



Minutes of the Board meeting 2009-02 on 24/25 August 2009

Place of the meeting: Appenberg (Schulstube)

Part I: 24 August 2009, 17.30-19h

Part II: 25 August 2009, 16.25-18h

The Chair opens the meeting at 18.20h (24 August) and on 17.05h (25 August).

1. Agenda

On proposal by Straumann agenda item 7 will be extended (by an exchange of views on the long term financial tables), newly ordered (FORCE, FOLIS, SER Roadmap) and dealt with after item 8. With this amendment, the agenda is approved.

2. Apologies

Straumann has received three apologies: Bay (has given proxy to Schneider), Shaposhnikov (has voted by email), Rattazzi (has voted by email).

→ The Board agrees to accept the votes thus expressed.

3. Minutes of the last meeting (2009-01; 5 March 2009)

Approved.

4. Enlargement of the Board

Straumann recalls that the CHIPP Constitution includes also the professors in astroparticle physics as Board members. It remains to the discretion of the person concerned, if he/she considers him/herself as an astroparticle physicist and therefore as a CHIPP member. The updating of the CHIPP membership list is done individually in each university / institute. Vuilleumier finds it problematic that people can belong to two "clubs". He fears that CHIPP will be confronted with problems of no concern to it and vice versa. This opinion is not shared by Clark who advocates for a free choice; Nakada – supported by Pauss and Pohl – suggests that CHIPP be open to other communities, since people will join anyhow only if they have an interest.

Straumann concludes that the majority wishes to be open.

- Outreach Coordinator
- Computing Board Coordinator

Straumann recalls the nomination of Beck who has been already very active since March and Grabs longstanding contributions as Computing Board Coordinator. The proposal is to accept the two as ex officio Board members, the membership being linked to their function.

→ The Board unanimously approves the proposal of accepting the Outreach and the Computing Board Coordinators as Board members.

5. Elections and Re-elections (proposal distributed by mail)

- CHIPP EB
- CHIPP Chairman

Straumann recalls the result of the nomination process carried out among the Board members: Pohl is proposed as new CHIPP Chair, chairing also the CHIPP EB, which is composed of Ereditato (2nd term), Nakada (2nd term), and Baudis (new) as Vice-Chairs.

→ The Board approves the proposal with an overwhelming majority (1 abstention).

6. Mandates and Representations (recommendations to the Plenary)

- P-ECFA (T. Garvey)

Straumann recalls the nomination of Garvey in March; this nomination should now be recommended to the Plenary.

→ The Board unanimously recommends to the Plenary to mandate Terence Garvey (PSI) with the representation of Switzerland in the Plenary ECFA, starting on 1 Aug 2009.

- R-ECFA

Straumann recalls that the election of Nakada as ECFA Chair leads to nominating a new Swiss member of the restricted ECFA. After the nomination process carried out among the Board members (the result of which had been communicated to the Board ahead of the meeting), two candidates stand for election: Amsler and Gehrman. The Board is asked to formulate a recommendation to the Plenary who will elect the person. Each candidate has the opportunity to present himself and his ideas. After a short Q & A session, the Board proceeds to the vote.

→ With a large majority, the Board recommends to the Plenary to mandate Thomas Gehrman (U.ZH) with the representation of Switzerland in the Restricted ECFA, starting on 1 Jan 2010.

7. Report on CHIPP activities (elements not reported in the Plenary)

- CHIPP tables (long term financial planning)

Ereditato presents the table [\[see slides\]](#) as 'work in progress', since not all Board members have already contributed. He points to the inclusion of 2014 and asks for new inputs. Ruder is of the opinion that 2008 should also be updated (according to the reality) and stresses the necessity (for the SER and the funding bill to Parliament) of including 2015 and 2016. Beck proposes to include a special line for Outreach (agreed), whereas Ribordy notes that ICECUBE is missing. Minkowski asks about the end of funding for DIRAC (no answer – Amsler absent).

→ Straumann invites all Board members to constructively contribute to the table and sets the deadline for inputs on 30 September. He will inform / remind the Board by mail.

- FORCE requests (2009 (approved, new), next period)

Straumann shows the status table containing the first batch of 2009, recalls the ongoing synchronisation of the FORCE requests (starting now, all FORCE request are submitted in fall) and reminds the Board about the possible inclusion of manpower (according to the rules) [\[see slides\]](#). Ruder reminds all applicants to send a copy of the main financial table to Ereditato.

→ all: to send a copy the funding table of the FORCE request to Ereditato.

Rubbia expresses his desire to have the possibility of giving input to the LA FORCE concerning the definition of the FORCE guidelines for the year to come. This is noted.

- FOLIS

Straumann presents FOLIS (background, idea, action, outlook, funding range) [\[see slides\]](#).

After a few additional explanations, he asks for one slide per project for his presentation to the State Secretary (physics goal and 'Swissness'; deadline: 4 September).

→ Straumann, Baudis, Rubbia, Nakada: to provide 1 slide / project by 4 September at the latest.

- SER Roadmap (distributed)

Straumann introduces the SER Roadmap, its background and goal and points to the selection criteria for projects. He invites the Board to make substantial input to the SER. On a question of Grab, Ruder will inquire about the deadline at the SER. Overall, the Board is of the opinion that several texts are either outdated or focus on wrong elements. The CHIPP input for LHC e.g. will have to be based on the long term financial tables (see above). Missing projects are the EuroFEL (Rivkin) and the e-Infrastructure (Grab). Rubbia is wondering whether CTA should be included in the SER Roadmap or in the FOLIS list or appear in both (will be a SER decision).

