

Director's response
ATUC meeting 9th and 10th December 2004

Actions from meeting	Director's response
2. ATUC business	
b) Retirements and replacements (raised by ATUC)	
<i>Will the Director forward ATUC nominations for replacements to the ATSC?</i>	Yes: The names have been forwarded to the chair of the ATSC for consideration at the next sub-committee meeting. <i>Green</i>
4. Matters arising from Director's response	
b) Do ATUC comments get back to staff (raised by ATUC)	
<i>Do ATUC comments under the "Celebrating Success" section of the ATUC report get forwarded to ATNF staff?</i>	Yes: Comments directly emailed to all staff in announcement regarding availability of ATUC report. <i>Green</i>
d) Comments on effectiveness of six month terms (raised by users)	
<i>Will the ATNF adopt ATUCs suggestion that the Parkes schedule be produced in a more timely fashion?</i>	The ATNF acknowledge that the timely production of the Parkes schedule is an important performance indicator. The goal is to produce the full schedule within 1 month of the TAC meeting. <i>Green</i>
<i>Will the ATNF adopt ATUCs suggestion that email notification of TAC outcomes be used, rather than via the regular post?</i>	The ATNF will notify users of ATUC outcomes by email in future. <i>Green</i>
e) More concise requests for responses from ATUC (raised by Director)	
<i>Is the Director happy with the format of ATUC requests used in this report?</i>	Yes
6. High priority items for ATUC discussion	
a) In some instances, ATCA DAs for remote observers and inexperienced users have been completely unprepared to give the required support. Does ATUC have any recommendation to make on this issue? (raised by user)	
<i>Will the ATNF adopt the ATUC suggestion that new DAs be required to arrive at the ATCA on the Monday, rather than Wednesday?</i>	The Director thanks ATUC for bringing this important issue to ATNF's attention. The quality of the DA support is a crucial measure of the ATNF's performance as a National Facility. To this end, the ATNF have developed a policy statement regarding DAs which seeks to address the issues raised by ATUC. <i>Green</i>
<i>Will the ATNF adopt the ATUC suggestion that an induction be run each year to train new and inexperienced DAs?</i>	

b) Does ATUC have a view as to the priority of the following major projects, given that there are time/effort/return tradeoffs between them (raised via Director's report and ATCA/Mopra report)	
<i>Will the ATNF adopt ATUCs suggested option for the Mopra 3mm system?</i>	ATNF thanks ATUC for the consideration of these options. Subsequently significant risks were identified regarding ATUC's favour option (2). Additionally half of the best ranked proposals from the TAC process during semester 2005APR require the SIS system, whereas 20% would significantly benefit from the multi-line filterbank. ATNF has decided to offer the SIS system for the early part of the winter, and plans to switch to the MMIC system and wideband filterbank near the end of the season. <i>Yellow</i>
<i>Will the ATNF consider ATUCs priorities for these three projects?</i>	
c) Can ATUC comment on the progress and review of the CABB project? (raised by ATUC via CABB presentation)	
<i>Will the ATNF conduct a design review of the CABB project in December 2005 and aim to make specific decisions on the special requirements for the CABB?</i>	The time scale a for design review of CABB will be set following the DEST review of the program in May 2005. Currently, the ATNF favour a design review on a somewhat earlier time scale than ATUC have indicated. <i>Green</i>
d) Can ATUC comment on the 7mm frequency range that will be useful to users, given that there are technical tradeoffs between different options. (raised via 7mm science case presentation)	
<i>Does the ATNF think that a one-day meeting to discuss the technical and scientific requirements of the ATCA 7mm system, and the impact on users, would be useful to the project?</i>	The ATNF has asked the project scientist for the 7mm system to organise such a workshop during 2005. Some co-ordination might be required/desirable with similar workshops for the CABB and xNTD also proposed during 2005. <i>Green</i>
e) There are a number of proposals for 12mm receiver upgrade projects. Can ATUC comment on their priority? (raised in Tidbinbilla, Parkes, technology development reports).	
<i>Will the ATNF consider ATUCs suggested priorities for 12mm upgrades?</i>	A project plan to upgrade the 12mm receiver at Parkes will be submitted by April 2005.
<i>Can the ATNF advise ATUC of the feasibility of carrying out an upgrade to the Tidbinbilla 12mm system as an extension of the Parkes upgrade?</i>	The production of spares for the 12mm receivers on the ATCA is proceeding and due for completion by June 2005. The existing project concept document for a 12mm upgrade of Tidbinbilla had the receiver upgrade being paid for and carried out by JPL. If the proposal is now that ATNF do this work, a new concept document for this work will need to be submitted to the ATNF Project Review Board. <i>Green</i>
f) What is the useful lifetime of the 21 cm multibeam? (Question from ATNF)	

