

**ATNF Director's response  
ATUC meeting 2 December 2005**

ATUC Comments	Director's response	Traffic light
<p><b>2a. Welcome to new members (raised by ATUC)</b></p> <p>New members: Kate Brooks, Alyson Ford, Melanie Johnston-Hollitt, Katherine Newton McGee, Stuart Ryder and Rachel Webster</p> <p><i>ATNF response optional</i></p>		
<p><b>2b. Nomination of new ATUC members (raised by ATUC)</b></p> <p>Nominations: Andrew Walsh (UNSW); Erwin de Blok (RSAA); Ramesh Bhat (Swinburne); Steve Longmore (UNSW) <b>student</b>; Sarah Maddison (Swinburne); Andrew Hopkins (Sydney); Merve Lynch (Curtin); Cliff Senkbeil (UTas) student; Annie Hughes (Swinburne) <b>student</b>; George Hobbs (ATNF)</p> <p><i>Could the ATNF please pass these nominations to the Steering Committee, for consideration at its next meeting.</i></p>	<p>The ATSC meets on 4,5 April. These nominations will be sent to the ATSC.</p>	<p>green</p>
<p><b>2c. New ATUC Secretary</b></p> <p><i>Could the ATNF think about a replacement for the ATUC Secretary position, following the June 2006 meeting, please.</i></p>	<p>The ATNF is seeking a new ATUC secretary.</p>	<p>green</p>
<p><b>2d. New ATUC Chair</b></p> <p><i>Could the ATNF pass to the Steering Committee the need to appoint a new ATUC Chair at their next meeting, please.</i></p>	<p>The ATSC will be informed of the need for a new ATUC chair.</p>	<p>green</p>

<p><b>2e. Substitute members</b></p> <p>ATUC would like to recommend that members be able to nominate a substitute, one month before an ATUC meeting, if that member cannot attend.</p> <p><i>Does the ATNF and the Steering Committee approve this recommendation?</i></p>	<p>This question will be put to the ATSC.</p>	<p>green</p>
<p><b>2f. Dates for the next meeting</b></p> <p>ATUC identify the first week of June 2006 (before June 15 ATNF proposal deadline) as a time range for the next ATUC meeting?</p> <p><i>Does this time range work for the ATNF?</i></p>	<p>The ATNF proposes 6,7 June 2006 for the next ATUC meeting.</p>	<p>green</p>
<p><b>3. Report from last meeting</b></p> <p>That the ATUC report from the June 2005 meeting be accepted.</p> <p><i>ATNF response optional</i></p>		
<p><b>4. Matters arising from Director's Response</b></p> <p><b>4a. ATUC Vice-Chair</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Does the Steering Committee approve the role of Vice Chair of ATUC, in order to assist the Chair with various ATUC activities and provide overlap and continuity between successive Chairs?</i></li> <li>2. <i>If the Steering Committee approves the above, what does the Steering Committee think about the succession of Vice-Chairs to the Chair?</i></li> </ol>	<p>These questions will be put to the ATSC.</p>	<p>green</p>
<p><b>5. Celebrating Success</b></p> <p><i>ATNF Response Optional</i></p>		
<p><b>6. High Priority Items for ATUC Discussion</b></p> <p><b>6a. 3 mm season follow-up report (raised by ATUC)</b></p> <p><b>6a(i). Suggestion for "priority" 3 mm proposals</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Will the ATNF adopt the use of Director's time and swap time in priority for highly ranked 3 mm projects?</i></li> <li>2. <i>Will the ATNF adopt the recommendation that low ranked but scheduled 3 mm observations not be replaced by highly ranked 3 mm projects in the case of bad weather for the highly ranked projects?</i></li> </ol>	<p>The approaches of (1) and (2) are usually followed in practice. With regard (1): although this is the normal practice the opportunities are limited. It is usually the case that the best proposals all require the same sidereal time range.</p>	<p>green</p>
<p><b>6a(ii). 3 mm documentation</b></p> <p><i>Will the ATNF review and rationalize the existing 3 mm</i></p>	<p>Tony's script and documentation is linked from the Narrabri observers' page -- 3mm guide. It does need updating which will be done as resources permit.</p>	<p>yellow</p>

