these people to the steering committee. HO: Wants to check with agency representatives to know their opinion about this procedure. WL. Danger of many proposals. RM- we don't have the manpower to address every discipline. MG. Bring an idea and show how it augments scientific plans. WL. It should be up to the proposer to go to his/her agency, then the agency can send the proposal to us for our opinion. MG. Yes, each agency has a point of contact with us. HO. Probably the agencies need to see our roadmap.

MG. How will we go about providing a roadmap? It is a big effort. WL. This meeting will be a success if we can form 4 task groups. We can spend some time brainstorming on science roadmapping. If every agency speaks, all our time will be spent. Give them a chance to suggest members for task groups.

MG. IT group has a chair and members. Ground based TG has a chair and is discussing members. No chairs have been selected for the other groups. We need the steering committee to go over this again. HO We can collect input on this here.

HO. Sooner or later we will need a roadmap - the initial one will come from what we hear on Monday. MG. George Withbroe is

officially on board now. Collecting this and assembling it into a plan will be his task.

JYP. We need a plan that goes beyond existing/planned activities. Thus we will have a programmatic session.

WL. We need to give the two groups some framework in which to work.

HO. Some agencies work by providing contributions, others attempt to run full missions. Thus, we will ask each to describe how decision making works in their country. The steering committee will then consider how to deal with unique national characteristics.

MG. Agency level presentations should indicate missions, planned missions, missions that would welcome joint participation. There may be some one-on-one discussions thereafter.

HO. UK is known to have several Magnetospheric missions in mind, with reasonably high priorities. Must be RAL and QMC (possibly even Leicester). They are trying to combine and repropose based upon ILWS.

JYP. The Storm mission is being discussed with the Chinese leader (Liu) of Double Star. They are happy to join ILWS. Storms could be one of the missions developed by China alone or with Europe. One of their missions seems similar to the radiation belt mapper. MG. We have budget difficulty implementing both radiation belts and IT Storm Probes as envisioned in the GMDT report. WL- I have talked to the Vice President of the Chinese Space Agency- they are ready to launch a solar telescope with a 1m diameter. MG. NASA cannot cooperate with China yet. JYL. It could be programmatic. MG. We are having budget trouble with 2 probes in the radiation belt. We would like to work with

other agencies to pick up 1 or 2 of the RB Storm probes. This requires lots of planning. We need someone to stand up now and then we can form a planning team. HO. Finland, France, and China are interested in geomagnetic storms. Even if they don't collaborate, the others could solve the problem. MG It is important to coordinate instruments. WL would it be a problem if one mission was Chinese? MG. We are open with regard to observations. HO. But there can be no exchange of instruments. WL There would have to be both scientific and technical discussions. MG. Maybe via a European mediator. HO. Suppose the US flies two and the others fly number three. Then there would be a discussion with NASA. JYL It is too early to worry about problems of who builds the spacecraft and gives to Chinese. WL We will want to answer these cooperation questions early. MG. NASA will not cooperate in a bilateral manner. HO Let's try to get 3 petals. WL. CSA is talking to China now. MG. Let's elevate this. NASA has budget problems. HO. Roadmap.

HO. There is one deadline coming up, September 15, when members can propose missions and ESA pays 15%. WL. Canada qualifies for this program. HO. Canada should come with ESA members if it wants to succeed.

HO.. I will give a background talk to the working group based on an original from George Withbroe.

RM sent Lika a draft charter for Sentinels. He feels the group would be like Solar Orbiter. No point doing Sentinels until the science defined for SO is worked out. The SO group will finish well before the end of this year. He suggests starting the Sentinel task group early next year. MG is ready for Magnetospheric task group now. HO needs a chair. Tentatively Koskinen is selected for this chair.

HO. What about a computer/data group? It could discuss formats and archives. It could conduct a market search for end users. We need to get this started. MG. My worry is that we have no money. MG. Why not start this activity at the European level first? WL. We could wait for the science task groups to decide what they need. HO. OK. Then we request that information from them. HO. Many people approached me about a European SDO data base. MG. This kind of activity is now going on in the United States. HO. Let them see how much this costs. HO. So let us discuss this with the agency representatives. We might get a bit of money from them. Let's get a discussion started.

