

## 9<sup>th</sup> IACHEC MEETING SUMMARY

Matteo Guainazzi ESAC/ESA

### **Evolution of participants**



IACHEC year	Number of participants	Number of talks
2006 (Iceland)	36	26
2007 (California)	35	30
2008 (Germany)	36	26
2009 (Japan)	35	34
2010 (Massachusetts)	45	50
2011 (Italy)	44	38
2012 (California)	40	29
2013 (UK)	36(+6 seq.ed)	48 (20 plenary)
2014 (Virginia)	51	54 (24 plenary)

#### **Paper status**



5 IACHEC papers published on refereed journals between 2013-4: Timing, Galaxy Clusters (EPIC/ACIS, EPIC/XIS), G21.5-0.9, PKS2155-304

2 new calibration-related papers published in 2014: Read et al. (2014, A&A, 564, 75; EPIC); Schellenberger et al. (2014, arxiv1407.7130; EPIC/ACIS)

Paper	Status	Submission by:
1E0102-7219	Wrapping-up	May 2014
Blazar sample	Wrapping-up	2014
Capella	High-resolution spectroscopy line census	?
Crab	Advanced draft	2014
G21.5-0.9 II.	To be started	?
N132D	Fitting the model	?
PKS2155-304 II.	First draft	2014
WD	To be started	?

#### **Main trends**



- New "Golden era" of X-ray astronomy, 4 missions to be launched in the next 18 months
- New missions see the IACHEC as the forum to increase quality and efficiency of calibration work
  - Forster: 3C273 observation ~1 month after the NuSTAR launch arranged at IACHEC
- The IACHEC is gaining visibility and credibility in the community at large (COSPAR talk, talks on calibration at scientific conferences, IACHEC-related activities in generalpurpose astronomical proposals, Astro-H SWG interested the IACHEC experience ...)
- After more than a decade, it is increasingly difficult for "old missions" to be creative on how to improve the cross-calibration status
- IACHEC WGs are not always consistent <10 keV, we still do not understand why</li>
- Instruments age, and become whimsical with age
- Calibration teams of "old" mission shrink
- The community requires more ambitious calibration goals
  - Claim that calibration uncertainties limit cosmology is a serious trouble (to me)
- The community does not want to deal with systematics ("Tell me which instrument I can trust"), and we do not tell it how to do it (yet) PyBLoCXS being an outstanding counter-example

#### Agreement#1: the future of cross-calibration



- 1. Get an update of the global picture of the true cross-calibration status
  - Guainazzi to ask the WG to verify by June 15 the measurements on the crosscalibration status and prepare a summary of the current status for the 2014 IACHEC report
- 2. Compile a list of astronomical topics on which cross-calibration uncertainties are a limiting facto
  - Guainazzi to activate a discussion among the IACHEC WG Chairs on how to compile this information
- 3. Propose a mechanism allowing each astronomer to easily assess the impact of and remove the cross-calibration uncertainties with existing spectral analysis tools
  - Marshall to coordinate a Technical Note detailing the requirements
- 4. Extend the pool of IACHEC cross-calibration sources to objects originally observed for scientific purposes
  - Forster to distribute the results of his study to the IACHEC Working Group Chairs

#### Agreement#2: bridging past and future



- 1. Organizing a (at least) half-a-day session on in-flight calibration plans for Astrosat, Astro-H, HXMT, eRosita, at the next IACHEC
- 2. Choose venue of future meetings that facilitate the contact between calibration teams of missions close to be launched and the IACHEC community
- 3. Fulfill the Working Group activities related to future mission: Contamination WG (contamination prevention White Paper), Heritage (in-flight calibration White Paper, collection of ground-based calibration papers), Uncertainties (Pyblocxs extension to NuSTAR and, hopefully, XMM-Newton)

#### Our warmest thanks to ...



Our warmest thanks to the LOC members:

# David Burrows, Laurie Ebertowski, Michael Stroh and Jamie Kennea

and to the sponsors for their generous financial contribution:

**GSFC, Swift and Chandra projects**