



**NUAP(09)05**

## **MINUTES OF THE NUAP MEETING ON 16<sup>th</sup> APRIL 2009 HELD AT IMPERIAL COLLEGE LONDON**

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 The members and attendees introduced themselves and gave their areas of expertise as follows:

- Professor M Dougherty: NUAP Chair, planetary magnetospheres
- Professor T Hartquist: star formation and diffuse matter
- Dr S Matthews: solar physics and Sun-Earth connection
- Dr E Bunce: outer planetary magnetospheres
- Dr I Franchi: solar system formation and planetary formation
- Dr B Gaensicke: stars, stellar evolution and stellar remnants
- Dr P D'Arrigo: space technology, specialising in Solar Orbiter and asteroid missions
- Professor D Pollacco: exoplanets, instruments and stars
- Professor M Sims: AURAC Chair, space instruments
- Professor Y Elsworth: PPARC member, the Sun (variable stars), oscillations in stars
- Dr C Castelli: Head of STFC Space Science Group
- Dr S Berry: Head of STFC ground-based Group
- Ms R Young: NUAP Secretary

1.2 It was agreed that Drs Matthews and Bunce would cover Solar Terrestrial Physics.

### **2. TELECON FOLLOW-UP AND ACTIONS**      **NUAP(09)02**

2.1 The Panel had agreed the following during the telecom:

- To hold a Community meeting on 9 July (location to be decided)

- Questionnaires to be sent to the community
- Transparency to exist between NUAP and the community, with a Web page for documents and presentations. The Website could have a front page at STFC a link to possibly less restricted site elsewhere. Where this should be located was to be decided.
- Initial priority documents would be produced covering different science areas through consultations with small groups

2.2 The Panel noted that there was huge pessimism regarding the future budgets from STFC which could drive the timetables for the advisory panels. Other issues it needed to consider included the outstanding issues on BepiColombo, Aurora and ExoMars within ESA; how the build and exploitation programmes within STFC should be balanced; and whether the Ground-based Review would recognise the value of smaller facilities as well as large telescopes.

2.3 The Panel agreed that it needed to address the community's concerns e.g. through reassurance that ground- and space-based facilities would be considered equally and by showing how the various STFC strategic inputs, documents and Panels were joined up and influenced by the community.

2.4 Dr Castelli said it had been recognised that leaving the Advisory Panels in abeyance when STFC was created had left the Programmatic Review without a mechanism to engage the community. PPAN needed to build a long-term strategy to enable it to deal with proposals and understand contexts. STFC was currently trying to understand what its financial allocation would be for 2009/10 and 2010/11. Exchange rate changes were affecting subscriptions dramatically and discussions were ongoing with DIUS regarding protection against this.

2.5 Dr Berry provided some background on the review of Ground Based Facilities currently being initiated. This would be a cross-facility review and had been set-up at the instruction of the Chief Executive in response to a request at NAM 2008. It was recognised that the Programmatic Review was perhaps limited as a snapshot review of current issues and that the GBR (Ground-based Astronomy Facilities Review) would be tasked with examining the future goals in the field and therefore the facility portfolio required. In addition to examining UK interests in large optical-IR telescopes such as Gemini and VLT there was a need to look at the whole ground-based portfolio and how currently-available facilities fitted with the strategy for future projects such as an ELT and SKA. The GBR had taken a while to set up and the timing now crossed with the work of the new Advisory Panels but could report through them to PPAN and have cross-membership. The details would be discussed at the first meeting due to take place shortly. The Astronet plan provided a useful view of European priorities and Simon would circulate this to the Panel. The GBR membership was M Rowan-Robinson (Chair), R Fender, R Ivison, M Hoare and R McMahon. The review had originally been conceived as a ground-based optical IR review but the scope had now widened to include radio

facilities. There was concern that small facilities and areas like exoplanets that did not currently have a strategic plan should not be excluded. There was also concern that STP was not included in the GBR or have its own review.