HO. What about meetings. Can national funding sources support these? ESA – Marcello was positive about funding meetings. ISSI would like to do this sort of thing. Bonnet is interested in large workshops. HO and Kosugi and von Steiger are talking. ESA can offer SOHO/Cluster as a topic. But Cluster is scientifically not ready yet. Paschmann is currently leading a dayside workshop. ISSI wants to host a Cluster/ground based workshop and in Autumn 2004 it might be more timely with a SOHO/Cluster workshop. MG. Let's get these communities talking first. MG. It would be better to pick a science topic. HO. We could mentor this activity by suggesting the topic of the meeting. MG. We could identify the primary questions and then work on the intermediary problems. HO. We have received criticism. The IACG is formally moving to Paris. It will be a matter for the next IACG meeting. There is a danger within ESA and NASA of wishing to let IACG die. ISSI is looking for something else. We should worry about making ISSI the ILWS institute. ESTEC would be better for that. The old reasons for their existence are no longer valid. ESTEC is not a good place for meetings like these. Moving carefully right now. Plan to accept ISSI's offer.

HO. Remaining problem. I have been overwhelmed with requests for recommendations and endorsements. Those who want a faster response - e.g. SAFARI team (US mission launched by Ariane-ASAP). I have been telling them that I will take the matter to a working group for their opinion, then to steering committee etc. MG. It should be evaluated by the member agency first. HO. Will say no to direct transmission to ILWS henceforth.

HO. The letter to the Russian Space Agency has already been sent out.

MG. How do you form partnerships? What's the plan? We need to prepare for a May bilateral meeting. HO. Southwood spoke to the community. He taught them a lesson. A serious problem for ESA lies in member states making promises to NASA and not keeping them. Chris Russell says that the requirement of international cooperation is now considered as a negative point in NASA reviews. HO. I am going to provoke a European meeting to determine what is desired by ESA states. I have been criticized as being the street sweeper cleaning up behind NASA. We need to have a plan for ILWS, and also a plan for the European involvement and priorities in ILWS. More discussions to come at the Bilateral between ESA and NASA. MG Don't close the door on SDO. I want an answer about W. Schmutz.

JYP. When we are aware of a proposal, it is already too late to know what is happening. We just saw in a proposal that CNES would provide a free launch. They ask us for an endorsement later. We can only state that we are aware of proposer activities and that if we will have funding, we will help. There is a need for a discussion. We cannot agree in April to spend money in December of the same year. There is a need for an early discussion between sponsoring agency and NASA early on. MG. We can bring this up at the bilateral meeting. It can be difficult because it can hold up selection. HO. It could be built in to initial questions to the

agencies. Within ILWS this can happen: scientists make deals. Warn the agencies and ask them to think about it so that ILWS doesn't get used this way. JYP NASA proposals don't require firm commitments from foreign partners. HO. David Southwood thinks all the problems get passed off to ESA. UK might say ok to NASA and later try to transfer the responsibility to ESA. If Southwood would pay for England then every other country would come with similar requests. JYP There needs to be some intermediate procedure. MG. This is happening a lot - promises cannot be kept anymore by small agencies in particular. WL. Beyond our pay grade.

MG. What is going on with Bepi-Colombo? TK. There will be an announcement of opportunity. I don't know the rules. Don't know whether those outside ESA and Japan can apply. HO. Europe anticipates that most or all MPO instruments will be European. Therefore, logically MMO will be mostly Japanese. There will be almost no competition. Others should try to join an existing team. TK. Consistent with my understanding. MG. I would like feedback to know how we work together. HO. Yes, the US can answer the AO, but it could be difficult to beat an existing consortium. MG. In this case I will tell this to our community. There is no formal agreement. TK. Mukai is responsible for the precise answer. As far as I know, Mukai is afraid of competition on individual instruments, but of course he expects some competition. Pre-arrangement is not complete. MG. Knows that some US scientists are working with the Japanese. HO this information comes from wave-particle teams. Mukai is on the particle side. TK. Will NASA give money for Bepi-Colombo? MG. Not if there is no expectation of participation. WL. You want to be co-I or PI?

General discussion of agenda for the ILWS WG meeting.

First Day

9:00 Bus departs
9:30 Welcome
9:45 HO. Background and introduction
10:00 5 Top level Steering Committee Agency presentations
(15 min each). NASA, ESA, Japan, Russia, Canada
11:30 Brazil, China, Hungary, Ukraine
12:45 Departure for Lunch
1:00 Lunch
2:30 14 Small Agency Presentation (10 min each)
Alphabetical Order for Europeans
5:30 Discuss and approve organizational structure. Any
comments?
6:00 Bus returns.

Second Day

8:30 Bus pick up at acropolis
9:00 Task groups: IT (Sibeck), Ground (Eric Donovan),
Magnetospheric (Opgenoorth), heliosphere (Marsden will talk on
solar orbiter). We will be forming a solar sentinel task group.
10:00 Break into two subgroups.
12:00 Reports of subgroups
12:45 Break for lunch
2:00 Plenary discussion.
3:00 Meeting ends. Next meeting Banff? One year from
now. By that time task group has proper report.