<i>documentation and incorporate Tony Wong's 3 mm pipeline reduction scripts into the documentation?</i>		
<b>6a(iii) Flux calibration</b> <i>Will the Narrabri Observatory attempt to ensure that primary calibration is done at 3 mm with suitable sources at suitable intervals.</i>	<p>Observatory staff will continue attempting to ensure optimum primary calibration. There are significant practical difficulties that cannot always be overcome. Flux calibration of the ATCA at 3mm is an issue. It is dealt with in the (updated) Miriad 3mm chapter and an item in the coming ATNF Newsletter. Basically von Hoerner (the classic paper on the limits to dish sizes) says that, given the ATCA dish construction style, the ATCA dishes are twice the size of what is sensible for 3mm observing. One consequence of this is we have to be quite particular about flux calibration step if you want good accuracy.</p>	yellow
<b>6a(iv) 3 mm remote observing</b> <i>ATNF response optional</i>		
<b>6a(v) Change to Observer's Questionnaire</b> <i>Will the ATNF add this question (asking the observer what percentage of their TAC-ranked project was successfully completed) to the Observer's Questionnaire?</i>	<p>This seems unnecessary. The ATNF already estimates downtime statistics that are made public.</p>	red
<b>6a(vi) Bad weather reverting to Director's time</b> <i>Can the ATNF point ATUC to the formal documentation that states that bad weather reverts to Director's time? If this policy is not documented on the web, could it be added somewhere appropriate, please?</i>	<p><a href="http://www.narrabri.atnf.csiro.au/observing/weatheroverride.html">http://www.narrabri.atnf.csiro.au/observing/weatheroverride.html</a></p>	green
<b>6b. ATCA 3mm upgrade</b> <i>Will ATNF explore future possibilities for upgrading the ATCA to 115 GHz?</i>	<p>Yes. The ATNF personnel required for the 115GHz upgrade are fully committed to the 7mm upgrade until mid-2007. The 115GHz upgrade will be considered when priorities are set for the following period.</p>	green
<b>6b(ii) 3 mm ATCA polarization upgrade separate from 115 GHz?</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Can ATNF provide clarification of the general improvement in calibration from such a system, i.e. is this the normal Tsys calibration scheme that operates at cm wavelengths?</i></li> <li><i>Further, can ATNF provide some additional clarification of the level of resources that such an upgrade would require, compared to a full upgrade to 115 GHz?</i></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes. It involves the injection of a calibration noise signal of known polarisation, without which the polarisation properties of the array can not be calibrated. It is, however, unlikely to improve the effects of gain instabilities, as evidence is building that these are due mainly to changes in the beam efficiency of the antenna.</li> <li>Approximately 30% of the full upgrade. Even at this level it would not be possible to begin this work until after the 7mm upgrade is completed.</li> </ol>	green

<p><b>6c. Prioritisation of instruments at the observatories.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Will the ATNF add Tidbinbilla instrumentation to the instrumentation summary?</i></li> <li>2. <i>Will the ATNF undertake a major review of instrumentation, concentrating on the 2008/2009 timeframe and beyond, specifically to address the transition to new instruments such as the xNTD and SKA phase 1?</i></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes</li> <li>2. The ATNF is keen to put in place a mechanism for longer-term planning of instrumentation. A single review is not necessarily the best approach. A possible model is a series of relatively broad and informal internal for a to be fed into less frequent (quasi-annual) open discussion of future instrumentation.</li> </ol>	yellow
<p><b>6d. 21 cm Parkes multibeam refurbishment, phase II.</b></p> <p><i>Will the ATNF adopt the ATUC recommendation on timing of the multibeam refurbishment?</i></p>	The 2 <sup>nd</sup> stage 21cm MB refurbishment will take place early in the 2006Oct term as recommended by ATUC.	green
<p><b>6e. University/ATNF collaboration/appointments/resource sharing</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Is ATNF willing to jointly appoint Bolton Fellows with universities, depending on a suitable funding profile?</i></li> <li>2. <i>Could ATNF come up with a mechanism on the CSIRO side that would make this possible and approach the universities with their ideas?</i></li> </ol>	The general question of the balance of astrophysics resources between the ATNF and the Universities will be raised at the coming ATSC meeting. It is expected that possible models for CSIRO/University partnerships including joint appointments will be discussed.	yellow
<p><b>6f. MIRIAD review, support, maintenance, new features</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>What is the ATNF response to the software review (undertaken in May 2005) that ATUC participated in?</i></li> <li>2. <i>Will the ATNF undertake a major overhaul of MIRIAD in the near future?</i></li> <li>3. <i>Will on-going support of MIRIAD be maintained at a suitable level in the long term, 0.5 – 1.0 FTE?</i></li> <li>4. <i>In the process of developing a requirements document for this upgrade, will users be surveyed for a list of essential upgrades and additions to be made to MIRIAD?</i></li> <li>5. <i>Will the ATNF explore and strengthen the links to the BIMA/CARMA MIRIAD developments?</i></li> <li>6. <i>Will the ATNF put more thought into the distribution of new MIRIAD releases, keeping users up to date with changes, patches etc via a mailing list, regularly updated web page etc.</i></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The ATNF response has now been transmitted to ATUC.</li> <li>2. 2 – 6: A review of miriad will be conducted to address these questions in March 2006. (LSS)</li> </ol>	yellow
<p><b>7. Director's Report</b></p> <p><b>7a NCRIS</b></p> <p><i>Will universities have a chance to participate in NCRIS in the same way as occurred for the MNRF program?</i></p>	Universities will have the opportunity to contribute fully to the development of the NCRIS investment proposal (via the facilitator) for the priority infrastructure identified in the Strategic Roadmap. This will include University participation in both the development and utilisation of the	green

