

---

# ICECUBE SCIENCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

---

October 19 & 20, 2015

Wisconsin IceCube Particle Astrophysics Center  
222 West Washington Ave, Suite 500  
Madison, WI 53703

## AGENDA

### FORMAT OF TALKS

To encourage a dialogue, talks have for the most part been padded with discussion time following each talk.

### MONDAY 19 OCTOBER

8.45 – 9.15	SAC Closed Session	SAC
9.15 – 9.30	Introductory remarks	Kael Hanson
9.30 – 9.50	IceCube collaboration report	Olga Botner
10.00 – 10.45	IceCube / Gen2 Science	Francis Halzen
11.00 – 11.15	<b>Pause</b>	
11.15 – 11.45	M&O, solicitation & proposal status	Kael Hanson
12.00 – 12.30	IceCube detector operations	John Kelley
12.45 – 13.45	<b>Lunch</b>	
13.45 – 14.05	Simulations	Alex Olivas
14.15 – 14.45	Raw data to analysis; IceCube data sharing	Erik Blaufuss
15.00 – 15.15	<b>Pause</b>	
15.15 – 15.45	PINGU	Ty de Young
16.00 – 16.30	Gen2 HEA	Claudio Kopper
16.45 – 17.15	Gen2 surface array and radio extensions	Albrecht Karle
17.30 – 18.30	Executive session or open discussion as per SAC	
19.30	<b>Dinner at Resto 43 North</b>	

### TUESDAY 20 OCTOBER

8.45 – 9.30	SAC closed session	
9.30 – 10.15	Education and outreach	Jim Madsen
10.15 – 11.30	Open discussion	
11.30 – 14.00	SAC report writing and working lunch	
14.00	Closeout	

## QUESTIONS

1. The Management and Operations proposal being in response to an open bid, its content and the requested budget should be subject to additional scrutiny. Are the proposed activities sufficiently innovative and forward looking? Is the budget justified?
2. Interest is high from groups wishing to join IceCube while funding support for existing groups dwindles or is cut completely. How do we get stronger support in US for analysis grants?
3. Are we making good progress in reducing time to analysis?
4. At the last SAC meeting the answer to the question of whether the collaboration policies on data sharing are adequate indicated a desire to see improvements in this area. Has this changed? Do recent data releases and data sharing agreements demonstrate progress in this area? How should the M&O program support an expanded program in view of lack of support from NSF?
5. Are our plans for proposing the future facility optimized for success?
6. While funding opportunities for Gen2 outside the US exist, US support does not exist at present and the future is unclear. There is a sense of urgency due to competing experiments and due to potential loss of interest. How do we build momentum?
7. What are your thoughts on our response to National Academies report [\*A Strategic Vision for NSF Investments in Antarctic and Southern Ocean Research\*](#)?