

# Committee on Solar and Space Physics

**Co-Chairs:** Sarah Gibson and Maura Hagan

**Members:** Brian Anderson, Steve Battel, Yue Deng, Stephen Fuselier, Todd Hoeksema, Mary Hudson, Robyn Millan, Tai Phan, Jiong Qiu, Josh Semeter, Howard Singer, Leonard Strachan, Barbara Thompson, Gary Zank

**Staff:** Abigail Sheffer, Anesia Wilks, and Marchel Holle

# Space Weather

- Widespread interest, national and international (NSTC; FERC; DHS; FAA; UN; WMO; NATO\*)
- New and planned NOAA satellites (GOES, DSCOVR\*\*)
- Research to Operations – Operations to Research (SWORM\*\*\* white paper: multi-agency sponsored center capability)
- Situation continues to evolve



\*National Science and Technology Council, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Department of Homeland Security, Federal Aviation Administration; United Nations; World Meteorological Organization; North Atlantic Treaty Organization

\*\* Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite, Deep Space Climate Observatory

\*\*\* Space Weather Operations, Research, and Mitigation

# NSF Geospace (GS) portfolio review (PR)

- **NAS assessment report:**
  - Bottom line: PR committee fulfilled its charge within imposed constraints.
  - Recommendations for NSF Atmospheric and Geospace (AGS) division strategic plan and implementation of midscale program; also recommendations for coordination between GS section and community regarding PR implementation, requirements, and implications

# NSF Geospace (GS) portfolio review (PR)

- **NSF GS response:**
  - Moving forward with PR recommendations (Arecibo, Sondrestrom radar, CubeSats, new investments)
  - Community driven strategic vision; PR every 3-4 years

# Discussion informing Heliophysics Science Centers Report

## **Solar & Space Physics Decadal Survey -- DRIVE (Diversify, Realize, Integrate, Venture, Educate)**

- *NASA and NSF together should create heliophysics science centers (HSCs) to tackle the key science problems of solar and space physics that require multidisciplinary teams of theorists, observers, modelers, and computer scientists, with annual funding in the range of \$1 million to \$3 million for each center for 6 years, requiring NASA funds ramping to \$8 million per year (plus increases for inflation).*

# Discussion informing Heliophysics Science Centers Report

## **Statement of Task:**

The Committee on Solar and Space Physics (CSSP) will draft a very brief report to provide a set of options for NASA and NSF to consider for the creation of HSCs. Topics may include:

- How to make the HSCs unique from other research elements; and
- Options for implementation (for example, consideration of a virtual institution).

# Discussion informing Heliophysics Science Centers Report

- Questions that arose during discussion with agencies:
  - What should HSC **framework and priorities** be?
  - How to **scope and bound** them?
  - How to decide **what science to tackle first**?
  - How should the **community be engaged**?

# Discussion informing Heliophysics Science Centers Report

- **Intention of Solar & Space Physics Decadal Survey (Drake)**
  - Heliophysics involves complex, coupled systems posing problems that are **difficult to solve**. At the same time, **breakthroughs** are occurring in computation, observations, and theory.
  - **Bringing together** people who may not necessarily usually work together **enables progress** on problems too difficult to be solved otherwise
  - The **range of topics** covered by HSCs would necessarily be **limited**; they **do not replace** but rather **augment** existing research programs

# Discussion informing Heliophysics Science Centers Report

- **Intention of Solar & Space Physics Decadal Survey (Drake)**
  - A **center-like environment** involving some (not too many) institutions, with **sufficient funding** for substantial coordinated efforts
  - Science **topics** would be **identified by proposers**, not prescribed top-down
  - Success should be judged based on **scientific progress**

# Discussion informing Heliophysics Science Centers Report

- **NSF Physics Frontiers Center (PFC; Caldwell)**
  - **10 PFCs** in existence; some in partnership with NSF Biology Division
  - **Multi-institutional connections not required**
  - **~\$2.5M per year for 5 years**; competition **every 3 years**
  - Nominal center **lifetime is 10 years**
  - Allowed to **re-compete** ⇒ need to reinvent themselves if so

# Discussion informing Heliophysics Science Centers Report

- **NSF Physics Frontiers Center: Lessons Learned**
  - Center mode brings together scientists - **ideas emerge that would not otherwise have**
  - Centers need **flexibility to respond** if a **discovery** is made
  - It takes **~two years** for a center to **form an identity**
  - When successful, there is a powerful difference in the **educational experience** for postdocs and grad students

# Discussion informing Heliophysics Science Centers Report

- **NASA Astrobiology Institute (NAI; Boston)**
  - **12 teams** contributing to program led by NASA Ames with programmatic direction from HQ
  - All teams **highly interdisciplinary consortia** of institutions, led by NASA center/university
  - **~\$1M per year for 5 years** (varies) ; competition **every 2.5 years**
  - Nominal center **lifetime is 5 years** (1 year no-cost extension)
  - On average about half immediately **re-compete**

# Discussion informing Heliophysics Science Centers Report

- **NASA Astrobiology Institute: Lessons Learned**
  - Give **autonomy to teams**; don't predetermine topics beyond high level
  - **Constant communication is critical**; multiple virtual meetings between and among teams
  - **Integrating research themes** group subsets of research that bring teams together
  - **Value-added programs** – minority-institute research support; early-career support; meeting/workshop support; EPO; IT enthusiasts; “Workshops without walls”

# Heliophysics Science Centers Report Procedure and Status

- Split up into writing groups 3/30 → draft findings/conclusions
- Report compiled, sent to committee 4/7
- Committee telecom 4/10
- Further revisions, new draft sent to committee 4/17
- Small changes in response to comments from committee, then sent to reviewers April 24
- Reviews due May 2
- Expected release second half of May
  
- Overall – positive experience
- Might be easier during non-Space-Science-Week meeting