

# 2022-01-26 TSO WG Meeting notes

## Date

26 Jan 2022

## Attendees

- [Sarah Kendrew](#)
- [Nestor Espinoza](#)
- [Unknown User \(aroy\)](#)
- [Brian Brooks](#)
- [Diane Karakla](#)
- [Knicole Colon](#)
- [Loic Albert](#)
- [Michael Regan](#)
- [Unknown User \(birkmann\)](#)
- [Tony Keyes](#)
- [Everett Schlawin](#)
- [Leonardo Ubeda](#)

## Apologies:

## Meeting agenda:

1. News & Announcements.
2. TSO commissioning discussion
3. TSO task updates
4. Closing remarks

## Meeting slides

Meeting slides are on innerspace. Reach out to [Nestor Espinoza](#) to get them.

## Discussion items

Time	Item	Who	Notes
5 mins	<b>1. News &amp; announcements</b>	Everyone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ <a href="#">Sarah Kendrew</a> stepping down as TSO WG Deputy Lead during commissioning.</li><li>▪ <a href="#">Knicole Colon</a> asks about the JWebinars — when are the TSO ones going to be uploaded? <a href="#">Nestor Espinoza</a> mentions Cami Pacifici and JWebbinar team heavily working on this. Probably by the end of the month, but nothing certain (ton to do on all fronts!).</li><li>▪ <a href="#">Loic Albert</a> advertises that he will be presenting in the CalWebb WG on not to use photom step for SOSS, as this poses troubles for the spectral extraction. Will also discuss if to perhaps move photom step after so it is a 1D correction.</li></ul>
25min	<b>2. TSO commissioning</b>	<a href="#">Nestor Espinoza</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Discussion as to whether push for target changes should be done sooner rather than later. Two questions on strategy: timing, and whether request should be done jointly between instruments.</li><li>▪ The main question is how to make it easy for the JDB to understand this need as efficiently as possible. <a href="#">Nestor Espinoza</a> sent some e-mails to figure this out. <a href="#">Sarah Kendrew</a> mentions that commissioning leads on each instrument should be aware of anything we say to the JDB — so plan is to coordinate with them as well. After that, perhaps go to Scott et al. to figure out how to move forward.</li><li>▪ Consensus is that the best would be to start movement on this by mid-February. Main questions to answer are: why not wait until ERS observations? Why not proposed targets before?</li></ul>
	<b>3. TSO Task updates</b>		

		<a href="#">Nestor Espinoza</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updates on <a href="#">Leonardo Ubeda</a> 's NIRSpec pipeline validation. He found that for some pixels, errors on the slope are zeroes. Unclear why this is so. He also finds that (scatter)/(pipeline-estimated errorbars) is actually smaller than 1 by a factor of ~0.7.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Michael Regan</a> suggested that this factor is suspiciously close to <math>1/\sqrt{2}</math>. Might be a reference file issue? <a href="#">Unknown User (birkmann)</a> mentions that the reference file includes this factor due to CDS.</li> <li>• Zero-slopes also a mystery. Loïc mentions that he also saw this whenever groups had negative counts, but the effect disappeared in further versions of the pipeline.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Nestor Espinoza</a> mentions <a href="#">Everett Schlawin</a> shared ROEBA code to replace reference pixel correction. <a href="#">Loïc Albert</a> will work on using it for SOSS. <a href="#">Nestor Espinoza</a> suggests <a href="#">Leonardo Ubeda</a> uses it as well for NIRSpec. What about MIRI? <a href="#">Sarah Kendrew</a> unsure as to how well reference pixels do on MIRI. Will ask the Ramps-to-Slopes MIRI group and report back.</li> </ul>
2 mins	<b>4. Closing Remarks</b>	<a href="#">Nestor Espinoza</a>	Next meeting will be a hard one for <a href="#">Nestor Espinoza</a> to lead. If there is nothing urgent to report on, he proposes to skip it.