Comments on topics for workshop program

List of topics (proposed on 02/04/2014):

- Historical perspective: (90 minutes)
- Programmatic: national and international SLR and related programs (270 minutes)
- Science through Missions: missions supported by SLR and the science enabled by this support (270 minutes)
- Future Missions and the Role of SLR: applications of SLR for GNSS, etc. (150 minutes)
- Advanced Techniques: advances in SLR engineering, etc. (180 minutes)
- New Technologies and Looking Forward: what is on the horizon for SLR (180 minutes)
- Core Site and Components: SLR integrated with other techniques (240 minutes)
- Operations: station issues and operational considerations (270 minutes)

Comments received:

- Laser safety should be a topic (Under Operations? GGOS? Advanced Techniques?)
- Position papers to start each session: To promote discussion and information exchange. Problem with this approach is to have invited presentations to have time for discussion
- Core Site Components: include site tie determination and monitoring, analysis that compares results
- Need to give opportunity for many to present, even if "only" a poster
- Need to define program: Panel discussion, open forum for all, lecture style?
- Divide topics into review by specialist followed by discussion
- Need to ensure presenters provide proceedings papers
- Additional topic: New applications for SLR infrastructure: optical telecom, space debris, etc.
- Need to better organize open discussion by asking small group to facilitate

U. Schreiber:
In view of VLBI2010 slowly coming about, pulsed laser safety radars will certainly phase out in collocated stations due to the interference between radar and VLBI. In view of that I think we should specifically make laser safety a topic, although one could surely slip it under Operations.

With the same line of arguments it may be also worthwhile to call for GGOS related topics. (Again, I note that contributions for this topic can easily find other headlines within your list where they would fit. However it would give GGOS more visibility.)

G. Appleby:
Overall: I think to achieve the aim of fostering discussion it will be necessary at the start of each session to present 'position papers' that include provocative statements and views of the ways forward. Ideally, this will provoke discussion and information exchange. A problem with making such a large assembly a workshop and not a conference is that one needs at least a few pre-prepared presentations or there could be long periods of silence. The key will be to invite just those few prepared presentations for each session that together leave plenty of time for discussion.

Detail:
Programmatic Session. I assume 'national' refers to any nation¹s SLR programme?

Science Through Missions. In my view a very important session. There were some good papers on this in Japan. This could also include an opportunity to discuss the culling of some missions from the ILRS list that are currently supported but don¹t appear to produce any scientific return - 'come and say why the ILRS should continue to support your mission¹

Core Site and Components: Again very important with respect to GGOS. Get stations to up their ambitions to go multi-technique. Include ideas for site tie determination and monitoring and include analysis that compares (e.g loading) results from as many techniques as possible at individual sites.

T. Otsubo:
In a long discussion time, it is often hard for us, non-English-speaking people, to keep up with what is discussed. I am sure we (ILRS) want to see the wide range of people there, and the programme should look (reasonably) attractive to everyone.

It seems important to provide an opportunity for many people to present something, even if it got short or in poster. At LW18, we got several requests from China, Germany, USA and Egypt to send them a signed document that proves his/her paper was accepted, probably to help the trip funded. To our perplexity, some wanted a letter with a quote 'accepted as an oral presentation' far before we arranged the session programme.

S. Nakamura:
At 18LW, we discussed to introduce "plenary open discussion" at draft program.

However, since there were many abstracts beyond capacity of presentation slots, we gave up our idea.

What image do you have about seminar, that is, “panel discussion by key persons” or “open forum for all participants”, or “lecture style”?

If possible, is it possible to divide each topics into “review part by specialist” and “discussion part”. By looking back on 18LW, we have assigned similar subjects into same session. We could perform specialized and effective discussion, but, I forgot paying attention to unprofessional attendee who are professional at certain field, in spite of 18LW had a synergy purpose.

Additionally, I would like to feedback 19LW.
After 18LW, there were many withdraw of proceedings paper without saying reasons. On next 19LW, it needs rule that presenter has obligation to submit abstract, presentation file, and proceedings paper. Please consider this feedback.

P. Bianco:
Regarding the topics, I would suggest to add new one such as “New applications for SLR infrastructure: optical telecom, space debris, etc.”. Several stations are nowadays engaged in such activities and I think that this should be a recurrent topic in our meetings.

From the methodological point of view, I’m not particularly fond of general, last minute “open-to-the-floor” discussions. I think that we should give more room to discussions in our meetings, but we need to better organize it, maybe through an “ad hoc” task force (say, a group of 3-4 colleagues) for each topic which should trigger and animate discussion, take note of the outcomes and report those to the wider audience in a final session.