2023-05-31 TSO WG Meeting notes

Date

31 May 2023

Attendees

- Brian Brooks
- Sarah Kendrew
- Michael ReganJeroen Bouwman
- Leonardo Ubeda
- Loic Albert
- Unknown User (birkmann)
- Nikolay Nikolov

Apologies

- Everett Schlawin Nestor Espinoza

Meeting agenda

- 1. News & Announcements
- 2. TSO upcoming observations 3. TSO WG FY2024 planning
- 4. JWST Cycle 3 preparation
- 5. Roundtable check-in.

Discussion items

Time	Item	Who	Notes
5min	1. Ne ws & Annou nceme nts		Nikolay Nikolov mentions that SASP students will be arriving this weekend and start their projects next week. NN's student will be comparing public 1/f algorithms on NIRCam data.
	2. TSO upcomi ng observ ations	Nikolay Nikolov	Nikolay Nikolov summarized observations over the past two weeks; all executed successfully and the data is archived on the MAST. Next two weeks focus on exoplanets and ISM (for higher SNR) and will be using all JWST science instruments.
	3. TSO WG FY202 4 planning	Everyo ne	 Nikolay Nikolov mentions that it is the time of the year to start planning FY2024 priorities for the TSO WG and invites the members of the TSO WG to propose ideas by reaching the TSO WG and communicate feedback. Part of the meeting was dedicated to brainstorm potential tasks with the results outlined below. Brainstorm ideas during the meeting: Reassessing the maximum exposure/visit duration for Time Series observations (Sarah Kendrew): Sarah Kendrew points out the problem of having a limit of 24h on TSOs and suggests an investigation on the decision and its eventual reassessment for TSOs. Sarah Kendrew mentions that there are observations that request ~50hr long TSO and points out a work around solution, which covers the observation with two separate exposures. This could be done in one go, if the limitation is lifted. Sarah Kendrew and Brian Brooks point out that this issue has been captured by STScl: JPPS-1068. Michael Regan and Unknown User (birkmann) mention that the limit thas been set to impose a stop of observations that have taken long time executing. Optimization of individual pipeline calibration steps (Sarah Kendrew): a. Sarah Kendrew suggests that there are several topics that can be researched in the next year, relevant on detector calibration in the context of MIRI including, ramp fitting, jump detection, etc., depending on ho much the TSO WG would like to go in optimizing the pipeline. Nikolay Nikolav mentions that this will be coordinated with the TSO WG would like to go in optimizing the pipeline is to handle data that is on the archive in order to enable the data use by the science community. Improvement of the reference files for all JWST instruments (Loic Albert): a. Loic Albert mentions that SOSS background and super bias are particularly important and need improvement Investigate transmission spectra across multiple JWST instruments (Nikolay Nikolov): a. Requires coordination

4. JWST Cycle 3 prepar ation	Everyo ne	 Nikolay Nikolov invites the TSO WG members to share ideas for additional JWST Cycle 3 preparation. Brian Brooks mentions that the Science Planning Board reviews current example science programs on JDox whether updates from APT and ETC are needed. Likely the updates will be completed by the Board: JSOCINT-723 Loic Albert shares recent NIRSpec+BOTS experience of 2 WATA failures of a very bright star and makes the point that there should be a clear explanation in JDox what is the best procedure for TAs (e.g. target offset, skip?) in such cases to guarantee success. The community would be interested what is the best practice, especially for long phase curves of bright targets. Brian Brooks suggests categorization of the TAs using JWST QLT products. Nikolay Nikolov mentions that there should be a JDox article that documents timing issues. Nikolay Nikolovdiscussed offline the idea of having cross-branch training for TSO program reviews to enable more IS perform the TSO reviews and find support for the idea from Sarah Kendrew and Stephan Birkmann
5. Roundt able check- in		Sarah Kendrew reports a help desk ticket on pixel flagging in MIRI data by the pipeline and mentions that Michael Regan is looking at the details. Jeroen Bouwman mentions that there is a difference between pipeline version 1.9 and 1.10, and that there might be a bug that propagatedafteur 1.9, because pixel flagging was good on earlier versions

Action items