- Ruder: to inquire at the SER regarding the deadline [*result: the feed-back is expected by end of September*].
- Rivkin: provide input to CLIC and EuroFEL.
- Grab: provide input to e-Infrastructure.
- Straumann: to inform the (absent) Board members about the deadline [*after the meeting set on 14 September*] and to organise further feed-backs.

8. Roadmap on Particle Physics (Re-discussion)

- Update, revision or new?

Straumann recalls the history (establishment of the Roadmap in 2004, discussion in March 2009, second thoughts after the meeting, and uncertainty about the way to proceed) and summarizes the options available: do nothing, produce an addendum, or revise the present Roadmap thoroughly. He asks the Board to express its opinion in order to take a final decision.

In the ensuing discussion, the following points were made:

- the Roadmap
 - is instrumental for multi-annual funding (Rubbia);
 - is useful when hiring university professors (Gehrmann);
 - should be on physics and science (Pohl);
 - is also a bottom-up science policy document (Pohl).
- the Roadmap is not suitable for dealing with day-to-day issues and not related to a specific funding instrument (Gehrmann, Pohl, Straumann).
- a possible addendum
 - should fill gaps identified and give some specific details (Gehrmann);
 - would benefit the neutrino and the astroparticle communities; the latter could profit from some concentration and streamlining (Rubbia);
 - should also include Dark Matter searches and theory (Baudis);
 - would meet a new strategic surrounding with the CERN Strategy (Minkowski) and with the NuPECC strategy plan (Kirch).
- the timing is important, but
 - the start of real operations of the LHC should happen first (Minkowski);
 - before producing anything, let's be clear about the readers (internal or external use?) and the impact thought on the SER Roadmap (Paus);
 - the time-scale for the three Roadmap pillars are not identical (Bourquin);
 - would a delay by three years be detrimental? (Dissertori);
 - the preparation of the multi-annual funding bill to Parliament should also be taken into account (Pohl).

- How to proceed?

After further informal discussion, the debate is resumed the following day. The necessity for taking stock of the steps taken and foreseen in implementing the Roadmap is widely recognised and a corresponding proposal is made (Paus, Pohl, Ereditato). Reference is made to the three recommendations 4, 5 and more specifically 6 of the Roadmap, mentioning "... a realistic strategy to participate meaningfully in future important fundamental experiments ...". (Pohl). Ereditato prefers to talk about "implementation of the strategy of the Roadmap" and suggests

including all pillars (Beck supports this). Horisberger suggests including also the PSI programme and promises substantial contributions to the text. Other requests for inclusion concern accelerators (Pauss) and Theory (Baudis). Minkowski notes that concretisation of a Roadmap means inevitably also guiding the way; according to him, the task is not trivial.

→ In the end, the Board agrees unanimously on writing such an implementation paper and confirms the Editing Group as designated in March (Ereditato, Baudis, Rattazzi).

After having heard some requests for enlarging the group, Ereditato defends the small group for practical reasons. He outlines again that the group would be in contact with all Board members for contributions and feed-back on iterations.

US confirms that the Board will have to approve the paper before publication.

9. Common publications about LHC experiment participation

Straumann asks the Board to make an effort for avoiding individual publications, but rather join forces with the aim of presenting always the totality of the Swiss contribution to a given project. Ereditato underlines that such joint activities fit nicely in the Outreach effort as proposed by Beck in the Plenary. The idea of Pauss of producing a picture book about the LHC participation is supported very much by Beck, whereas others are more sceptical.

10. Impressions from the Plenary meeting (programme, meeting place, ...)

Straumann ask for feed-back regarding the location, but also about the programme. Pohl expresses his satisfaction with the venue as the remote location has allowed informal discussions also in the evening, because people had to stay. He has welcomed the fact that the all the logistics has been taken care of by the hotel, and he suggest continuing like this. Pauss shares these views, but suggests planning for longer coffee breaks and spare time around the talks in order to increase the possibilities of interaction.

→ the Board decides to hold the next Plenary on 23/24 August 2010 (alternative: 30/31 August) and to follow the same formula as this year and asks Ruder to organise the meeting.

11. Status of new professorships at CHIPP Institutes

U.GE: two openings will be advertised soon: one full professor (succession MB) for LHC ATLAS, plus one new professor (created through upgrading of a MER position) in astroparticle physics; a new position in theory (cosmology) will come out later this year.

ETHZ: the candidate selected for the joint PSI/ETHZ professorship in particle physics (at PSI) has accepted; for the full professorship in collider physics (succession FP), the selection committee will meet on 21 September.

U.BE: one opening in theory (succession Hasenfratz) is advertised; the next upcoming vacancy is expected in two years (succession Vuilleumier).

No open positions are reported from EPFL, PSI and U.ZH (next opening in 2012 – succession Amsler). U.ZH signals the arrival of a visiting professor (1 year) in astroparticle physics.

12. Next Board meeting

The next Board meeting will take place on 28 January 2010 in Zurich.

13. A.O.B.

None.

The meeting was adjourned at 19.55h (24 August) and ended at 18.40h (on 25 August).

31 August 2009

written by: Jean-Pierre Ruder
approved by: Ueli Straumann