	infrastructure.	
<b>8. ATCA and Mopra Report</b> <b>8a. future Array configs</b> <b>8b. Advice on 3mm productivity</b> <i>ATNF response optional</i>		
<b>8c. Online software</b> <i>Will the ATNF look into the various suggestions for the improvement of the ATCA online software that have been given?</i>	<p>The ATNF continues to work on improving reliability of the new linux-based ATCA interface. New functionality of the kind suggested (new scan options, and integration of Sched, OPAL etc) will be addressed as resources permit. Although the ATNF recognizes the value of the on-line imaging system, there are no resources available at present to pursue this.</p>	yellow
<b>8d. Thunderstorms at ATCA</b> <i>Will the procedure for dealing with storms be clearly defined in the Users Manual? It should be made clear in the manual that users should only deal with generators themselves as a last resort. The Duty Astronomer should always be called out first.</i>	<p>The Users' Guide is already explicit about the expertise required for dealing with the generators: <b>"This is a job for experienced staff, so please contact the Duty Astronomer or local staff if you suspect you should be using the generators."</b></p> <p>The Guide continues by giving detailed instructions on the procedures.</p>	green
<b>8e DA system</b> <i>ATNF response optional</i>		
<b>8f. Financial implications to universities of complete remote operation at Mopra</b> <i>Could the ATNF make available an on-site cottage at the ATCA for rent to long term Mopra users over the 2006 winter season?</i>	<p>UNSW observers have been given the option of staying at Mopra this season (not observing remotely from ATCA). ATCA site housing is currently under review because of several staff movements. No commitment to offer housing to Mopra observers can be made at present (March 2006).</p>	yellow
<b>8i. Phones at lodge</b> (Phones in all rooms.) <i>ATNF response optional</i>		
<b>8j. Mopra washing machine</b> <i>ATNF response optional</i>		

