

Minutes of the Board meeting 2011-02 (extraordinary) on 11 April 2011

Place of the meeting: Schweizerische Akademie der Naturwissenschaften SCNAT, Schwarztorstrasse 9, 3007 Bern

Date and time: 11 April 2011, 13.45-17h, Meeting Room 'MAX' (Ground Floor)

Active Board members (as of 11 April 2011): 41

Active Board members present: Beck, Blondel, Chiochia, Clark, Colangelo, Ereditato, Horisberger, Iacobucci, Kirch, Krusche, Pohl (Chair), Ritt, Rubbia, Schneider, Spira, Thielemann, Wallny, Weber

Other participants: Antusch (not yet a member), Bourquin (HM), Minkowski (HM), Pretzl (HM), Ruder (Admin.), Steinacher (Obs.)

Apologies received:

Members: Baudis, Bay, Becher, Dissertori, Gaberdiel, Gehrmann, Grab, Meylan, Nakada, Rattazzi, Rivkin, Shaposhnikov, Straumann.

Observers: Burkhard

The Chair opens the meeting at 13.45h

1. Agenda

The agenda is approved.

2. Apologies and Proxy Votes

The Chair informs about the apologies received and reads out the list of proxy votes as announced before the meeting¹.

Quorum needed: 14 votes (= 1/3 of the Board members; Art. 24.1 Statutes)

Votes present: 18 + 6 proxies = 24

→ The quorum is reached

3. Minutes of the last meeting (2011-01; 26 January 2011)

The minutes are approved (with thanks to the minute writer).

4. Roadmap on Particle Physics: the Implementation Paper (for discussion and decision) (next steps)

Ereditato (complemented by Pohl) presents the Implementation Paper and reminds the Board its purpose: it's an update of the existing Roadmap, taking into account the evolution over the last five years, formulating clear recommendations for each section and containing choices regarding projects and activities supported.

¹ Kirch (for Baudis), Pohl (for Rattazzi), Ritt (for Grab), Rubbia (for Shaposhnikov), Schneider (for Bay), Wallny (for Dissertori).

At the end of the meeting, the document should be voted (and approved).

In order to collect latest input and comments, the Chair opens the discussion, going around the table and giving every member the opportunity to speak.

- Several members express their appreciation of the document and see it in a positive way. (Minkowski, Pretzl, Iacobucci, Weber, Ritt, Rubbia, Thielemann, Antusch)
- A few members are of the opinion that there are too many details presented in some of the sections, whereas others have not received enough attention (Colangelo, Blondel, Antusch, Clark). The Chair reminds the Board that the Editing Group had worked on the input received from the Board members and shortfalls in this respect shows missing input; this is noted most in the theory section.
- A few comments deal with the fact that some of the text has been written a few weeks or months ago and that latest results and evolution has not yet led to updated text (Beck, Spira). The Chair agrees to adapt the text at a few places, whereas at other places no changes are introduced.
- Several members suggest drafting changes, point to factual errors and potential sources of misunderstanding, or highlight other possible improvements (especially in the Recommendations or in the title). Improved text is formulated in real-time, inserted and approved in the meeting.
- One suggestion for updating the references to publications (Chiochia) leads to the Board's agreement to remove all such references.
- Two members (Kirch, Clark), are asking for additional information or justification regarding some of the projects mentioned (e.g. EUCLID, JEM-EUSO, Darwin, CLIC, CLOUD).
- One comment (Bourquin) deals with the way, the Cantonal universities and the Federal Institutes are referred to. The Board decides to use the complete name at the beginning and call them 'universities' for the rest of the document. This is in line with the new official terms used in the law regarding Higher Education Institutions.
- One member specifically wonders about the small role theory seems to play in CHIPP (Spira). The Chair agrees, deploring this fact and suggests trying to improve the situation over the coming months (and years). He would also include astrophysics and astronomy in this action. Ereditato cautions to force people to join and prefers to act in such a way that a 'desire to participate' evolves.

After having completed the 'tour de table' the Chair puts the document to a vote.

The Board

- approves the Roadmap Implementation Paper by an overwhelming majority (24 votes in favour, 1 abstention), and
- recalls that this update paper should never be distributed to external readers as a stand-alone publication, but always together with the existing Roadmap.

The Chair will integrate all comments and corrections and circulate this draft for a very last proof reading among the Board members. Then, the text goes to PSI for printing.

→ MP: to circulate the revised version in the Board.

→ Board: to provide last comments to MP.

