

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** \Rightarrow 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