<p><b>9. Parkes Report</b></p> <p><b>9a. Meals</b></p> <p><i>If this (night lunches) is possible and does not happen already, ATUC would really appreciate it if this could be introduced. Can it?</i></p>	<p>There should no problem in having night lunches (a luncheon meal set aside to be eaten later in lieu of a standard evening meal), provided the cook is given reasonable notice. A meal diary at Parkes is provided for the purpose of requesting non-standard meal times or arrangements.</p>	<p>green</p>
<p><b>10. Tidbinbilla Report</b></p> <p><b>10a. ATUC may wish to consider making the following recommendation to ATNF:</b></p> <p>ATUC recommend that DSS-34 time is made available at the next Announcement of Opportunity and that the ATNF support observations on a best-efforts basis with current resources.</p> <p><i>Will the ATNF adopt the ATUC recommendation?</i></p>	<p>At time of writing (March 2006) NASA have not yet started to allocate DSS-34 time for radio astronomy. Until they do it seems premature to be offering this facility. Therefore we propose to begin offering DSS-34 once radio astronomy allocations begin appearing in the NASA schedule. This is likely to be the 2007 April semester</p>	<p>yellow</p>
<p><b>11. LBA Report</b></p>		
<p><b>12. National Facility Office Report</b></p> <p><b>12a. Trade ATCA time for time on overseas facilities</b></p> <p><i>ATNF response optional</i></p>		
<p><b>12b. ToO Criteria.</b></p> <p><i>Will the ATNF place the full criteria at an appropriate location on the ATNF web site?</i></p>	<p>Yes The information is now at:  <a href="http://www.atnf.csiro.au/observers/apply/too_apply.html">http://www.atnf.csiro.au/observers/apply/too_apply.html</a></p>	<p>green</p>
<p><b>12c. email communication</b></p> <p><i>ATNF response optional</i></p>		
<p><b>12d. 6 month terms</b></p> <p><i>ATNF response optional</i></p>		
<p><b>12e. Mopra/Parkes online archives</b></p> <p><i>Will the recommendations on data archiving from the ATNF software review in May be implemented?</i></p>	<p>ATOA was undertaken with a large amount of external (CMIS) help with the Compact Array specifically in mind. It is technically difficult to extend this system to Mopra and Parkes. However, we will investigate it, as well as an alternative scheme of homogenizing the interfaces to our single-dish telescopes alone. However, the commitment is likely to be significant and the work, once scoped, will need to be prioritized by ATUC and the ATNF.</p>	
<p><b>12f. ATNF Synthesis Workshop</b></p> <p>1. <i>Will the ATNF guarantee that the synthesis imaging school will go ahead next year?</i></p> <p>2. <i>Would the ATNF like to discuss alternative models for graduate training in radio astronomy.</i></p>	<p>1. A synthesis Imaging Workshop has been scheduled for 18-22 September. The budget for this is yet to be approved.</p> <p>2. The ATNF would be happy to hear of alternative models.</p>	<p>green</p>

<p><b>12g. Instrumentation summary</b> <i>ATNF response optional</i></p>		
<p><b>13. Software and Computing Report</b> <b>13a. Laptops</b> <i>ATNF response optional</i></p>		
<p><b>13b. ASAP email list</b> <i>Was ASAP released widely? Will the ATNF review the distribution of ASAP, along the same lines as same question ATUC ask of MIRIAD distribution?</i></p>	<p>ASAP 1.2 was released on 30 November 2005 and advertised at: the ATUC meeting of Dec 1; by an ATNF news item (1903); and by email to the ATNF astro exploder. Future releases will follow initially the same model (as opposed to the current silent and continuous miriad model).</p>	<p>green</p>
<p><b>13c. RPFITS</b> <i>Can an RPFITS installation procedure be included in the MIRIAD installation script?</i></p>	<p>The ATNF has been testing an improved version of the RPFITS installation program that should simplify installation. This could be merged with the miriad installer if enough requests are received. To date a single request has been made via ATUC. The address for bug reports and feature requests is <a href="mailto:miriad@atnf.csiro.au">miriad@atnf.csiro.au</a>.</p>	<p>yellow</p>
<p><b>13d. MIRIAD email list</b> <i>ATNF response optional</i></p>		
<p><b>13e. Marsfield fault report system</b> <i>ATNF response optional</i></p>		

<p><b>14. Astrophysics Report</b></p> <p><i>Is there any particular reason why no ATCA 3mm results were highlighted in the last astrophysics report?</i></p>	<p>The ATNF is keen to highlight high impact 3mm results to inform users of the new scientific capabilities of the ATCA. Such results were included in the previous (Dec 2004) ATUC presentation meeting and in Newsletters during 2005. The 2006 AT Steering Committee astrophysics report includes two 3-mm items both of which have featured, or will feature, in the AT Newsletter. The Head of Astrophysics would welcome suggestions from ATUC members for new highlights, ATCA 3mm and otherwise, to be included in the next ATUC astrophysics report.</p>	<p>green</p>
<p><b>15. mm White Paper</b></p> <p><i>ATNF response optional</i></p>		
<p><b>16. Technology Development Report</b></p>		
<p><b>17. Any Other Business</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Will the positions project database be made redundant by ATOA/OPAL?</i></li> <li>2. <i>If not, can the positions archive be updated soon, please?</i></li> </ol>	<p>The positions database has been updated to August 2005 and will be updated again before the next deadline.</p> <p>At present there is some doubling of effort with information separately recorded through the ATOA and the positions database. Following some upgrades to the ATOA and OPAL we do plan to remove the positions database. This will be done after the new webmaster is appointed.</p>	<p>green</p>