<p><i>Will ATNF consider ATUCs suggestion of a limited phase 2 refurbishment of the 21cm multibeam receiver?</i></p> <p><i>Will ATNF advise ATUC as to how long would be required to replace the remaining LNAs on the 21cm multibeam receiver?</i></p>	<p>A project plan for a scaled-back refurbishment of the Multibeam receiver will be submitted by March 2005. In line with ATUC's suggestion, the refurbishment is likely to consist only of;</p> <p>(a) replacement of all remaining original LNAs, (b) other minor modifications or repairs of an urgent nature, (c) upgrading the refrigerators (little labour required in this)</p> <p>Several of the original LNAs in the 20cm MB have deteriorated since re-installation and are exhibiting low-level instabilities. This strengthens the case for undertaking the refurbishment as early as possible in 05OctT. <i>Green</i></p>
g) Methanol multibeam vs 21 cm multibeam at any one time at Parkes. (raised via Parkes report)	
<p><i>Will the ATNF provide ATUC with a scheduling plan for the multibeam receivers for the 2005 October and 2006 April terms at the next ATUC meeting?</i></p>	<p>A scheduling plan for the two multibeam receivers in 05OctT and 06AprT, or a full range of possible options, will be presented at the June 2005 ATUC meeting for discussion. It is the ATNF's intention to allow the precise scheduling plan to be determined as much as possible by user demand.</p> <p>As noted elsewhere, instabilities in some of the original 20cm MB LNAs would appear to make a good case for completing the MB refurbishment early in 05OctT rather than later. <i>Green</i></p>
<p><i>Will ATNF provide technical information on the scheduling of the multibeam receivers in the call for proposals for the October 2005 term, as well as technical information on the feasibility and timescales for multibeam receiver changes?</i></p>	<p>It is the ATNF's intention to allow a flexible scheduling plan driven as much as possible by user demand. The detailed technical, logistical and scheduling constraints applying to changes of the Multibeam receivers will be outlined in the 05OctT call for proposals according to the best information available at the time. <i>Green</i></p>
h) Strategic review of ATNF software. Would ATUC like to be involved? In what capacity? (raised in Director's report and Application software report)	
<p><i>Is the ATNF happy for ATUC to start work with Dave McConnell on setting out the Terms of Reference for the software review?</i></p>	Yes <i>Green</i>
<p><i>Does ATNF support the participation of Tim Cornwell in this review?</i></p>	Yes, Time Cornwell will participate in the review if possible <i>Green</i>
7. Director's report/Project management report	
a) Need to remove future developments pages from ATNF web site and make summary of project management database available to public (raised via ATUC)	
<p><i>Will ATNF remove the future developments pages from the ATNF web site?</i></p>	Yes <i>Green</i>
<p><i>Will ATNF make some form of the projects database publicly available via the web?</i></p>	Yes <i>Green</i>

