1. Roll-Call: please sign up on the telecon notes pages
Jessica Gaskin, Alexey Vikhlinin, Feryal Ozel, Steve Allen, Daniel Stern, Tesla Jeltema, Gabriel Pratt, Randall Smith, Ryan Hickox, David Pooley, Andy Ptak, Chris Reynolds, Niel Brandt, Mark Bautz, Rachel Osten, Martin Weisskopf, Mike Pivovaroff, Brian McNamara, Rob Petre, Doug Swartz, Harvey Tananbaum, Juna Kollmeier, Piero Madau

2. April Deliverable (Jessica):
Study Management Plan comments (Requirements and Deliverables)

We need to accept, or comment on, the Study Management Plan by 4/29. Please have a look and email to the xrs-stdt list if you have any concerns. For definition of the Concept Maturity Levels referred to in the Management plan, see this document. Please provide comments to Jessica, Alexey or Feryal by COB 4/27.

3. June Deliverable (Alexey)
a. Update from AV on the scope of the initial technology gap assessment.

Currently, the primary method for recording NASA technology needs is "Program Annual Technology Report" (PATR) documents. Inputs are collected in ~June every year, and then the Physics of the Cosmos (PCOS) program office cross-correlates community inputs with strategic documents (e.g. Decadal Report, NASA Roadmap, etc.). See last year's PATR (esp. Starting page 15) and the inputs the X-ray Surveyor community has provided to PCOS, as examples of inputs we can provide. This year's form can be found here.

The current technology AO's (proposals due in March'16 and selections expected in ~September '16) are based on the 2015 PATR, and the terms of the AO cannot be changed. Our inputs can still re-affirm the priorities established in the 2015 PATR and *may* be taken into account when NASA makes a funding decision in the Fall.

Unless NASA changes the model for defining technology priorities, our June input is the best chance to influence the AO for proposals

The technology gap definitions in the PATR are quite broad. Our inputs can be based on our overall sense of what X-ray Surveyor mission is likely to be. They can be as simple as to suggest re-prioritization of the gaps in the existing PATR.

The plan is to collect individual inputs from the STDT members and community **by June 7**; STDT then reviews, generates a consolidated, prioritized list of technology gaps and submits to PCOS **by June 30**.

b. ***Technology gaps assessment needs to be done after we confirm the general path for X-ray Surveyor as discussed in the Roadmap (or determine a new direction).***

In 2015, MSFC+SAO led concept development studies and organized a science workshop to provide "proof-of-concept" to the vision of X-ray Surveyor in the NASA Astrophysics Roadmap. Here are the related documents:

- NASA 30-years Astrophysics Roadmap
- 2015 X-ray Surveyor white paper for the PAGs
- "X-ray Vision" science workshop program and presentations

These activities have shown that such a concept is "executable" and there is Decadal-grade science associated with it. We can develop the X-ray Surveyor mission concepts along similar lines and present a great case for the 2020 Decadal.

Before we embark further on this path, we would like to ask ourselves whether this is indeed the path to follow, or if there are compelling reasons to change the science requirements and the corresponding mission design. For example, we recognize that Athena was not selected at the time the Roadmap was compiled. In addition, within this team, we have a group of broader expertise and fresh insight that could lead to additional science concepts and requirements. The goal of this first survey is to quickly start identifying Decadal-grade science that could justify a radical change in direction for the mission configuration. "Radical change" is more fundamental than, e.g., tweaking parameters of the 2015 X-ray Surveyor concept or adding a science instrument. It is something that may require different X-ray optics and/or spacecraft (due to change in focal length or diameter of the optics, for example). Examples may include changing the energy band, or considering a very wide survey telescope instead of a pointed-mode telescope.

The survey should be filled out by 4/27.

Once we discuss the results of the survey and gauge the need for possible new directions, we will continue to refine the optimal X-ray Surveyor configuration which flows down from the science requirements. That would be our next step.

Associated timeline: Complete the survey by 4/27. Tentative decision on the path for X-ray Surveyor by May 7. We need to collect inputs for technology gaps by June 7 (see above). This gives us ~ a month to listen to presentations from technologists.

4. Discussion on the plan/schedule for this NASA Fiscal Year (which ends September 30th)- Needed for budgeting and planning purposes (Jessica)

a. ***Advanced Concept Office - will this resource be needed this FY?***

We don't have time to properly plan for a 6-month in-depth ACO run this FY. However, ACO can be forward-funded, so we have a few months to plan and schedule a future ACO study without risking loss of funding. We can also do a shorter ACO run this FY once a direction is provided.

b. ***Workshops - Should we plan on having a workshop this year? What kind of workshop/conference should we have?***

There were several suggestions. Perhaps plan on a large conference that involves a large community in spring of 2017. Planning for a large conference/workshop for next year, should start now to increase participant numbers. We may want to hold a more focused workshop (or workshops)(possibly involving technology aspects as well) in late fall of this year.

Please note a Summer Chandra workshop on *Chandra Science for the Next Decade* (Boston, August 16-19). It is expected to have some X-ray Surveyor coverage.

5. First Face-To-Face Meeting (Feryal)

We will try to balance between maximum attendance and earlier dates. Right now July 25-26 is looking good from those points of view but to be confirmed soon. Meeting location not yet determined. We will consider Cambridge, Washington, and Chicago.

6. Working Groups structure and implementation (Feryal)

Several points were raised during the discussion:

- The working group structure for Athena, Astro-H, etc. may be not suitable for us, because it is built around existing missions.
- Our working groups should be the means of involving community rather than re-organizing the STDT.
- If working groups are too big, we risk signing people up and then having their voice lost. This will alienate the community instead of promoting X-ray Surveyor.
- We are still unclear on the exact kind of Q & A we want from the working groups. This may affect the structure.

At this point in the discussion, we need to look at concrete proposals. Please contribute at https://www.dropbox.com/sh/acvo33scj955k10/AACjt3S7WD6QgBu_mDLbDuYFa?dl=0 (XRS STDT Dropbox folder -> Working Groups)

7. Comments, suggestions, input from STDT members (Feryal)+

A google calendar with external and internal deadlines, include our standing telecons has been set up, and invitation has been sent out. Please subscribe.