

CHIPP

Summary of meeting at the SNF Berne, 29 October 2002.

Present:

C. Amsler, A. Bay, A. Clark, J.P. Derendinger, K. Gabathuler, J. Gasser, K. Pretzl, F. Pauss, L. Schaller, M. Shaposhnikov, M. Steinacher, U. Straumann, L. Tauscher, J.L. Vuilleumier

Agenda

1. Nomination of a minute secretary
2. Information
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Discussion of the minutes, and decisions taken at the meeting of 23 September 2002 point by point
5. Legal basis of the institute
 - a. Foundation to be proposed, by whom
 - b. Relation to the current Forum
6. Short term duties
 - Proposals
 - Outlines
 - Division of work
7. AOT
8. Next meeting

Agenda items 1 and 2

- a) A. Clark agreed to be secretary for the meeting.
- b) C. Amsler distributed letters related to CHIPP from the Universities of Zurich and Geneva.
- c) M. Steinacher briefly reported on the FORCE request for 2004-7. There had been no significant change since the last meeting, but economies were being requested from all government departments. More would be known in December 2002.
- d) C. Amsler reported that for the period 2004-7, FN funds were expected to increase by ~ 6% per year, however average cuts of 6 % in FN were expected for all exact sciences in 2003

Agenda item 3

The agenda was agreed.

Agenda item 4. Discussion of the previous minutes

The discussion concentrated on the purpose of CHIPP, and in particular on items 4.1 and 4.2, and item 5. Discussion on other items (new chairs and replacement of chairs, teaching, outreach) was postponed because of time.

4.1 General

*It is important, that particle physicists speak with one voice to the political **and financial** authorities as well as to the public. We should show, that we are a well organized community and have clear road maps and realistic priorities on our research and teaching projects.*

The importance of a clear roadmap, and the need to define realistic priorities, was stressed by several participants. The text was modified slightly as shown above to include financial authorities.

4.2 Research projects

Items a) – c)

Items a) -c) of the minutes of 23 September 2002 were discussed.
The minutes of 23 September read:

- “a) The CHIPP should coordinate large research projects and financial requests of Swiss groups both in experimental and theoretical particle physics, including astroparticle physics and computing projects in particle physics theory.
- b) The CHIPP should recommend projects on the basis of scientific considerations AND available resources. If necessary, clear priorities should be set. No consensus as to how far the recommendations should go (evaluation, priorities of the projects) was reached yet, to be discussed again. The need for international advisers or committees was mentioned.

Projects should be discussed publicly in an open meeting before the scientific committee makes its recommendation. It was proposed, that the recommendations will then be sent to all members of the "Forschungsrat", before they make decisions.

c) To whom should we recommend?

- to CUS, SNF, University/ETH management
 - "To whom it may concern" initially
-
- It was noted that the text above implied only computing for particle physics theory, whereas it was intended to be applicable for all particle physics related activities; the wording was therefore changed removing "in particle physics theory".
 - The need for a clear physics road map with realistic and well thought out priorities (both physics and financial) was stressed (K.Pretzl, F. Pauss) and agreed. A. Bay commented that for this the available resources should be known.
 - There was a long discussion introduced by L. Tauscher on the purpose of CHIPP, and what its powers should be.
 - a) L. Tauscher used the example of small projects where a project might be submitted to the FN, and that would be irrelevant to CHIPP. He said there was no need for CHIPP unless as a financial source. A. Bay rather argued that all agreed projects should be CHIPP- approved. it should be necessary stressed the need to know the available resources.
 - b) Comments by K. Pretzl, C. Amsler, J.-P. Derendinger and M. Steinacher led to an agreed consensus. It was felt that CHIPP should help to obtain a clear road map with better transparency. Items 4.2 a) - c) are therefore re-phrased as:

a) The purpose of CHIPP is to coordinate the involvement of Swiss institutes in particle and astroparticle physics research and teaching, and to recommend priorities in the case of limited resources.

b) CHIPP should make recommendations on projects or activities on request. Such recommendations

- *may be requested by the proponents of a particle or astroparticle physics project,*
 - *may be requested by a funding agency (for example the FN, BBW or CUS) with respect to a funding request for a particle or astroparticle physics activity*
 - *may be requested by an external bodies (for example the BBW) on more global issues.*
-
- It was agreed that CHIPP should actively help to ensure the financial resources needed to successfully execute an approved or existing project related to particle or astroparticle physics, and this is reflected in a change to item (e) of the previous minutes (see below).

Item d)

In the meeting of 23 September (Item 4.2 d) those projects which may be dealt with by CHIPP were discussed and 4 options were proposed:

- all PP projects (even if resources are only requested to Univ./ETH authorities)
- all NF/FORCE requests in which case they should be presented one month before the SN closing dates (1 Apr. and 1 Oct.)

- all longterm "Big" projects only, small projects ONLY "on request by the initiators"
- "SNF - 'Forschungsrat' asks the CHIPP for a recommendations or those projects it finds necessary.

