

Plans for Cycle 2

Bill Reach

Associate Director for Science



Outline



- General Ideas for Cycle 2
- Instrument Availability
- Guiding Principles
- Proposal Review
- Proposal Submission
- Questions for SUG

SOFIA General Ideas for Cycle 2



- Disclaimer
 - *The plans for Cycle 2 are for public discussion and input, and the SUG is welcome to comment but will not have a role in formulating the Call for Proposals*
- More flights
 - Operations at 3 flights per week
 - Expect at least 50% more GI observing time
- New instruments will be commissioned
 - EXES, HAWC expected to be ready for first flights
 - FIFI-LS possibly also ready
- Fixed proposal schedule
 - Continue coordinate US & German Calls



Instrument Availability



Instrument	Wavelengths	Spectral Resolving Power $\lambda/\delta\lambda$	Status	Estimated Availability Plans
FORCAST	5-40 μm	4-1200	Prep for commiss	BS, Cycle 1
GREAT	60-200 μm	10^5	Operational	BS, Cycle 1
HIPO	0.3-1.1 μm	4	Operational	Cycle 1
FLITECAM	1-5 μm	4,900	Prep for commiss	Cycle 1
EXES	5-28 μm	4000- 10^5	Lab testing	Cycle 2
HAWC	50-240 μm	5	Lab testing	Cycle 2
FIFI-LS	42-210 μm	1300-7500	Lab testing	Cycle 3
[2 nd Gen]	TBD	TBD		

Notes: BS = Basic Science;

Prep for commiss = final preparation for commissioning, including hardware modifications at the SI institute and redelivery



Guiding Principles (1)



- No Guest Investigator usage of a Facility Science Instrument mode until it is commissioned
 - Rule was “broken” for Basic Science, by design, in order to get early scientific results before the observatory construction, control software, and characterization were complete
 - For Cycle 1, this means FORCAST observations start Fall 2012 and FLITECAM early 2013, whereas the dates in the Call were Aug 2012-Aug 2013
 - Feedback on Cycle 1?



Guiding Principles (2)



- Offering an instrument in a Call before its commissioning data have been reduced introduces significant shared risk between the observatory and the guest investigator
 - The user community is asked to accept this risk, in return for having early access to the scientific instruments
 - Feedback on Cycle 1: Was the level of Shared Risk adequately explained and acceptable to Observers?

- Technical review
 - For Basic Science, German Demonstration Science, and Cycle 1, a technical review was performed for each proposal
 - For Cycle 1, the initial technical reviews are intended as a triage, and the more in-depth technical review will be after TAC recommendations
 - For Cycle 2+, we are considering these schemes
 - No technical review at Phase 1 (pre-TAC)
 - Technical review only of large proposals
 - As for Cycle 1 (triage at Phase 1, in-depth Phase 2)



Proposal submission



- We will continue a 2-phase proposal submission system for Cycle 2
 - Phase 1: SOFIA proposal tool
 - collects information including target location, observing mode, and requested observation duration
 - Proposers do not specify precise observing parameters
 - Phase 2: S-Spot
 - Collects observing parameters by filling out Astronomical Observing Template
 - AOR files are saved and used by Science and Mission Operations to make observing scripts



Questions for the SUG



- Feedback on Cycle 1 tools?
- Feedback on two-phase submission system?
- New tools for proposers in Cycle 2?