

# **SPIRE ICC Steering Group Meeting**

**Rome 17<sup>th</sup> July 2002 (14:00)**

The SPIRE Consortium meeting in Rome included a meeting of the ICC Steering Group. This meeting had the following objectives:

- (i) identifying clearly the resources available for ICC development;
- (ii) agreeing the Management Plan for the ICC;
- (iii) agreeing a detailed programme for the next 12 months and an outline programme for subsequent phases of the development.

Present were the following members of the ICC steering group

- Seb Oliver                      ICC Scientist (Chair)
- Matt Griffin                  PI
- Paolo Andre                  (representing Laurent Vigroux, Co-PI and SAp Co-I)
- Bruce Swinyard              Instrument Scientist
- Ken King                      ICC Development Manager
- Matthew Graham            ICSTM DAPSAS Centre Manager
- Marc Sauvage                SAp DAPSAS Centre Manager
- Michael Rowan-Robinson   ICSTM Co-I

And the following Co-Is

- Jean-Paul Baluteau (Marseille)
- Paolo Saraceno            (IFSI)
- Göran Olofsson            (Stockholm)
- Ismael Perez-Fournon (IAC)
- Roger Emery                (RAL)
- Pierre Cox                  (IAS)
- \*\*\*\*\*                    (IFSI)

## **1. Report from ICC review panel**

Matt Griffin presented a summary of the ICC review panel's report (SPIRE-ICC-\*\*\*\*\*). It was noted that the ICC had already addressed many of the recommendations. The steering group accepted the review and instructed the ICC to address any remaining recommendations.

The ICC-DT should arrange an informal meeting with the review panel; soon and perhaps at the next ICC-DT meeting. The outcome of this would be a short report back to steering group.

## **2. Summary of reports from Co-Is contributing to the ICC**

Ken King presented a summary of the ICC human resources both in terms of the total effort available and the skills of the individuals (where known) this summary is attached. This included a proposed but as yet unconfirmed contribution from the Canadians. It was confirmed as a factually accurate representation of the current situation. Jean-Paul Baluteau commented that after 2004 CNES would possibly review the French contribution to the ICC.

## **3. Agreement of total ICC staff effort available from within the consortium for the ICC Development Phase.**

It was noted from Ken King's report that there was not enough total effort available to deliver the ICC as planned. In addition key skills were under-represented (e.g. FTS and calibration).

*Only two options appeared to be available*

- (i) Persuade ESA to provide additional staff effort preferably by funding appointments at ICC locations
- (ii) Deliver a reduced ICC

Following the Payload Funding meeting on June 19, ESA have set up a review under the chairmanship of Martin Kessler to examine the resourcing of the instrument ICCs and how ESA might support or take over some activities. In the context of this review, Matt Griffin and Ken King would inform ESA of our current situation and endeavour to persuade ESA of the need for additional resources within the SPIRE ICC

Ken King and the ICC-DT would draw up a plan for the ICC development based on the assumption of no additional resources materialising. As far as possible this plan should not compromise testing and operation of the instrument.

Ken King noted that we appear to have enough ICC resources at the moment for test programme, i.e. the full ICC could be completed if additional resources appeared in future years. This assumed that the ICC staff would not be required to do instrument team jobs in the testing. Bruce Swinyard said that if the Canadian's provide people for ILT this should be OK. It was noted that any shortfall in staffing at ILT would be a critical point.

#### **4. Proposed ICC Management Structure and workpackage definition**

Ken presented his revised management proposal (attached). Michael Rowan-Robinson proposed that the "Observation" team be called the "Observation & Science Data Reduction", accepted. Roger Emery suggested that the ICC shortfall and associated cuts be presented in terms of these teams. The proposal was accepted in principal, though the details would be studied later.

Leaders and deputy leaders were agreed for each team.

Calibration:	Marc Sauvage & Tanya Lim (Joint leaders)
Observation & Science Data Reduction:	Matt Fox & TBD (pref. from Sap Rene or Koryo?)
Operations team	Sunil Sidher & Sergio Molinari
Software team	Steve Guest & Matthew Graham
(Test team	Dave Smith)

Seb Oliver & Ken King would take an overview role.

The composition of the teams, their terms of reference and main actions would be defined by ICC-DT in a development of Ken King's current document.

#### **5. Proposed ICC Development work plan and schedule:**

Ken King presented a summary breakdown of the main packages over the next 12 months (attached).

Calibration:	6.5 months (which could be carried out remotely)
QLA:	66 months (which could be carried out remotely)
Instrument Information	8.5 months (some remote of which could be carried out remotely)
ILT support	2 months (effort must be located at RAL)
+ continuous tasks (include commenting on AIV documentation, defining)	

The total required effort was 83 months + TBD (TBD was difficult to cost as it included the creation of test scripts, could be covered by Canadians); this falls within the envelope of current resources. The WPs fit into instrument test schedule.

Not all WP for next year have been described to the required level of detail.

Observation WPs on how to carry out AOTs within test programme had not been costed or included in the plan. This would be the first task of Observation team.

Cardiff contribution to the testing at RAL would be 50% -100% f.t.e., some of which could be deployed on ICC activities.

## **6. Incorporating key instrumental expertise into the ICC**

We recognised the need for the instrument knowledge from the consortium (including e.g. that of the engineers building components such as the SMEC) needs to be fed into ICC development of photometer and FTS data processing.

One way this could happen would be through development of the simulation activity. Matt Griffin would write a note based on his presentation and arrange a "Kick off" simulation meeting. Michael Rowan-Robinson proposed identifying one or two key instrument people who can provide information to the simulations. The "Observation and Science Data processing" team should define WP prioritised by what is needed immediately and as a lower envelope.

It was seen as vital to maintain communication and thus have someone at Project level be aware of what the ICC is doing and bring key people in as necessary.

Future consortium meeting should feature a more prominent ICC report.

**Meeting ended at 16:10**