5. C-15 Centre for Advanced Studies: pre-proposal 2013-2016 (for discussion and decision)

Following a short introduction by the Chair, Ruder presents the pre-proposal (→ [slides](#)) on behalf of Straumann (not available). The basic idea is to continue with the successful activities of the Centre for a further period of four years with 10 PostDocs and 10 PhD students (alternative: 12 and 12) and introduce at the same time improvements based on the experience of the first three years. In addition, the updated boundary condition of the SUK must be followed. The pre-proposal foresees a digressive payment from SUK, accompanied by a progressive increase of the Eigenmittel of the participating institutes. Over the four years, SUK/ETH-Rat is expected to contribute with 3.2 MCHF; the same amount will have to be made available by the participants. Corresponding support letters are required from the institutions. Bourquin recalls that the set-up chosen by SUK is very similar to that of the NCCRs and that also here the presidents/

rectors will have to demonstrate the availability of Eigenmittel and show the corresponding shift in the institution's priorities.

In the ensuing discussion, many questions focus on the character and amount of the Eigenmittel and the posts connected with these matching funds. In summary, Eigenmittel

- should be fresh (and real) money (in-kind contributions are more difficult to integrate),
- should allow to increase the number of posts for particle physics (and not just put a different label to an existing post at the participating institutes),
- will be used exclusively for the institute providing them,
- might vary from institution to institution,
- and must be mentioned in a supporting letter from the institution.

Antusch inquires about the physics scope of the Centre's activities (e.g. collider physics) because he would have a potential interest in joining. Schneider inquires about the increased teaching (SUK guideline: no projects with a predominant research component) and the networks proposed. Although PostDocs are requested to teach and to supervise PhD students, a much more extended teaching activity seems difficult to achieve. Regarding the networks, several Board members express their preference for an experiment specific one. Physics collaboration within each experiment should be more intense than between experiments, whereas the sharing of resources might well be tackled in a Swiss-wide network. Beck flags possible difficulties for collaborating beyond the 'borders' of the experiment collaboration proper, since there are specific rules of the experiment collaborations regarding the sharing of information. Replying to a question by Schneider with respect to the PostDocs assigned for IT tasks, the Chair estimates that about 20% of these PostDocs' activities would be directed to this service.

After an exhaustive discussion the Chair puts the document to a vote.

The Board

- approves the philosophy of the pre-proposal (i.e. continue with PostDocs, integrate PhD students, enhance IT activities, search for Eigenmittel, continue with the Centre beyond 2016) with 22 votes in favour (1 abstention);
- decides unanimously to go for a 10 position package (10 PostDocs/IT engineer; 10 PhD students);
- agrees unanimously to further study the possibilities for an experiment specific network with an increased involvement of the PostDocs and expresses its determination to encourage the integration of Theory into the Centre;
- notes the timetable requesting the Group Leaders to discuss the matter with their hierarchy between now and end-June.

Ruder will report to Straumann and integrate the decisions into the pre-proposal. The final text will be distributed shortly to all Board members for the discussion with their hierarchy.

→ Ruder: to report to Straumann, to integrate the decisions, and to distribute the final version to the Board.

→ Group Leaders: to talk to their hierarchy regarding the progressive co-funding during 2013-2016 and the sustainable funding beyond this period.

→ Group Leaders: to report regularly to Straumann on the result of their discussions (dead-line: end-June).

→ Straumann: to draft the SUK request on the basis of the feed-back from the Group Leaders (July).

6. Computing: connecting HEP to the European Grid Initiative (for information)

The Chair informs about the presently ongoing discussions between Swiss National Grid Association (SwiNG), Switch and SER regarding the future set-up of the Swiss connection to the European Grid Initiative EGI (which is of big interest to CHIPP and particle physics). Switch would be willing to take care of the management tasks associated with the European project as well as with the Swiss participation therein beyond the end of this year. SwiNG serves as a coordinating body for the period 2013-2016. A funding request to the SER is under preparation. The complicated overall structure is explained with the help of a slide (→ [slide](#)). Grab as representative of CHIPP in these discussions would be happy to get helpful input from Board members.

7. Next Board meeting

The Chair reminds the Board that the next meeting will take place in the context of the CHIPP Plenary Meeting, scheduled for 1/2 September 2011 in Leysin and invites all Board members to attend. One of the important decisions to be taken then concerns the SUK request for the Centre (see above item 5).

The Chair closes the meeting at 17:05h.

13 April 2011

written by: Jean-Pierre Ruder

approved by: Martin Pohl