

Comments on the ST selection and workings:

Communication within the science team:

- Connections between different group: relating to others.
- Better bridge IOP-AC divide.
- More combined activities.
- Telecons: not good idea to split. Add cross-disciplinary subgroups. Add more content from members. Presenting during telecons can increase sharing/stimulate interactions (prerecorded presentations?). Not voluntary- put it in schedule (assignment for members to present or lead discussion).
- Subgroups oriented research working on common goals.

Communication with project office:

- Communication between GSFC and ST about the details of the missions was not always effective – in particular on the impact of engineering choice on science. Not always sufficient time for ST to provide input.
- Some input from the ST was done on time as GSFC needed.
- If we could do it again - an instrument-specific science team would have been great.

ST meeting:

- One ST meeting per year is as frequent as possible.
- Recording presentation allowed for more discussion. Enforce time limits. Recoding presentation is nice but allow 10min discussion (not re-presentation). Everybody should meet deadline. Check quality (microphones). Takes time to spinup. Some do not like. One slide allows synthesis of salient points.
- Final ST meeting (\$ can be found if needed), wrap up – open meeting?
- The full project science leadership and associated advisors should come to ST annual meeting.

How to improve ROSES call for ST:

- During proposal call make sure proposers understand that there will be work beyond individual proposed work.
- Composition of team is critical for success of meetings/goals. Invite experts from outside to help with specific issues that arise for which we do not have sufficient expertise in the team.
- Make clear what expected from team (algorithm development vs. science).
- We all are funded for our individual science. Would be nice to have a part of our project to be advisors and address problems from the project/HQ.
- Role of leads should be better defined. Build consensus focus on group activities. Perhaps have them direct more of PIs activities.
- Consensus/collaboration language in the call was very useful, changing the tenor of the team.
- Next ST: instrument will be finalized. Maximizing utility of what is being built. How do we react when something breaks?
- Project science will provide details on how they will interact with ST and what they expect from ST.