



Critical Issues Facing the Detector Characterization Working Group

Keith Riles
University of Michigan



Brief Status (details on Thursday)

- Commissioning produces initial IFO characterization
- Online Diagnostics Test Tool working well (D. Sigg)
- Environmental monitoring underway at both sites
- Offline Data Monitoring Tool (DMT) working well
 - » Infrastructure nearly complete, already comprehensive(J. Zweizig)
 - » Some LSC members have delivered DMT packages
 - » More on the way
- Data set reduction partially available
- Data set simulation well advanced
 - » Parameterized simulation
 - » End-to-End Model



Status (cont.)

- Successful engineering run in April
 - » Many LSC members participated in data taking
 - » Many LSC members analyzing the data (see session reports)
- LDAS mock data challenge planned for February to test integration of detector characterization into data conditioning API
 - » Test line removal, cross-channel regression, time interval vetoes
 - » Leader: L.S. Finn
 - » DC group contributors: S. Klimenko, E. Mauceli, A. Ottewill



Critical Issue I

- Better integration of Detector Characterization group into LIGO science at the sites
 - » Problems I see:
 - Many persons writing / delivering code for DMT, but much of it unused
 - Software not tailored to operator use
 - Authors not on site to educate operators
 - Authors too detached from IFO operation (in general)
 - Some authors not delivering at all
 - Too few scientists on site looking at available data



Critical Issue I (cont.)

- » How to do better?
 - As a minimum, software writers should provide ample documentation, sample programs & makefiles.
 - Better: Tutorials to persons on site.
 - Much better: Extended site visits to shake down code and make it truly useful for data quality monitoring.
 - Even better: Take responsibility for monitoring and regularly reporting on interferometer subsystem.
 - Software writers who promise but don't actually write (*i.e.*, deliver code) should be held accountable:
 - MOU renewal
 - LSC membership review

- » Need scientific monitoring shifts in parallel with operator shifts



Scientific Monitoring Shifts

- LIGO will run 24/7 operator shifts (day/eve/owl)
- LIGO Lab operators will keep IFO running:
 - » Adjust gains, as needed
 - » Monitor alarms, fix problems
 - » Run calibrations, as needed
 - » Update electronic log
- In addition, need scientific data quality monitoring:
 - » Review daily logs of IFO performance & detected transients
 - » Check stability of calibrations
 - » Manual entries to meta-database
 - » Maintain DMT processes
 - » Feedback to DMT software writers



Scientific Monitoring Shifts

- At least 1 scientific monitoring shift per day, perhaps more, especially at beginning
 - » Manned by Lab and non-Lab LSC physicists
 - » Pool of experts on call for consultation
 - » Training necessary -- Practice shifts with experienced physicist one possible scheme
 - » Expect duties to evolve (toward greater efficiency, one hopes!)
 - » Want stable shift system in place and experienced pool of shift takers by start of first science run
 - » Use upcoming engineering runs / daq shakedown as warmups



Upcoming Engineering Runs

- 1-2 week data acquisition and data monitoring shakedown at Hanford this fall (October/November)
 - » Exercise DAQ and tape writing in extended 24/7 operation
 - » Exercise Data Monitor Tool in 24/7 operation, including real-time scientific review of results
 - » Shakedown to include 1-2 day engineering run with 2-km IFO (Goal: Locked 2-arm, recycled Michelson)
- 1-2 day engineering run with partial 4-km IFO at Livingston in late fall / early winter
 - » Recycled Michelson without arms (?)



Upcoming Engineering Runs

- LSC turnout at April engineering was good first step
- Want to do even better at upcoming events:
 - » 1-2 double-manned shifts each day
 - » Experienced / inexperienced IFO persons paired for training
 - » LSC groups urged to sign up when schedule ironed out

Round table discussion on increasing LSC participation
in on-site science this afternoon in DC session



Critical Issue II

- Working group needs eventual reorganization
 - » Present subgroups organized to provide tools:
 - Transient Analysis (chair: F. Raab)
 - Performance Characterization (unofficial)
 - Data Set Reduction (chair: J. Brau)
 - Data Set Simulation (chair: L.S. Finn)
 - » This scheme is fine at outset for building software infrastructure
 - » More natural: subgroups focussed on detector subsystems
 - More accountability (responsibility to monitor & report on performance)
 - Better integration of Lab & non-Lab efforts
 - Discussions begun with LIGO/LSC management to see what makes most sense as commissioning ends



Non-Critical Issue

Too little joint gathering of the DC group and the advanced detector groups at LSC meetings

- Real effort was made to avoid overlap at this meeting, but only one DC session (Thur 10:45-12:00) will have many advanced detector physicists present
 - » Thursday morning talks selected accordingly
 - » But other DC talks would have been appropriate too
 - » More important, DC group missing benefit of expertise from experienced instrument builders in many discussions



Non-Critical Issue

- Possible solutions:
 - » Lengthen LSC meetings (3.0 → 3.5/4.0 days)?
 - » Hold meetings more often?
 - » Make more use of teleconferences between meetings?
 - » Hold meetings of alternating focus (LIGO I vs LIGO II)?
- For reference, HEP collaborations at a comparable phase (construction ending, data taking imminent) typically hold 5-day meetings every three months
- Discussed this issue at last meeting and decided to try to do better at next meeting

Are we satisfied with the improvement?