8. ATCA/Mopra Report	
a) Overseas remote observing (raised by user)	
<i>Will ATNF adopt the ATUC suggestion that overseas observers need not be a DA before being allowed to remote observe from overseas?</i>	Yes. Although ATNF reserves the right to formally approve all requests for overseas remote observing. <i>Green</i>
9. Parkes report	
a) SETI receiver - any reason to resurrect it? (question from ATNF)	
<i>ATUC were asked if there were any reasons to resurrect the SETI receiver for use at Parkes. After ATUC discussion it was decided that there were no reasons for doing this.</i>	Remounting the SETI in the Parkes focus cabin for general observing does not look to be technically practicable. That frequency coverage provided exclusively by the SETI receiver would probably be more simply obtained through other means. <i>Red</i>
10. National facility report	
a) ToO policy and feedback on ToO proposals (raised by users)	
<i>Can the ATNF advise ATUC as to the detailed criteria used to assess ToO proposals?</i>	Consistent with its treatment of normal proposals, the ATNF considers it inappropriate (and probably impossible) to produce detailed criteria (e.g. weights) for the assessment of ToOs. Assessment is made by the Director on the basis of science and technical feasibility in consultation where appropriate with the relevant OiC(s) and TAC chair. <i>Yellow</i>
<i>Can the ATNF revise the webpages on ToO proposals to make clearer to users how their proposals are assessed i.e. what weight is given to which criteria?</i>	
b) ATCA SCHED (raised by users)	
<i>Will ATNF consolidate and revise SCHED information on the web, providing a single high-level link to this information for users?</i>	This has been done. All of the information on Sched has now been consolidated on the single web page www.narrabri.atnf.csiro.au/observing/sched <i>Green</i> A high level link to the SCHED page and to other observers tools will be provided at www.atnf.csiro.au/observers
d) Marsfield friend (raised by users)	
<i>Will the ATNF adopt the ATUC suggestion that overseas users who request friends be encouraged to meet their friend before travelling to Narrabri?</i>	Yes – now included in information sent out to relevant users. <i>Green</i>
i) Overseas representation on TAC (raised by users)	
<i>Will the ATNF consider appointing overseas representatives to the TAC?</i>	The ATNF has considered this request, but does not consider it an appropriate option. Formally the ATNF has no obligation to provide time to overseas proposers, and therefore the ATNF is under no obligation to include overseas TAC members. The fact that a purely Australian TAC chooses to give 40% of the time to overseas proposals thus provides a clear indication from the community that it supports this process. <i>Red</i>
12. Broadband ATCA front end	
a) Does ATUC consider the proposed upgrade valuable? (question from ATNF)	
<i>ATNF response optional</i>	
b) Does ATUC have any comments on the proposed	

frequency ranges of 1-3 GHz and 4 – 12 GHz? (question from ATNF)	
<i>Will the ATNF adopt the ATUC suggestion that 1-3 GHz has a higher priority than 4- 12 GHz?</i>	ATUC's recommendation has been noted and will be factored into the planning of this project when activated. <i>Green</i>
c) Does ATUC have any specific suggestions for items to be included in the science case? (question from ATNF)	
<i>Will the project scientist look at the advantages of the same system for Mopra and provide example MFS (u,v) coverages for the ATCA, showing the effect of the broadband system?</i>	Yes <i>Green</i>
d) Would ATUC be satisfied with the insertion of notch filters for RFI at the price of an increase in the overall system temperature? (question from ATNF)	
<i>Will the ATCA broadband backend and frontend projects consult over the overall RFI mitigation strategies that will be implemented at the ATCA?</i>	Yes <i>Green</i>
13. Technology development report	
a) Doubling of 6 GHz multibeam bandwidth to 600 MHz for pulsars (question from ATNF)	
<i>Will ATNF adopt ATUCs suggestion that the bandwidth on the methanol multibeam receiver be doubled to 600 MHz?</i>	The ATNF plans to design the system in such a way that an eventual 600MHz bandwidth could be made available for pulsar observations. This will require an additional conversion system to be provided by Jodrell Bank. ATUC also mentioned an improved "continuum sensitivity" with the wider bandwidth. ATNF notes that there are no plans to provide a wideband continuum backend. <i>Green</i>
14. NTD report	
a) Comments on the NTD/xNTD plans? (raised by ATUC)	
<i>Will the planned NTD/xNTD science workshop be useful for the ATNF?</i>	Yes, we thank ATUC for their willingness to help organise this.

22 Green

2 Yellow

2 Red