In attendance:

- @AEI: B. Allen, C. Cutler, Y. Itoh, B. Krishnan, M. Allessandra Papa
- @CIT: S. Anderson, T. Creighton
- @Glasgow: R. Dupuis, G. Woan
- @LHO: M. Landry, G. Mendell
- @Michigan: K. Riles
- @MIT: M. Zucker
- @UIB: A. Sintes
- @UWM: X. Siemens

1. Time-domain update (R. Dupuis, G. Woan)
   
   (a) analysis of GEO S1 data included in document, please refer to our latest version at www.aei.mpg.de/papa/pulsars/pulgroup02
   
   (b) Sec. 2.39 binned data $B_k$ shows few outliers, RD believes noise is well modelled
   
   (c) MZ ask if no threshold is applied and you do not throw away outliers, what happens? RD responds, no major difference in result
   
   (d) GW: RD has injected artificial signals (following expected phase evolution of source)
   
   (e) posterior pdf distribution changes if you introduce weak signal - injected signals appear at expected strain amplitudes
   
   (f) LIGO analysis: static calibration employed
   
   (g) less outliers in LIGO data than GEO data
   
   (h) Multiple IFO’s: joint upper limit shown in eq 26, figure to follow (code is running)
   
   (i) BA asks if this technique for combining ifo’s is optimal - all: not necessarily
   
   (j) MZ suggests common parameters must be used in this case of multiple ifo’s
   
   (k) GW: expect joint upper limit to be dominated by (most-sensitive ifo) L1
   
   (l) MZ asks if polarization modulation won’t play more of a role - GW: no
   
   (m) KR requests a worst case scenario for the analysis. RD: added “WUL” in his code, the results of which are only a factor two (or perhaps a few) higher
   
   (n) KR suggests graph of best and worst case, RD and GW agree to produce
2. Discussion of the November 1 document (all)

(a) discussion over Fig 1 ensues; MZ wants to move conservation of energy data points outside of figure into table or a second figure (essentially, let the data stand on its own, without a presumption of the mechanism for gw generation, this is what we want to emphasize, the new ground that is broken). Others prefer to leave them in (previous papers (albeit not data-driven ones) include such plots, so the data points are a convenient reference). MZ: stick to facts, this is what we saw. GW: put observations in context. The majority appear to be in favour of retaining Fig 1 as is.

(b) SA: in the report text for Fig 1, we should make explicit the moment of inertia issue

(c) ML: can we include true S1 duty cycles of ifo’s and vetted L1 data in Fig 1? RD agrees to replot

(d) MAP proposes title “Methods to establish upper limits on the gravitational wave amplitude of continuous gravitational waves - a working document”, to emphasis the document must change prior to publication

(e) Author list on paper (i.e. not the report) will be the LIGO I LSC collaboration

(f) MAP re: names of people and institutions in document, should we keep these? SA suggests keeping names in the working document, and delete for preprint.

(g) MZ to obtain LIGO (T) document number (Technical document) [LIGO-T020186-00-Z, note that there is a security issue here, in that the DCC is not password protected. DCC submission may well come at a much later date - ML]

(h) MAP suggests section 2.5, a comparison of Bayesian and frequentist analysis, should be clarified. GW indicates the conclusions therein may not be generally true.

3. Deadlines on modifications to November 1 document (all)

(a) document frozen at Thursday noon CET - it is expected that this document will be released to the LIGO I LSC, with the caveat that it will be updated shortly

(b) a brief review phase for the group will occur, followed by a rapid update to the document

(c) the actual method on how the document will be released is TBD. Initially the DCC was suggested, however, security may require that the documents be password protected and thus reside elsewhere

Next telecon: No telecon Thursday this week (unless deemed completely necessary!), hence Thursday, 28 November 2002 at 8:30am PST (11:30am EST, 16:30 UTC, 17:30 CET)