

Minutes of the Board 2012-02 on 13 June 2012

Place of the meeting: University of Berne, Albert Einstein Centre for Fundamental Physics,
Sidlerstrasse 5, 3012 Bern, Lecture hall 119

Time of the meeting: 1 p.m. – 5 p.m. (approx.)

The Chair opens the meeting at 13.05h.

[\(→ complete set of slides\)](#)

1. Agenda

The agenda is approved as is.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

2. Apologies and Proxy votes

Active Board members (as of 13 June 2012): 61

Active Board members present: Baudis, Bay, Beck, Biland, Blondel, Colangelo, Derendinger, Ereditato, Gehrman, Gornea, Greub, Hildebrandt, Iacobucci, Kirch (Chair), Laine, Montaruli, Nakada, Neronov, Nessi, Pauss, Pohl, Pozzorini, Ribordy, Rubbia, Schneider, Spira, Straumann, Vuilleumier, Wallny, Weber, Wenger, Wiese, Wyler

Other participants: Baltensperger (Guest), Langenegger (Guest, filling in for Horisberger), Mühlebach (Obs., filling in for Moor and Steinacher), Burkhard (Obs.), Fischer (Obs.), Ruder (Admin.)

The Chair informs about the apologies received and informs about the proxy votes as announced before the meeting¹.

Vuilleumier would like to know why it had been denied to Amsler to transfer his voting power to him. The Chair explains that Amsler – having been a member of the predecessor organisation of the CHIPP Association – has never accepted the statutes of the new association (which is required by Swiss law [Zivilgesetzbuch]) and has therefore lost his status of a Board member. The Chair has informed Amsler about this situation and asked for the required acceptance but without response. For this reason, Amsler does not dispose of voting powers and in consequence cannot transfer them to someone else. Vuilleumier takes note of this explanation.

Quorum: 21 votes (= 1/3 of the Board members; Art. 24.1 Statutes); Votes present: 33 + 10 proxies = 43

→ The quorum is reached.

3. Minutes of the last meeting (2012-01 [12 January 2012])

The Board unanimously approves the minutes (with thanks to the minute writer).
--

DECISION ITEMS

4. European Strategy for Particle Physics: The CHIPP input paper ([→ slides](#); [→ documents](#))

Presentation, specific proposals and approval

The Chair explains that he plans to discuss the proposals for amendment received and to go then to a final

¹ Bay (for Rivkin), Biland (for Grab), Colangelo (for Chiochia), Hildebrandt (for Ritt), Nakada (for Shaposhnikov), Pauss (for Gaberdiel), Pohl (for Courvoisier), Th. Gehrman (for A. Gehrman), Wallny (for Dissertori), Iacobucci (for Clark).

approval vote. Before that, he opens the floor for general remarks. Baltensperger would like to decide first about the proposals for amendments and hold the general discussion afterwards (suggestion not followed). Pauss would have preferred to first discuss the possible content of the strategy input paper and then see the first draft (instead of the other way round) and states that there are several factual errors in the present text. For Derendinger, supported by Iacobucci, a clear strategy is not visible in the present text; he would have preferred that several scenarios are described and is of the opinion that some re-writing is required. In his view, at least a strategy part should be added to the 'wish-list'. Not agreeing with this statement, Straumann reminds the Board that this document is not supposed to describe a strategy by itself, but to give input into the European Strategy Update process. Wallny supports this intervention, adding that in his view it is anyhow not the right time to write a strategy. Pohl goes even a step further and challenges the need of having a strategy at this point in time. Nakada (who leads the European effort) expects scientific input and explicit views about how the European strategy should be set. Rubbia recalls that in 2006 there has been more time to discuss the issue, but mentions also that since then the European strategy had been established and the Swiss Roadmap and its implementation document exist. For him the question to be answered at present is rather how to match the three pillars with the European picture.

The Chair underlines that there have been time constraints and that – if the Swiss input is to be delivered by the end of June – one should go forward now. He is of course ready to correct factual errors. On this last point, Pauss is ready to contribute. The Chair calls up the changes received and puts them to a vote.

Amendment 1 (Iacobucci); not approved.

