



THE EVOLUTION OF COLLABORATIONS AND DETECTORS FOR GRAVITATIONAL WAVES IN THE US AND EUROPE

DAVID SHOEMAKER

MIT

22 OCTOBER 2025


CE G2500077

RAI WEISS

SEPTEMBER 29, 1932, BERLIN, GERMANY

AUGUST 25, 2025, CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS, U.S.












- 1972 Internal Report – roadmap for making instruments that work
- 1975 discussion with Kip – triggering the activity at Caltech leading to LIGO
- 1983 Blue book with MIT-Caltech authors – put LIGO on a firm quantified basis
- 1986 NSF Blue Ribbon Panel – Convinced Garwin
- 1990 10,001 analyses to manage Drever's imagination
- 1994 Designing and watching over the beam tube realization
- 1997 Launching the LSC; current Analysis domains
- 2000 Constant presence at the LIGO Sites, LIGO BT leaks
- Mentoring many of the leaders of the field



COSMOLOGY AND GRAVITATIONAL RESEARCH GROUP

BETWEEN 1965 – 2007

WEISS GROUP TIMELINE CMB+GW



OBJECTIVES

- Give a reminder of the growth of the observational field
 - Limited to terrestrial interferometric detectors
- Tease out some differences and repercussions; a personal view
- Organized around Epochs:
 - Prototypes on a range of scales
 - Coalescence of Experimental groups
 - Observatory proposals
 - Observatory design and construction
 - Start of the Collaboration Epoch
 - Observatory Operations and Upgrades
 - Next-generation Observatories

TRAJECTORY


- 1975-83 MIT Weiss group; COBE, GW
- 1983-86 Garching Max Planck group
- 1986-89 Orsay Brillet group
- 1989- MIT LIGO, LISA, CE

RAI WEISS

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10714-022-03021-3>


<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10714-022-03022-2>

- **Electromagnetically coupled broadband gravitational antenna**
- 1972 Internal Report – roadmap for making instruments that work
- Both analysis and instrument concept show Dicke's influence
- Basic concept sketched
- **'Basis Set' of stochastic forces and optical sensing limitations, with conceptual designs and derivation of requirements**




1970-80 R&D

- Glasgow/Caltech
 - Developing ideas for interferometry; **Fabry-Perot cavities, power and signal recycling** (Drever, Hough, Strain, Meers...)
- Orsay
 - Bringing forward interferometry topologies, frequency stabilization, and **Nd:YAG lasers** (Brillet)
- Pisa
 - Trying first active isolation controls, then multiple **6 degree-of-freedom pendulums** (Giazotto)
- Early MIT experimental effort started from the 1972 report
 - 1.2m Michelson interferometer using Delay Lines in the arms, data acquisition and instrument monitoring, a search for signals – **a complete system**, of marginal sensitivity (Weiss, Dewey, Livas, Shoemaker...)



1970-80 R&D: GARCHING GROUP

- (Schilling, Rüdiger, Maischberger, Winkler, Schnupp)
- Seasoned instrument builders, in MPI Astrophysics
- Backed up by electronics and mechanics specialists and shops
- Built the best room-temperature Weber bars, saw nothing
- Received Weiss' proposal to NSF by back door; adopted interferometry
- Built several prototypes, final one of 30m armlength
- Perfectly suited to work through Weiss' 1972 paper, providing experimental basis to complement Weiss' 'theory' paper
- Gave LIGO credibility, and a model for how to do lab work
- As for NR, the Max Planck approach key



PHYSICAL REVIEW D PARTICLES AND FIELDS

THIRD SERIES, VOLUME 38, NUMBER 2

15 JULY 1988

Noise behavior of the Garching 30-meter prototype gravitational-wave detector

BY THE MID-1980S...

- Viable notions of the instrumentation for full-scale detectors
- Independent studies of full-scale detectors from US, France/Italy, Germany, UK
- Initial efforts at analyzing data
- Initial concepts for managing quantum noise
- Growing interest by funding agencies of this new field
- Most work was undertaken in isolated groups, in 'friendly competition'

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP COALESCENCE

- Driven by Weiss and the NSF, Caltech and MIT joined forces
 - After some early efforts, Robbie Vogt named director, at Caltech (1987)
 - Brought authority, project experience, and engineering resources
 - Dictated changes in MIT and Caltech experimental groups, instilled 'Project' mentality, and led to some loss of staff
- Orsay and Pisa joined forces
 - Real complementarity in instrument skills (lasers, seismic isolation)
 - Brillet had optics and interferometry experience; was a leader in laser stabilization
 - Giazotto had project experience from HEP (and good connections)
- Garching → Hannover (Danzmann) and Glasgow joined forces
 - Similar working vision, similar interests

