

## **Report on teleconference with Chandra Users' Committee and the Chandra Director's Office Staff**

Three topics were discussed. These were the status of the Chandra Source Catalog, the early proposal statistics for Cycle 20, and the proposal for having cool targets as one or two special proposal categories.

### *Chandra Source Catalog*

Major progress has been made on the catalog since the last face-to-face meeting with the CUC, and the CUC commends the catalog team both for their work and for taking the committee's suggestions seriously. Access to the catalog via the CXC's tools has increased substantially over the past six months. It is not entirely clear whether this is because of greater overall use of the catalog, because the CXC tools now provide access to data not available through Vizier, and other tools, or because of an increasing preference for usage of the CSC's custom tools. The Committee encourages the team to try to determine whether access through Vizier has gone down after the new release, because the committee recognizes that there is a lot of usage of the catalog not currently tracked by the CSC team. The committee has some minor concerns that the impact of the catalog may be underestimated due to usage on other platforms, and that when the full release is integrated into these other databases, there may be a downturn in catalog usage at the CXC that is not reflective of a real downturn in the use of the catalog products worldwide. The committee considers this a relatively low priority item compared with finishing off the coverage of the more crowded and otherwise technically challenging fields in the catalog. The CSC staff were also asked about the availability of an upper limits tool that could track upper limits for individual observations and not just the full data stack and were told that this would be available.

### *Cycle 20*

An update on Cycle 20 was given, and things appear to be continuing to proceed well with the calls for proposals. For the next call, there will be a new category of exoplanets, and the proposals for stars, exoplanets and the solar system will be reviewed together in one panel which has an explicit remit of considering exoplanet proposals.

A review of the career-stage demographics of proposers is ongoing. The committee agrees with a comment made during the debate that it is important to focus on career stage rather than actual age to avoid both age discrimination and the appearance of age discrimination.

### *Cool Attitude Targets (CATs)*

The CDO staff presented a plan for having cool attitude targets. These provide substantial help to the scheduling team in getting schedules planned effectively.

There will be two categories of these CATs -- Catalog-CATs, which will be proposed by white paper and reviewed by a special panel, and GO-CATs, which will be proposed through the normal GO process. The objects must be no more than 50 degrees from the ecliptic plane. The observations must have simplified modes for collecting the data, in order to reduce operational complexity and avoid observations that may heat the satellite by using too many ACIS chips.

The Catalog CATs will be large classes of objects that are spread across the sky. These ensure that there will always be some cool target with some scientific value to observe. Data will be public immediately, and funding for analysis will be available only through the AR program. The GO-CATs may be smaller samples of objects, and many such proposals may be accepted.

The committee was asked whether the GO-CAT program is justified in light of the level of complication adding a new type of proposal adds to the call for proposals. The committee makes three recommendations with respect to the CAT program. 1) There should be some means of identifying catalogs which are scientifically higher priority. 2) There should be some flexibility in the type of program to be executed. 3) There should be some means of directing some funding to analysis of these data, even if it is merely an increase in AR funding relative to GO funding in the future to account for the fact that a higher fraction of the data are going immediately into the archives. Whether this necessitates an actual GO-CAT call is something for the CXC team to decide given its better understanding of operational procedures.

The committee was asked for a recommendation on whether targets should be allowed to stay in the queue for more than a year, and whether there should be some requirements about completing projects.

The committee supports allowing the targets to stay in the queue for more than a year, with the understanding that new regular GO proposals take priority over GO-CAT targets. The committee recommends that PIs list a number of targets needed to make a good sample, and that preference, but not requirement be given to reaching the minimum good sample size. The committee is, in particular, worry that the requirement of completion could be problematic if the targets are near one another, rather than spread over the sky. Because the C-CAT proposals can fill in gaps where necessary, there is still real value in GO-CAT proposals which cover limits parts of the sky.