

## Roberto Abraham

---

**From:** casca-board-bounces@lists.casca.ca on behalf of Kristine Spekkens <Kristine.Spekkens@rmc.ca>  
**Sent:** September 10, 2016 9:07 AM  
**To:** casca-board@lists.casca.ca  
**Subject:** Re: [CASCA Board] Drafts of feedback for the fundamental science review  
**Attachments:** Untitled attachment 00537.txt

Hi Bob,

Regarding the CASCA response: I think that it reads very well overall but I have two comments on the response to #19 and our vision for science in Canada.

- I think that the first point about being Canadian astrophysics being ambitious is bang-on. However, there isn't much explanation of what that actually means to the astronomical community (what discipline doesn't want to win more Nobel prizes?). So there isn't much for the govt to go on here. What exactly do we mean by ambitious, here? More partnerships in international facilities? More Canadian-led experiments that address fundamental questions? More astronomy faculty/HQP? Maintain our status as the highest-impact science in Canada? All of the above? In other words, if the govt is on-board with astronomers being ambitious, how should it act?

- The second point for our vision conflates two issues: economic benefits and outreach. If the idea is to discuss both of those things here, I'd suggest removing the "outreach" part in the title, so that it reads:

"2. Astrophysical research programs need long planning horizons, and have an obligation

to transfer knowledge back to Canadians."

Then you can discuss two kinds of transfer: tech transfer and outreach. I presume we need to be a bit careful about outreach spilling over into "education"... but do we want to recommend re-instating nationally funded outreach programs?

Hope this helps.

Kristine

On Fri, Sep 9, 2016 at 7:21 PM, Roberto Abraham <[roberto.abraham@utoronto.ca](mailto:roberto.abraham@utoronto.ca)> wrote:  
Dear Board and LRPIC,

Here are some updates on where things are at WRT the submissions for the fundamental science review. I've attached two documents. The first is Draft #2 of CASCA's response to the request for feedback, while the second is Draft #0 of the coalition's response. Here's some explanatory info on both:

CASCA response:

This is based on the subset of the committee's provided questions that I went over with the board in a quick telecon last Tuesday. Rob Thacker gets a cookie for getting the initial draft off the ground. Note that the review committee provides 20 questions total, but most don't apply to organizations, so we weeded it down a lot. In fact, at the moment I'm responding to only five questions. It'll probably be more like 8 by the time I'm finished as I'm still mulling over the best approach to a few.

I verified that the review committee wants answers ONLY in this very specific format and ONLY to very specific questions by clicking various buttons and pretending to submit some feedback to see what the procedure for this is. I was hoping their provided questions were more-or-less just guidelines and they were open to more global feedback, but nuh-uh. They're really incredibly specific about providing questions in a web form and seeking feedback on just those exact questions via filling in the on-line form and nothing else. They also bend over backwards to say they want brief answers. Apparently they've already gotten 400+ submissions and it's 3 weeks before the deadline and they're committed to having a final report before the end of the year. Um.. good luck with that. They allow (but using words that kind of discourages) adding supplementary material as an attachment at the end. I'm debating whether I should add the MTR or the LRPIC two pager. I'll probably go with the latter and just embed links to various MTR sections in the text since they're pretty clear they want only short attachments.

COALITION response:

This was prepared by Duncan Rayner ages in advance... I'm guessing about 5 nanoseconds after he heard they were going to accept feedback. And in a classic example of the Universe kicking you in the ass for being too organized, Duncan completely jumped the gun by assuming the committee wanted global feedback and so he prepared a beautifully reasoned loooong draft that we're going to have to completely rejig in order to cast it into some form acceptable to the review committee. In fact, it's sufficiently nice as-is that I suppose we might just submit it in this form as an attachment in the end (since as I mentioned earlier you're allowed to do this for 'supporting documents') but I suspect we'll just have to figure out a way to tear sections of it apart and stick them into relevant bits of the web form.

Anyway, as always, comments very welcome.

Cheers,

Bob

--

Prof. Roberto Abraham  
Dept. of Astronomy & Astrophysics  
University of Toronto  
50 St. George St  
Toronto, ON M5S 3H4  
Canada

Office: Astronomy Building Room 206  
Phone (direct): 416-946-7289  
Phone (department): 416-978-2016  
Departmental FAX: 416-946-7287  
<http://www.astro.utoronto.ca/~abraham>

---

Casca-board mailing list - [Casca-board@lists.casca.ca](mailto:Casca-board@lists.casca.ca) - <http://www.casca.ca/mailman/listinfo/casca-board>

--

\*\*\*\*\*

Dr. Kristine Spekkens

-----

Associate Professor, RMCC Physics

<http://www.rmc.ca/aca/phy/per/spekkens-k-eng.php>

Cross-Appointed, Queen's University

[http://www.astro.queensu.ca/people/Kristine\\_Spekkens/main.php](http://www.astro.queensu.ca/people/Kristine_Spekkens/main.php)

-----

Professeure Adjointe, CMRC Physique

<http://www.cmrc.forces.gc.ca/aca/phy/per/spekkens-k-fra.php>

Nomination conjointe, Queen's

[http://www.astro.queensu.ca/people/Kristine\\_Spekkens/main.php](http://www.astro.queensu.ca/people/Kristine_Spekkens/main.php)

-----