Action: Dr Berry

### **3. DRAFT WORKPLAN**

**NUAP(09)03**

3.1 It was agreed that the members should produce draft priorities documents of approximately 3 pages in consultation with science colleagues and using existing strategy documents where available. These would be distributed with the questionnaire and although they might not cover all topics, they would provide a base to work from and the community would be able to comment on what was not covered. The documents were assigned to the members as follows:

- Prof. Pollacco – exoplanets
- Dr Gaensicke - stellar astronomy, galactic astronomy
- Dr Bunce – space physics, including solar system plasma, STP & planetary magnetospheres in consultation with Michele Dougherty
- Dr Matthews – solar physics
- Prof Hartquist - global interstellar medium, star formation, protoplanetary disks and migration, including dust.
- Dr D'Arrigo – technologies (not science)
- Dr Franchi – planetary aspects of sample analysis, on surface geochemistry (Prof. Sims to provide input)

3.2 The Chair agreed to check with the FUAP Chair (Bob Nichols) whether FUAP was covering galactic structure.

Action: Chair

3.3 Professor Pollacco would use the Exoplanets strategy panel conclusions as a basis for his and this could be provided within a week a template for the other documents. The FIRSP infrared and high energy strategy document would also be circulated as examples. The documents should indicate whether areas should expand, contract or remain in a steady state.

Action: Prof. Pollacco & Chair

3.4 The questionnaire should be based on the questions set by PPAN to the advisory panels and some changes were agreed e.g. they should ask about the challenges in the next 10-15 years, not 20-30 as this was felt to be more realistic; they should include knowledge exchange and economic impact (Dr D'Arrigo would provide input in this area); they should include human resource requirements, not just facilities; and they should ask what criteria should be used for prioritisation.

3.5 The consultation should be via a Web-based proforma with word limitations and a comments page. A temporary e-mail address should also be set up to return comments to. Rosemary would investigate setting this up.

Action: Secretary

3.6 Due to the tight schedule, the Secretary would send out a message warning the community of what would be asked of them. The schedule is listed below. Members could join the meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> June by telecom if preferred

Deadline/date	Action	Responsibility
21 <sup>st</sup> April	e-mail to community with planned deadlines	Secretary
24 <sup>th</sup> April	Exoplanets draft circulated to members	Prof. Pollacco
11 <sup>th</sup> May, morning	Panel priorities drafts circulated	Members
11 <sup>th</sup> May, 17:00	Telecom to agree priorities documents	Members & attendees
12 <sup>th</sup> May	Circulate drafts to community with questionnaire. Consultation begins.	Secretary
3 <sup>rd</sup> June	Deadline for questionnaire returns	Community
12 <sup>th</sup> June, 10:00-13:00	1 <sup>st</sup> prioritization meeting (London)/telecom	Members & attendees
22 <sup>nd</sup> June, time tbd	2 <sup>nd</sup> prioritization telecom	Members & attendees
2 <sup>nd</sup> July, 9:00 – 17:00	3 <sup>rd</sup> prioritization meeting (venue tbd, not London)	Members & attendees
9 <sup>th</sup> July, 13:30 – 17:30	Community meeting, London	All
17 <sup>th</sup> July	Final community comments by e-mail	Community
10 <sup>th</sup> August	Final document review	Members & attendees
September	Presentation to PPAN	Chair

#### **4. COMMUNITY MEETING**

4.1 It was agreed that the community meeting could be held in London at the RAS or IoP, starting at 13:30 and ending by 16:30 with time to talk afterwards. Pre-registration was preferred to assess numbers, but not essential. The meeting include a presentation of the NUAP remit and outline priorities, with how these were developed. Someone who could act as an independent Chair would be useful.

#### **5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

5.1 The Panel had some discussion on how priorities should be reached. Consideration was required of how the AURAC priorities fitted within NUAP. It was agreed that the initial priorities should have a science basis. Finance, life costs, subscriptions & treaties could be considered afterwards and it was noted that the science return was not necessarily related to costs, e.g. can negotiate to get non-PI role.