
Summary of
***Session 1, Recapitulation and boundary
conditions***

1. Intro/Objectives for this particular DAWN meeting (Shoemaker)

- Goal: Work toward a unified very informal single umbrella organization for 3G
- Goal: Inform and learn from funding agencies from US and Europe

2. Progress on action items in the Dawn III report (McIver/ Caddonati)

- Highlights of Dawn III meeting/report
- A walk through the recommendations from Dawn III, many of which have been followed through completed!
 - » Pursuit of A+, LIGO facility lifetime assessment, US 3G concept study, etc....

3. Time constraints and opportunities in Europe, US, Australia, Asia (Reitze/Katsanevas/McClelland/Somiya)

- US (Reitze): 5 year LIGO run plan, A+ through 2026,7, Voyager later, CE later, US process for large projects (NAS studies, decadal)
- Europe (Katsanevas): Virgo history, AdV 5 year, AdV+ 10 year, ET longer term, opportunities and threats
- Australia (McClelland): funding, Aus Astro decadal planning, scale of contributions (~ \$10s million), partnerships, global governance model needed
- Asia (Somiya): survey of pan-Asia+India, China space and atom IFOs, LIGO-India, Japan DECIGO & KAGRA+

4. Discussion on the evolving role of DAWN meetings (Berger)

- History of DAWN

- » Recommendations from prior DAWN meetings have produced CCR, A+, CE design study

- What comes next for DAWN? Models:

- » **End** the series or merge with another meeting
- » Be **flexible** - focus DAWN V as needed next year
- » Act as a “**clearinghouse**” - summarize the **state of ground-based GW science and technology** annually - use info from GWADW, GWPAW, ET meeting, CE status, ...

- Lots of discussion! On role of GWIC, GWAC APPEC, APIF; on need for global coordination; imperative of developing a compelling science case, 3G GWIC report

- **Outcome: The next Dawn meeting should focus on the GWIC report; reassess where Dawn should go after that meeting**



1. Use the GWIC structure as the point of departure for follow-up of DAWN IV Actions
2. Form a GWIC 3G WG focused on Infrastructure implementation and costs
 - » Note that this is covered as a subgroup in the R&D Coordination group led by McClelland, Lueck, van den Brand
3. Explicitly plan/coordinate for the A+/AdV+ implementation time gap
4. Gather lead organizers of the smaller workshop-style meetings in a telecon to discuss synchronization/synergies/redundancies