The choice of options was partly reflected in the discussion of items a)-c), and the discussion then concentrated on the realization of that choice. Viewpoints differed on what projects should be presented to CHIPP. Following discussion, a consensus emerged that

- it is inappropriate to ask presentations or recommendations for some small projects (for example particular theory projects),
- the activities of CHIPP should not preempt the activities of the FN or other funding agencies
- it is reasonable to request presentations for substantial new projects, and to request status reports from existing projects, but that recommendations should be made only on request of a proponent;
- if successful, CHIPP should be recognized as 'representing the field in Switzerland', and in that case a CHIPP recommendation for any large project should be seen as being credible.
- the information should exist to enable CHIPP to have a global view of particle physics in Switzerland,

Following a proposal by J.-P. Derendinger and others, item d) then becomes:

- “d) Particle physics related projects in Switzerland should be dealt with in a three-level procedure as follows:*
- i) CHIPP should be informed of all particle physics related projects in Switzerland,*
 - ii) a presentation of all major new projects should be made to the CHIPP Plenary, but small projects should only be presented following a request by the proponent;*
 - iii) an evaluation or recommendation will only be made on any project if requested by the proponent or on request from an external agency.*

CHIPP will provide recommendations or will suggest priorities related to more general issues of a scientific programme, at the request of a proponent, or a relevant external body (for example the BBW).

CHIPP reserves the right to initiate a study and/or express an independent viewpoint on issues relevant to the particle or astroparticle physics community in Switzerland.”

Items e) and f)

- M. Steinacher noted that CHIPP will replace the Forum, and will therefore be an important advisory body towards the FN, the BBW, the Secretary of State, etc. The mandate of CHIPP should therefore reflect that.
- The necessity of long term financial commitments, in particular for the M&O costs, computing costs etc. of experimental programs extending over many years, was stressed by several participants. At present, no mechanism exists to commit

funding beyond one year, and this starts to be a major burden. K. Pretzl suggested a program of the type 'Protex' associated with ESO activities.

- With this in mind, e) and f) have been re-formulated as follows:

“e) CHIPP will, in a role previously played by the Forum, serve as the contact between the particle physics related community and government agencies (Fonds National, BBW, etc).

f) The priorities and recommendations laid out by CHIPP should allow flexibility for the funding of small projects, and for projects proposed by new professors in particle physics related activities.

The recommendations of CHIPP concerning a given project should take into account the need in some cases to ensure the successful execution of a project over a long time period (for example LHC experiment construction, personnel, maintenance and operation, and computing costs).

CHIPP should actively work to ensure appropriate financial resources needed for recommended projects. In particular, the present structure allowing one year funding allocations prevents a reasonable project planning in large international collaborations. “

Item g)

- In the meeting of 23 September 2002, it was proposed that the Institute could nominate the Swiss representative to the resource review meetings (RRB) at CERN and DESY etc. This was further discussed, and it was strongly urged that Funding Agencies (FA) representatives should be at these meetings. This is not possible in the current FA structure, and it was agreed that CHIPP should work with the FA's to ensure that this will be possible. M. Steinacher noted that he was aware of the problem, and would investigate.

“g) CHIPP will appoint Swiss representatives to relevant particle physics related committees (ECFA etc.) in the role previously played by the Forum”

5. Organisation

Following discussion it was agreed that there should be two CHIPP bodies.

- The CHIPP Plenary
- The CHIPP Board

The official language of both bodies will be English.

5.1. The Plenary

The present FORUM will become the "plenary" of the CHIPP, which will meet as required but at least once per year.

- Members of the Plenary will PhD physicists working at Swiss institutions (including PhD students) in particle physics related activities, and Swiss PhD nationals working at CERN.
- The CHIPP Board will report to the CHIPP Plenary, which will ratify decisions of the Board.
- The CHIPP Plenary will hear reports from the Board, and from representatives appointed by the Board. It will also hear Status Reports on existing approved projects, and presentations of new projects.

5.2. The CHIPP Board (CB)

The CHIPP Board will meet at least twice per year or as required, and membership will include:

- all elected full professors in experimental and theoretical particle physics related activities;
- and the Heads of the Experimental and Theoretical particle physics groups at PSI;
- representatives from the Funding Agencies for particle physics related activities.

The Board will appoint a Chair, Deputy Chair and Secretary to serve on a rotating basis. The office term was discussed at the previous meeting and a period of 3 years with overlaps was suggested.

Agenda item 5 Legal Basis of the Institute

J.-P. Derendinger reported that SUK is able to distribute funds for administration and teaching, It looks possible for inter-university collaborations within Switzerland, in the context of Article 1412.26 of the SUK Funding Convention.

M. Steinacher noted that the Secretary of State for Education and Science is responsible for this aspect, and he thought it would be wise to invite a person from his Department to advise us on both the legal framework for CHIPP, and its access to SUK funding. He will follow up on this.

Agenda item 6 Short term duties

It was agreed that on the basis of the Minutes of this meeting, C. Amsler, A. Clark and U. Straumann would prepare a draft document for discussion at the next meeting.

Agenda item 7 AOT

U. Straumann said that he had been approached concerning the possibility of holding a major international conference (in particular the Rochester Conference) at the Montreux Conference Centre. This was seen very positively, and it was suggested that approximately 2010 would make sense since it would be soon after the turn-on of LHC.

A. Clark noted that the Hadron Collider Conference would be held in Switzerland in 2005.

**Agenda item 8 Next meeting: Tuesday 26 November 1400-1700h,
SNF, Berne.**

For the minutes: Allan Clark, 31.10.02

