

Subject: Re: I have decided to stop working for ILRS - further information

Date: Thursday, November 15, 2018 at 2:39:05 PM Eastern Standard Time

From: Ignazio Ciufolini

To: Dr. Erricos C. Pavlis, Frank.G.Lemoine@nasa.gov, peter.dunn@sigmaspace.com, Toshimichi Otsubo, Bianco Giuseppe, simone.dellagnello@Inf.infn.it, prof. paolozzi, Reinhart Neubert, josrod@nerc.ac.uk, matwi@nerc.ac.uk, jan.f.mcgarra@nasa.gov, SCOTT.WETZEL@honeywell-tsi.com, Georg.Kirchner@oeaw.ac.at, john.degnan@sigmaspace.com, prochazk@cesnet.cz, Michael Pearlman, stephen.m.merkowitz@nasa.gov

CC: David Arnold, ignazio ciufolini, Ignazio Ciufolini

Dear all,

Since Dave is sending a private email to others (without asking for permission) as a tool against us, we are forced to precisely explain the facts.

In the private email to Dave, Ignazio simply suggested, if Dave would be the only author, to use the title "optical analysis of the LARES 2 CCR array or something similar", or to avoid the word "design", or if the design of LARES 2 would have been included in the title and in the paper, to put one of the Italian design team as the first author. Actually, we did not have information about the content of the paper other than the title.

We are sorry to read that Dave seems not to distinguish design from analysis. According to us it would have been a damage to the Italian team if the first paper on the LARES 2 design would have been published with the single name of Dave using inappropriately the word design. It is technically incorrect to consider Dave's work the design of LARES 2, not even the optical design would have been correct since the CCR distribution was ours (the list of the work on the design done by the Italian team is given below.) We did not know the content of the Camberra paper, we simply disagreed on using the word design in the title. If Dave says that we "had nothing to do with the content of the paper", then he could not use the word design since his sentence is correct only if the content of the paper did not contain anything on the design. But if he used the word design, how can he state that we have nothing to do with the design if we are the ones that actually made the design of LARES 2 (and incidentally we are the design authority of LARES 2)? Consequently, his accuse of "an attempt at theft of intellectual property" is of course unacceptable. If he would have put the word design in the title, that would have been not acceptable for all the people that worked on the design. Concerning the Camberra paper we simply PROPOSED to him, since he asked, either to remove the word design or to put an Italian first, since his optical analysis was on our design of LARES 2, and above all, nothing on the LARES 2 design was published yet. When we realized he strongly disagreed using nasty emails to us, we wrote him to do whatever he liked with the Camberra paper and its title without expecting us to agree, although we wrote him that we would have not raised that issue. So we do not understand what he wants with those last emails, maybe he wanted to force us to agree with him even if we strongly disagreed?

It is not our custom to emphasize the work of our group but the last email of Dave forces us to do so. The calculation of the CCR distributions was very time consuming, complex and coupled with the designs of the mounting systems and the separation system and also of the stiffness and strength of the materials, just to mention a few topics involved in the design of the CCR distribution. We will not enter in the money matter because we were not aware of the requests raised by Dave in his email. We did not suspect this was an issue. If Dave would have told us that at the beginning, we would have tried out other ways for the optical analysis.

Best regards

Ignazio and Antonio