
UPPER LIMIT GROUP LEADERS' MEETING

DATE: noon PST, 13 February 2001
TO: A. Wiseman, S. Anderson, B. Barish, K. Blackburn, P. Fritschel, G. Gonzales,
J. Romano, J. Zweizig, A. Lazzarini, L.S. Finn, M. Zucker, P. Saulson, R. Weiss,
P Shawhan.
FROM: Stuart Anderson
RE: Minutes of 14 February 2001 meeting

1. In attendance: Stuart Anderson (minutes), Peter Shawhan, John Zweizig, Kent Blackburn, Barry Barish, Gabriela Gonzalez, Alan Wiseman (chair), Patrick Brady, Joe Romano, Rai Weiss, Peter Fritschel, Peter Saulson, Mike Zucker.
2. Alan gave a summary of the current understanding of the relationship between the UL efforts and the software MDC and inch pebble tests. In summary, the current schedule which puts the UL data run in Sep, should allow sufficient time for all of these efforts to progress naturally without the need for a win-lose decision. Patrick and the in-spiral UL group was identified as the path-finder for the UL implementation now that the in-spiral MDC has been completed successfully.
3. Mike started a discussion on the possibility of providing physical signal insertion into the instrumentation to monitor search algorithm efficiencies. There was no dissension that this was desirable, however, there was not a consensus that this should be a requirement for the first published LIGO results. It was noted that this effort overlaps significantly with the ongoing effort to calibrate the instrument and that Mike was the natural candidate to take the lead on expanding the calibration effort to allow the injection of false astrophysical signals. After a unanimous vote, Mike volunteered.
4. Peter Saulson raised two additional hardware issues:
 - (a) The precise definition of the single binary flag channel that many search algorithms will use to determine which data to analyze.

Rai agreed that he, Daniel, Stan, and John would present a candidate definition of such a channel at the next LSC meeting. Kent mentioned that Benoit Mours had given thought to this subject in the context of network based analysis, and had presented such at a meeting a few days ago.
 - (b) Coordination between detector characterization and the UL groups.

It was agreed that there are some tools in the DMT that could be used by the UL groups, but that there will be additional needs, some of which could overlap with future det. char. efforts. In particular, the DMT should be used for finding "toxic artifacts" to be flagged so they can be removed/ignored. The consensus was that each UL group should identify a det. char. liaison to make sure effort is not duplicated. An additional session at the next LSC meeting was proposed to discuss this.