In attendance:

- @Glasgow: R. Dupuis, M. Pitkin, G. Woan
- @LHO: M. Landry, L. Matone, G. Mendell, F. Raab
- @Michigan: D. Chin, K. Riles
- @UWM: B. Allen, Y. Itoh, M. Allessandra Papa, X. Siemens

1. S1 paper (all)

   a. MAP performed reorganization of frequency analysis section as per Barish suggestion. Certain information tabulated for easy presentation and to avoid cumbersome repetition.
   b. Added new paragraph: upper limit on ellipticity of pulsar
   c. Green margin notes: please address these issues!
   d. MRL: one person from each UL group has been volunteered for S1 UL paper coordination (burst - Weinstein, stoch - Fritschel, insp - Gonzalez, cw - Landry). Strive for consistency in description of apparatus, sensitivity, calibration, notation etc. S1 LIGO/GEO Lanl preprint on instruments to be ready on gr-qc for referencing by UL papers. ML to send around email of some proposed (common) changes later today
   e. MRL coordinating with M. Hewitson regarding compare/contrast LIGO/GEO calibration section
   f. MAP proposes drafts released every Friday until final release date Apr 25
   g. RD to make consistency checks on Fig 1 and text, and remove epsilon lines (to avoid confusion) from the figure. Some discussion ensues over an additional timing accuracy figure but agreement is reached that it is unnecessary
   h. XS introduced alpha cut on H2, cleaning up times in which the ifo was essentially broken. A similar cut on H1 failed to remove outlier SFTs: these correspond to ASQ glitches in H1 that still have alpha’s that pass the cut [despite there being a glitch in the alpha trend too - perhaps we can look for transients in alpha in the S2 trends -MRL]. XS is looking at each of these outlier SFTs by hand
   i. MRL: reviewing S1 excitation RDS, found stretch on Aug 30 in which the arbitrary waveform generator (AWG) was broken, so that calibration line was not at 973.3Hz, but 974Hz plus sidebands spaced at 2Hz intervals. These bad data generally excluded by H2 alpha cut, however, H1 uses same AWG. MRL to investigate and report new alphas to XS, RD
(j) MAP: draft of next week will reflect these new analyses (not ready for tomorrow)

(k) Can experiments put bounds on $\iota$ of our pulsar? SA and GW nominated to check into this

(l) a debate ensues as to whether $f_0$ should represent the pulsar rotation frequency, or the potential GW signal frequency (i.e. twice the rotation frequency). The decision is made to change the paper to explicitly note $f_r$ for the former, and $f_s$ for the latter. FR: as the abstract may at times stand alone, include phrase “at twice rotation frequency” so it is explicit

(m) Upper limit on epsilon (GS, XS)
   i. GS used eqn 3.1 with best UL to cast limit on epsilon
   ii. formula was corrected for rotation vs. signal frequency, resulting in epsilon less than $10^{-4}$ (employing a “conservative” $L_\omega$)
   iii. XS suggests parametrizing epsilon UL, so that it is easy to see what estimates went into limit. MAP: GS please enter paragraph in ULpaper.tex
   iv. a little post-hoc trickery: note we now have a good reason for having chosen the pulsar we did. FR dryly suggests we not claim we’ve chosen the best pulsar for this limit

(n) FR additionally suggests 1) not referencing web pages, or at very least, archiving such html pages so a reader could later reconstruct, and ii) formula 2.1 is 90% confidence level; should we change this for consistency with reported limits?

Next telecon: Thursday, 3 April 2003 at 8:30am PST (11:30am EST, 16:30 UTC, 18:30 CET) (please note European time change - Western Europe daylight savings begins on Mar 30, whereas in N. America, it is one week later on Apr 6.)