Amendment 2a (Gehrmann): Rubbia suggests to slightly rephrasing the sentence (“... *CERN to not invest in LHeC...*”), as the Swiss community is not active in this field.

Amendment 2b (Blondel): approved

Amendment 2c (Iacobucci): Bay mentions that magnet R&D is already going on and that therefore the text does not have to mention it. As a compromise, Pohl suggests to put the R&D request also in the footnote, together with the different collider options. Approved.

Amendment 3 (Ribordy): Rubbia is favourable to the suggested addition, but would like to rephrase it. Ribordy suggests to use the wording ‘non-accelerator experiment’. Approved.

Amendment 4 (Baltensperger): Spira notes that climate experiments are outside of the CHIPP research fields; however, they are interesting and of actuality. Montaruli agrees with the importance of climate research, but would not like to mention the specific experiment. It is mentioned also other core-disciplinary applications, like medical applications, should be mentioned. The sentence is amended and enlarged. Approved.

With all these amendments, which will have to be re-phrased, the Chair will not put the document to a final vote today. Instead of waiting for the September Board meeting, he will contact immediately a few members for drafting support and provide a revised version by end of June. Wiese asks to include a section regarding strategy (is ready to detail his expectations).

→ The Chair: to contact Members for drafting support

→ The Chair: to provide revised version by end-June

→ The Chair: to put the matter on the agenda of the September Board for further consideration and a possible second input into the European update process.

The Board is ready to contribute to the drafting when required and approves

a. the amendments as discussed and revised;

b. the idea of providing a first input to Europe in July and possibly a second in September.

5. Scientific CERN Council Delegate: Nomination of candidates (→ [slides](#); → [document](#))

The Chair recalls the fact that the delegate is selected by the State Secretariat for Education and Research and that CHIPP has the right to nominate two candidates and recommend them to the SER. The Board decides to hear a short statement of each of the three candidates.

Ereditato, Pohl and Schneider therefore present their motivation, views, and working style – Individually and in each case in the absence of the other two candidates.

In the absence of the candidates, the Board discusses the individual candidates at stake as well as the modalities of the vote. Rubbia suggests to not select two out of the three but to recommend all three to the SER. Derendinger proposes to vote on each individual candidate instead of voting for a ‘ticket’. These suggestions trigger a lengthy discussion about other possible voting schemes (one vote, three votes, YES/NO

vote, vote and then to decide whether 2 or 3 are recommended, etc.).

In the end, three schemes are put to the vote (2/3 majority = 28 votes required):

- recommend all three candidates: rejected (10 supporting votes)
- individual vote on each candidate (YES/NO): accepted (35 supporting votes)
- ticket vote: rejected (5 supporting votes).

In the following secret vote on each candidate (where just a few abstentions were noted), Ereditato gets 12 supporting votes, whereas Pohl and Schneider receive 32 supporting votes each.

The Board recommends Pohl and Schneider as possible new scientific delegates to the Swiss CERN delegation (1 vote against, 1 abstention).

→ The Chair: to send the nominations to SER.

6. PhD School: future intervals

Suggestion for future planning: The Chair recalls the past years with (initially) a PhD School every second year. Starting in 2010, an annual rhythm has been applied without taking a conscientious decision, but based on the fact that there has been a volunteer to organise the School. Today, it seems advisable to go back to the initial interval of two years, alternating with the Zuoz PhD School. In order to achieve this, a 2013 CHIPP PhD School will have to be organised, and Chiochia has informed the EB that he would be willing to do it.

The Board unanimously agrees

- to hold CHIPP PhD Schools every second year (odd years)
- to gratefully accept Chiochia's offer to act as organiser of the 2013 School.

7. CHIPP Long-Term Financial Tables: moderating the ambitions (→ [slides](#): → [documents](#))

The Chair, thanking all the Members who have delivered their data in the requested form and in time, briefly introduces the (well-known) subject. He deplores the fact that there still are a few 'holes' in the table and expresses his expectation that these holes will be filled in the near future, possibly in the next revision where today's input will be built in.