EUROPEAN GROUP BIFURCATION


- Glasgow/Hannover and Pisa/Orsay shifted from Pan-European work to really independent effort
- What caused this split?
- Giazotto took advantage of an opening to get funding for Virgo (1992/3)
 - In some measure a violation of agreements for pan-European planning
- Germany and Glasgow believed firmly in the need for prototypes
 - Not Pisa and Orsay – Desire not to incur the delay of realizing prototypes
 - This may have had long-term effects in depriving Virgo of new generations of commissioners
 - With hindsight, some Virgo design decisions might have been avoided
 - Glasgow/Garching may have believed that Orsay/Pisa lacked necessary experience/judgement

KEY LIGO PROTOTYPE DEVELOPMENTS

- **Weiss 1972: need both displacement AND phase sensitivity**
 - Demonstrate that the test masses can be isolated from seismic etc. noise such that the apparent displacement from GW will dominate, in some freq. range
 - Demonstrate required ability to measure a phase shift due to a GW
- Caltech 40m prototype
 - Did not have an optical sensing system that would work for LIGO
 - ...but did show good enough isolation of the masses >500 Hz; 1995
- MIT 5m prototype
 - Did have an optical system that resembled a very simplified LIGO
 - Was shot-noise limited (circulating power) to required level; 1999
- LIGO Lab – and NSF – convinced of need for these demonstrations
 - Virgo could use these as proof of principle as well



EUROPEAN OBSERVATORY PROPOSALS

- Germany and UK had plans for one or two km-scale observatories
 - A triangular configuration to be in Germany (1985) made good progress in the funding arena, until...
The Berlin Wall came down (1989)
 - GEO-600 was a fallback, with significant local funding
- France and Italy conceived of Virgo (1989)
 - Opportunistic jump forward by Giazotto in Italy cast a die in European relations
 - Particle physics funding sources
 - Kernel of the Virgo 'experiment' Collaboration formed



LIGO PROPOSAL (1989, 1994)

- Decision to jump from 40m to 4km (no intermediate step); Weiss' insight
- Two detectors, large separation, considered necessary
- National Science Foundation funding (under the Physics Division)
- Significant rescoping from Drever's initial vision to a realistic approach
 - 6 interferometers per site, rapid test-mass swap, etc.
 - ...replaced by 1 detector Livingston, and 1 full-length and one half-length at Hanford
- Joint MIT-Caltech work to prepare the proposal and defend it key to transformation to a single team, facilitated by Vogt and a 'circle the wagons' mentality
- Carried the message that detection was plausible, but that 'advanced detectors' would be inevitable and probably required
 - Infrastructure prepared for better sensitivity
- Significant activity *in* the NSF (Isaacson, Bardon) to support LIGO



OBSERVATORY PROPOSAL EPOCH ASTROPHYSICS

- Early efforts in data analysis
 - 1992 Sam Finn “Detection, measurement and gravitational radiation”
 - 1996 Bruce Allen’s GRASP
 - 1995 LIGO Research Community; open to all, informal, led to...
- Most of those proposing and working on instruments mostly AMO, precision measurement, or ‘project’ people
 - Many really interested in the measurement science – not GWs
- Astrophysics arguments to motivate the building of detectors from the ‘external’ astro community
 - Typically with one or several ‘liaisons’ to the Projects (e.g., Kip)
- Analysis, data quality, confidence, MMA developed in student theses and ‘demonstration’ observing runs using the prototypes
 - At MIT, ‘science’ was a necessary ingredient for a PhD

PROPOSAL EPOCH MEASUREMENT THEORY


- Thorne and Braginsky groups important for LIGO's success
 - For Virgo, one example is Jean-Yves Vinet and optics calculations
- Broader measurement theory community lively contributor
- Quantum measurement concerns and opportunities
 - Initially pretty simple stuff – shot noise, modulation schemes
 - Caves' insights triggered a slow tsunami of a more sophisticated view of quantum noise
 - Coupling of shot noise to radiation pressure via signal recycling
 - Now to frequency-dependent squeezing and speedmeters, etc.
- Interferometer configurations
 - Glasgow an important contributor – Strain, Meers
- Thermal noise (Levin)
- 'Ordinary' development of designs enabled by theorists' insights
 - Light scattering (LIGO Baffles)
 - Huygen's principle applied to optical modeling

