



LSC Council Meeting

Peter Saulson

- Announcement: SKC withdraws from LSC membership
- Applications for membership
 - » Szabi Marka
 - » Eric Myers
- Statement on Scientific Integrity (revised)
- Proposed revisions to the MOU system
- Open discussion on possible LSC restructuring

Under the present system of MOU's, there have been several problems:

- Cumbersome paperwork has meant that process has sometimes bogged down.
- Many of us get no feedback, and start to wonder about the value of the exercise.
- Some of us have let our compliance become imperfect.

Under a revised system, all MOUs would be reviewed together by an annual meeting of a board consisting of Technical WG chairs and Analysis Group chairs.

- » PI's would get feedback on what was going well (or not.)
- » The LSC and Lab would get a better picture of the whole effort of the LSC, be able to spot gaps, and to ensure that we have both the right plan and evaluate our progress.
- » This will engage the expertise of the LSC, and enable the LSC to take responsibility for its work in a fuller way than before.
- » System will also allow more timely recognition of planned work that is not achieved. Some sort of probation could result, or, in extreme cases, loss of LSC membership.

Many details of this plan are TBD.

Albert Lazzarini, Dave Reitze, and Alan Wiseman will flesh out details.

Intention is to do a trial run of this system for the Feb 15 cycle (for 6 month duration), then to transition to **yearly** reviews each August.

Introduction to restructuring discussion

What might we want to improve about the structure of the LSC and especially its relation to the Lab?

How can we ensure that our social arrangements best allow us to achieve our goals?

Can we do a better job of finishing commissioning and producing observational results?

... as we move to long-term running?

... in the transition to Advanced LIGO?

Data analysis vs. service

LSC institutions almost entirely science oriented, while LIGO Lab is loaded down with most service functions.

Independence of LSC from Lab means it is difficult to impose planning and deadlines.

Advanced LIGO

Skills are dispersed throughout the LSC, but central coherent effort required to coordinate project, while sharing responsibilities.

Accountability, review, and oversight of LSC

LSC lacks mechanisms for the above.

LSC stakeholders don't participate in oversight of Lab



Since Barry's memo to PAC



PAC endorsed a study of possible restructuring ideas.

LSC Exec Comm formed a small committee to carry out preliminary discussion.

Members: Bruce Allen, Sam Finn, Joe Giaime, Keith Riles, Norna Robertson, David Shoemaker, PRS

Committee has met several times.

We discussed Barry's memo.

Members have also talked to experienced colleagues about the management of other large experimental collaborations and labs.

We listed what things we'd like to improve, and explored several alternative visions of a restructured LSC-Lab relationship.

LSC Exec Comm has also had some discussions of the topic.

What might be improved with the right organization?

- Use of talent, distribution of responsibility, irrespective of “who writes the paycheck”
- Fairer distribution of service functions
- Planning, organization, review of data analysis and R&D, across all of LIGO (Lab + LSC)
- Better integration of commissioning, operations and analysis, and of R&D and Adv LIGO construction
- Give LSC “stakeholders” role in oversight of LIGO

A few models for discussion

1. Tighter integration = LSC reports to Lab
perhaps with stronger role of LSC leadership in some decisions
2. More independence = co-equal Lab and LSC
Define interface between “facility” and “science program”
3. Multiple collaborations report to one Lab
Initial LIGO, Advanced LIGO, and Future R&D each have their own
leadership, even membership

In all versions, we also need to work out relation
between LSC and GEO.

Another issue: Is Caltech the best home for LIGO? Or
should it be an independent consortium?

What's next?

Time scale is set by the need for the Lab to submit its next Operations proposal early in 2005.

By early fall (i.e., soon!), serious discussions with Caltech are needed about any changes.

I hope the LSC converges on a basic model.

Then, an LSC committee should draft a new charter, in ongoing dialog with the Lab as it prepares the new Operations proposal.