Before starting with the individual presentations, a short discussion on general points takes place. Rubbia expresses his discontentment with the compilation, because it mixes Laguna with T2K/NA61, provides a wrong impression of past Laguna FORCE grants, shows an incomplete picture regarding future FORCE requests, and states a wrong conclusion regarding the future needs of LAGUNA re FLARE funds. Ereditato underlines that also OPERA will ask FORCE money, even if this is not yet shown in the table. Burkhard informs that FLARE (formerly: FORCE and FOLIS) including deadlines and procedures have been discussed extensively at SNF and specifies at a question from Iacobucci, that at present the priorities are as they are, but that no guarantee can be given regarding their future evolution. This is also the case for the boundaries between the two initially separated funding instruments; in total 26.5 MCHF are requested from Parliament for the next four years. MP suggests to delete AMS from the table, because there will be no FLARE request regarding this experiment. Each of the following projects is presented by a speaker, who either details and explains the numbers provided for the tables, or gives information about the physics case and the organisation of the project, or shows the financial needs of the projects over the next years: ATLAS (Iacobucci), CMS Wallny), LHCb (Schneider), CLOUD (Baltensperger), OPERA (Ereditato), T2K (Blondel), NA61 (Blondel), LAGUNA-LBNO (Rubbia), EXO (Vuilleumier), GERDA (Baudis), XENON (Baudis), DARWIN (Baudis), MAGIC (Biland), CTA (Montaruli), ICECUBE (Montaruli) (→ [project slides](#))².

After the presentations, the Chair asks the Board Members to formulate their possible questions in writing (until end-June). He will then see that the projects deliver the corresponding answers and will distribute them to the Board Members. He confirms that the slides will be made available.

→ The Chair: to remind the Board Members about handing in possible questions until end-June.

→ Ruder: to make the slides available.

² the page is password protected; please contact the CHIPP Administrator at ruderjp@physik.uzh.ch

INFORMATION ITEMS

8. Composition of the EB for 2012ff: one replacement

As advanced information, the Chair informs that for reasons of extensive work-load Baudis has expressed her desire to step down as CHIPP Vice Chair at end of this year. He will launch a call for nominations among the Board members; the election will take place in the September Board.

→ The Chair: to launch a call for nominations regarding the replacement of one EB member.

9. ECFA Delegates: two replacements for 2013ff

The Chair informs that Wu (P-ECFA) comes to the end of his mandate at the end of this year and that Th. Gehrmann (R-ECFA) does not wish to be re-appointed for a second period. Therefore, the Chair will launch a call for nominations among the Board Members. The Board in September will formulate a recommendation to the Plenary for the election of the two successors.

→ The Chair: to launch a call for nominations regarding the election of two ECFA delegates.

10. ApPEC & CHIPP

The Chair informs about the ongoing discussion in ApPEC (Astroparticle Physics European Coordination) regarding its new structure and the question, if CHIPP should become a member of this organisation (which includes paying a membership fee). He urges the Board Members concerned to answer the survey undertaken by Baudis and Bourquin. The same goes for the questions that have surfaced in APIF (the OECD Astroparticle Physics International Forum), i.e. is there a need / desire to produce a global roadmap.

→ all Board members concerned: to reply to the survey sent out by Baudis and Bourquin re ApPEC and APIF.

11. Financial Support from SCNAT

The Chair informs the Board that CHIPP plans to submit to SCNAT a funding request for 2013 (approx. 20 kCHF). Among the topics and activities eligible for such funding, CHIPP would go for support to the CHIPP PhD School and possibly for the ApPEC membership fee.

→ The Chair: to submit the corresponding request to SCNAT.

12. Next Board meeting

The Chair reminds the Board that the next Board meeting will exceptionally be dissociated from the Plenary and will take place already on 7 September 2012, at ETHZ (to facilitate the attendance of the LHCb colleagues holding their collaboration week in Davos).

13. Next Plenary meeting

The Chair reminds the Board that the Plenary will take place at Kartause Ittingen (Eastern Switzerland) on 13/14 September 2012. The date has been chosen in such a way that the Board Members attending the Krakow meeting (European Strategy update) may attend. He points out that the block booking of the hotel rooms ends in a few days and urges the colleagues to register and to encourage the members of their research groups to do likewise.

14. A.O.B.

None.

The Chair closes the meeting at 17.50h.