

Chandra Users Committee Meeting Report

March 29, 2021

Meeting Summary: Pat Slane provided a summary of the status of the mission and addressed several previous requests by the CUC. Repro V is on track for completion in the fall, after which work on the next version of the Chandra Source Catalog (CSC) will commence and will prioritize new data. The following version of the CSC, which will include the remaining publicly available archival observations, is expected to be finished ~ 1 year after the completion of Repro V (i.e., Fall 2022). Subsequent updates are then expected annually thereafter. An update was also provided on the revisiting of Exclusive Use Period policies for Chandra data. For now, the previous exclusive use policies will remain unchanged, with some possible exceptions to specific time-domain studies. The policies for these data set releases are still under discussion by a time-domain working group. Finally, Pat shared that the CXC will be in discussions with the ALMA board to lobby for a future joint ALMA-Chandra proposal opportunity. As of now, ALMA does not participate in joint programs with NASA missions, but has agreed to bring the topic up at their board meeting, which will take place in April (next month).

Andrea Prestwich provided a summary of the Chandra Cycle 23 proposal statistics and briefly discussed the review process. Although an attempt was made to provide a built-in tool for proposers to see Resource Cost estimates up front while preparing their proposals, the CXC was unable to get this ready in time for this proposal round. They will, however, have this ready for next year. The Cycle 23 oversubscription remained very similar to that of Cycle 22 (a factor of ~ 5 in terms of time request), with some decrease in the submissions to the LP category. This decreased LP request could potentially be due to the fact that there was an excess of time available in Cycle 22 that was awarded to the BPP. The proposal review this year (2021) will be remote and similar to the Cycle 22 review, with 5 days dedicated to the main review, and then an additional 2 days for the BPP. For Cycle 23, however, more time will be allotted for chair discussions on the last day of the main review and then a reading day has been added on the Monday before the BPP discussion. Also, a Google-based tool will be used this year to more efficiently allow the exchange of notes and editing of panel reviews.

Paul Green gave an overview of the results from last year's Hubble Fellowship Program competition, discussed demographic survey studies underway for past fellows, and provided a status update on the SDSS V program. 24 Hubble fellows have been identified and have accepted, 8 of whom are Einstein fellows. A press release is expected in April, including the new fellows bios, etc., and a symposium will take place in September 2021. The CXC is now paying for a membership for SDSS V data access. They expect that, by the end of SDSS-V (about 5 years from now), spectral properties will be available for perhaps $\sim 50\%$ of the 155K counterparts to CSC 2.0 objects (which is itself near 50% of the CSC2 catalog). These properties will be made publicly accessible by the CXC.

CUC Discussion and Recommendation: The CUC was happy with the CXC's continued efforts to address past recommendations by the committee. In particular, the CUC thanks the CXC for their efforts in moving forward on discussions with ALMA about joint observing time. Discussions within the committee were mainly focused on the upcoming proposal review, with some additional discussion on proprietary periods and the format of future CUC meetings and communications. Polling of the CUC showed that out of 8 respondents, 5 preferred that future fall CUC meetings continue to follow the in-person format; the 3 remaining respondents had a preference for online meetings, with 2 stating that in-person would also be fine. Given these results, it seems that the in-person format is valuable to many, however, an option to join virtually should remain possible (as it has in past meetings).

After a year of virtual proposal reviews, some members of the committee have witnessed issues related to panelists having to disappear due to at-home responsibilities (e.g., childcare responsibilities). These issues can lead to delays in completing the reviews and an unfair review process from having to fill in for

MIA reviewers. *To help mitigate these issues in the forthcoming proposal review, the CUC recommends that review panels (1) informally name a back-up secondary on all proposals in the event that such an interruption occurs and (2) require that the panels set clear deadlines for when certain activities should be completed (e.g., finish discussions by X time/date, complete primary reviews by Y time/date, etc.) to help stay on track and set expectations.*

The CUC also discussed options for future proposal review formats (virtual vs in-person). The CUC suggested considering a scenario (for future reviews after Cycle 23) where potential panelists be given an option to join in-person or virtually to easily expand the number of available reviewers and balance review formats (if needed). For example, one could make the questions asked to potential reviewers: “Will you participate in the Chandra review this year? Would you prefer an in-person panel or a virtual panel? Are you flexible in your preference if necessary?”