OBSERVATORY DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION: LIGO

- Drever, and then Vogt, separated from LIGO
 - Did not conform to obligatory constraints of successful Project discipline
- Barish (Director) and Sanders (Project Manager), 1994 – 2006
 - Brought HEP Big Science Project insights and practice.
 - **Key step forward.**
- Robust support from the NSF; collaborative interaction with NSF
- Significant participation (intellectually, funding) from UK, Germany
 - N.B.: Continued fallout from the 'Bifurcation'
- Caltech was Project Lead; MIT key to design and realization, but minor engineering and management role
 - MIT (the Institution) uninterested in Project responsibilities;
 - Caltech did not want equal partnership
 - Continues to today (...and tomorrow)

OBSERVATORY DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION: VIRGO

- Initially one group each in France and Italy; 1991 Collaboration formally established
 - Leadership alternating between Giazotto and Brillet
- 3km baseline (LIGO is 4km)
 - Provides a standing barrier to LIGO-Virgo equality in sensitivity
- Low frequency instrument design focus
 - Giazotto targeted GW signals from Pulsars ~ 10 Hz
 - (Note that Virgo and LIGO have now similar *realized* low-frequency sensitivity)
- Facility buildings tightly designed around isolators
 - Creates challenges for modifications
- Instrument, like LIGO, needed a series of fixes and upgrades
 - Was there a negative consequence of the lack of prototypes?



THE VIRGO ORGANIZATION

- Early Collaboration a handful of University/Institute groups in Italy and France focused on building the initial detector (1993)
 - Experimenters did not initially welcome others, e.g., astro/GR folks
 - Now many nations and groups involved, with Observational Science included (2004)
 - Basic Collaboration structure and 'charter' has remained the same
- Individual groups obtain funds for subsystems; design, build, deliver, commission, maintain (and maintain control of) hardware
- Top level Virgo design determined by *consensus* of groups in Virgo
- Establishment 2000 of European Gravitational Observatory (EGO) at site
 - Intended to be a source of technical maintenance, not a scientific partner
- Spokesperson has the role of establishing *consensus* for the instrument plan and key design issues (as well as now the Observational Science)
 - Only 'moral' authority; decision discussions are on their own time line



THE LIGO ORGANIZATION: LIGO LABORATORY + LIGO SCIENTIFIC COLLABORATION

THE LIGO ORGANIZATION: LIGO LAB

- 1997: Creation of LIGO Laboratory
 - In parallel with the creation of LIGO Scientific Collaboration
- Caltech and MIT only. Not a “Collaboration”
 - Employees carrying out job responsibilities; hierarchical organization
- Observatory activities are Lab responsibility (and staff)
 - Visitors possible under Lab direction
- Caltech and MIT Campuses focused on R&D, engineering, and management
- NSF supports via ‘cooperative agreement’ with Caltech
 - MIT on subaward
 - 5-year funding cycle gives stability
 - Separate proposals for upgrades (e.g., Advanced LIGO)
- ...and Lab members are LSC members – mutually supportive

(ASPEN CENTER FOR PHYSICS MEETINGS)

LES HOUCHEs FOR LIGO

- Collection of meetings organized by Caltech/MIT (Syd Meshkov)
- Yearly from 1995 to 2001, molted into GWADW (Elba etc.)
- Focus was always on ‘future detectors’ – aLIGO, then beyond
- First meeting simple reporting of R&D
- Second meeting discussion of need to focus on relevance (1996)
 - Choices of ‘competing’ ideas for design elements
 - Complemented by NSF asking LIGO Lab to review proposals
- This process led to the initial concept for Advanced LIGO
 - Key insight: Glasgow monolithic suspensions to manage thermal noise
 - → Setting requirements on seismic isolation for aLIGO
- **A key event – the focusing of R&D**

THE LIGO ORGANIZATION: LSC

- 1997: Creation of LIGO Scientific Collaboration
- Not a significant source of deliverable instrumentation to the Observatories; Caltech and MIT produce installed equipment
- ...but LSC a very important contributor of R&D for new instrumentation
- Contributing to the science from LIGO the main criteria for membership
- Principal foci: Data Quality, Data Analysis, Astrophysical Interpretation
 - And a lot of bureaucracy to measure and monitor contributions
 - 'Payment' in authorship of LSC papers;
24→18→ 13 month proprietary period
- UK, Germany, Australia strong elements in the LSC (...not in Virgo...)



