

SSG Presentation to SKA Board of Directors

Vernon Pankonin

19 March 2012

SSG Objectives from ToR

1. Establish a roadmap to site selection and manage the implementation of the roadmap up to the issuance of a report and recommendation from the SSEC on the preferred site.
2. Establish scientific and technical criteria and non--scientific/technical criteria and selection factors applicable to both sites to be used for identifying a preferred site, and which are in the best interests of the SKA as an international scientific facility.
3. Provide oversight of the site selection evaluation which is to be managed by the SSEC; concurring with a plan prepared by the SSEC for the site evaluation prior to implementation, and receiving regular progress reports and the final report and recommendation from the SSEC.
4. Validate adherence to the agreed site selection process and transmit the report and recommendation on the preferred site to the SKA governing organization, that is in place at the time, for the site decision.

SSG Role – I

From the SSG ToR

- SSG was charged to validate adherence to the agreed site selection process and transmit the SSAC report and recommendation on a preferred site to the SKA governing organization.
- *“The SSG will review the report for adherence to the principles of fairness, impartiality, transparency, and freedom from governmental influence, and for compliance with the agreed process in carrying out the site selection analysis”*

=====

The SSG **did not** critically review and evaluate the SSAC report and it is not in a position to interpret the SSAC report.

SSG Role – II

- SSG “owns” the *Request for Information* which was developed by SPDO with guidance from SSG and in consultation with candidate sites (the sites commented on a draft distributed in March 2011).
- SSG served as buffer between SSAC and candidate sites, SPDO, expert panels, consultants, & FB/SSEC.
- SSG was the conduit for flow of all material (documents) directly related to the site selection process.
 - Site responses to Request for Information went through SSG.
 - SSAC questions to sites and responses went through SSG
 - Questions from expert panels & consultants went to SPDO then through SSG to sites.
 - SSG did not filter.
- SSG had observers at all SSAC meetings and telecons.
- The SSG did not have oversight of or direct cognizance of a number of activities conducted by the SPDO with the candidate sites on site characterization going on in parallel under Work Package 3 of PrepSKA.

the SSAC

From the SSAC ToR

- *“The SSAC is tasked with reviewing the data and information obtained on the Candidate Sites, assessing reports by expert panels and consultants, carrying out an evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the sites, and formulating a recommendation on a preferred site for the SKA.”*
- *“The site recommendation from the SSAC must be based on the material with which it is provided on the Science and Technical Selection Factors, the Other Selection Factors, and on the implementation Plans and Costs. This material is supported by reports of expert panels, consultants, the SKA Program Development Office (SPDO), and a sub-set of the SSEC.”*

- The procedures followed by the SSAC were governed by conditions and parameters that they were given --
 - The Request for Information from the Candidate Sites
 - Measurements and data collection managed by SPDO
 - The Selection Factors and weights
 - The Timeline

Key Documents in Site Selection Process

- ***Revised Plan for SKA Site Selection***
 - Approved by FB and SSEC – May 2011

- ***Request for Information from the Candidate Sites (Rfi)***
 - Draft to sites, ASG, SSEC – March 2011
 - Final to sites – June 2011

- ***SKA Site Advisory Committee (SSAC) Evaluation Plan***
 - Approved by FB and concurred by SSEC – November 2011

Site Selection Timeline

	ACTIVITY	Planned Dates	Actual Dates
1.0	SSG: Establish Roadmap	-31 Mar 2011	25 March 2011. But superseded by <i>Revised Plan for SKA Site Selection</i> in May 2011.
2.0	SSG: Establish Site Selection Factors & Data/Information Needed for Site Selection	-31 Mar 2011	25 March 2011. But superseded by <i>Revised Plan for SKA Site Selection</i> in May 2011.
3.0	Acquisition of Data/Information	1 Mar – 15 Sep 2011	1 Mar – 15 Sep 2011
4.0	Analysis of Data/Information by expert panels/consultants	1 Jul – 1 Nov 2011	1 Jul – 30 Nov 2011
5.0	Data/Information Evaluation SSAC carries out assessment and evaluation. SSAC submits report/recommendation to SSG.	1 Oct – 31 Dec 2011	15 Sep 2011 – 27 Jan 2012 Report submitted -- 16 Feb 2012
6.0	Validation SSG receives report and recommendation from SSAC. SSG validates the process. SSG transmits report/recommendation to SKA Governing Board.	1 Jan – 15 Jan 2012	1 Feb – 14 Feb 2012
7.0	SKA Governing Board Activities Receives report/recommendation. Acquires additional information. Concludes discussions/negotiations with candidate sites.	15 Jan – 29 Feb 2012	16 Feb -- TBD by the SKA Organisation
8.0	SKA Governing Board (Members): Makes site decision.	- 29 Feb 2012	TBD by the SKA Organisation

In validating the process, the SSG found

- that in arriving at its conclusions, the SSAC confined its evaluations to the material that was provided, as it relates to the Model SKA, and to the Committee members' own experiences and expertise.
- that the material led to the identification of a single preferred site and did not motivate the SSAC to suggest an alternative solution for study.
- that the SSAC recommendation on a preferred site is based on the material with which it was provided.

From SSG Report on Validation of the SKA Site Selection Process

The SSG attests, without qualification, that the agreed site selection process, as described in the Revised Plan for SKA Site Selection, was followed, thereby validating the SKA site selection process.

The SSG concludes that:

- The SSAC adhered to the Evaluation Plan, dated 2 November 2011, in the conduct of all SSAC business; and*
- The SSAC has discharged its responsibilities, as described in the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for the SKA Site Advisory Committee and interpreted and clarified in the Evaluation Plan, in submitting to the SSG a motivated recommendation for a preferred site.*