LSC VS VIRGO APPROACHES TO INSTRUMENTATION

- Both recognize importance of engaging the hardware R&D community
- Virgo gives responsibility to the distributed community for deliverables to the detector
 - Serves to maintain a wide group of instrument scientists and funding
 - Profits (and suffers) from pan-European collaboration and social environment
 - Presents challenges for systems design, project management
- LIGOLab/LSC has a two-step approach
 - LSC Working Groups develop ideas (Initially at Aspen, 1996)
 - Presented to LIGO Lab when demonstrated to be useful for detector
 - LIGO Lab takes over engineering, fabrication, installation, ownership

CURRENT LSC, VIRGO, KAGRA → IGWN

- All strain data are analyzed by all members of all 3 Collaborations
 - Papers are signed jointly
 - Instrument specific tasks – calibration, data quality – separate
- Successes: development of analysis pipelines, scientific interpretation, published papers
- Problems: different rules, separate decision-making processes, imbalances in computing contributions → inefficiencies and a sense of inequity in members
- Solution chosen: combine the 3 Collabs under one set of rules.
- ~2500 persons, checks on contributions, bureaucracy
- Hope is to reduce the highly variable levels and values of contribution
- Data remain proprietary for a period of a year+
- (For some future talk: not a long-term sustainable path!)

OBSERVATORY OPERATIONS AND UPGRADES

- LIGO and Virgo detectors have undergone a series of upgrades
 - Detection rate grows as cube of sensitivity!
 - Now, e.g., the most spectacular application of quantum sensing
- To date, all instruments stop and start observing together
 - May be an error from the greater astrophysics perspective
- Virgo and LIGO use many similar technologies
 - Seismic isolation approach very different (multiple pendulums vs. servos)
 - Virgo did not adopt a key optical upgrade ('mode-stable input/output cavities')
 - May entail a significant 'downtime' in coming years for Virgo
- Strategy for observation, interface with Astro world needs evolution

ADVANCED LIGO


Key advances that enabled 1st detection:

- Reduction of stochastic forces
 - Seismic noise
 - Thermal noise
- Reduction of sensing noise
 - Lower-loss optics
 - Change in light coupling cavities
 - Increase in circulating power

ADVANCED LIGO


Key advances that enabled 1st detection:

- Reduction of stochastic forces
 - Seismic noise
 - Thermal noise
- Reduction of sensing noise
 - Lower-loss optics
 - Change in light coupling cavities
 - Increase in circulating power
- ...after the comment yesterday about 'noise curves' I had no choice but to include some!



NEXT-GENERATION OBSERVATORIES: ET

- Einstein Telescope very well advanced in the funding/political/organizational senses
- Interestingly focus is again on low frequencies (~ 3 or 5 Hz)
 - Goals: pre-merger MMA guidance; IMBH
 - Drives the instrument underground to reduce gravity gradients – arm length of 10 (or 15) km
 - Drives the plan for low- and high-frequency detectors, cryogenics
 - Brings expense and challenges – and potential great science
- Instrument goals require significant technical advances -- very motivating for the ET instrument community!
- See differences north-south Europe once again
 - Sites, configurations, organization...cultural, or chance?
 - But this time UK and Germany may put focus on Europe, not US, for next-generation
- See tensions between 'the Collaboration' and 'The ET Organization'
 - Funding agencies need control; the Scientists want ownership
- See tensions ET vs Virgo –
 - Limited number of skilled experimentalists;
 - Much more generous funding for ET than Virgo



NEXT-GENERATION OBSERVATORIES: CE



- Cosmic Explorer the planned next US Terrestrial GW Observatory
- Started much later than ET, less developed, smaller community
- A giant LIGO (40km instead of 4km); surface, room temperature
 - Low-risk approach for the observatory, and the initial detector
 - Generates less excitement for the instrument scientists
 - Plan on evolution of the detector over ~50-year lifetime of Observatory
- Ever closer connection CE-LIGO Lab
 - Anticipate a single entity in future
- Greatest risk and challenge: making constructive relationships with the indigenous peoples whose land will host CE
 - TMT as a cautionary tale

CE AND ET NETWORK



- Evident that the Observatories will need each other to leverage the data
 - ET initially conceived before first detections, and planned to be the 'one' next generation detector
 - Now likely that US-based CE will be built, as a single detector
 - 40km and 20km is the 'baseline' but unlikely to be funded
 - LIGO-India, using components from US LIGO in an Indian Observatory, will likely form the 3rd leg of the tripod; progress there has been slow
 - **Could (should) be adopted by CE/ET as a central element of the next-generation program**

CLOSING THOUGHTS – PERSONAL OPINIONS!

- We have learned how to design, build, and operate successful detectors
 - Net uptime with upgrades is suboptimal
 - Virgo's performance limited by its organization
- Have developed Collaborations which deliver excellent science
 - Early-career scientists can get lost in thousand-person organizations
 - Proprietary data and payment in authorship unattractive elements
- Have visions of technology to make 10x improvement
 - ET excessively complicated
 - CE may not have timely funding and site options

We have been well rewarded for solving our past and future challenges!
will be