

## Minutes of the Board meeting 2012-03 on 7 September 2012

Place of the meeting: ETH Zürich-Zentrum (main building), Lecture hall HG E41  
Time of the meeting: 2 p.m. – 5.30 p.m. (approx.)

The Chair opens the meeting at 14.05h.  
([→ complete set of slides](#))

### 1. Agenda ([→ document](#))

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, Beck, Colangelo, Dissertori, Gehrman, Gornea, Hildebrandt, Horisberger, Iacobucci, Kirch (Chair), Montaruli, Nakada, Neronov, Pohl, Pozzorini, Ritt, Rivkin, Rubbia, Schneider, Spira, Straumann, Weber, Wenger

Other participants: Bourquin (Honorary Member), Moor (Obs.), Burkhard (Obs.), Ruder (Admin.)

The Chair informs about the apologies received and informs about the proxy votes as announced before the meeting<sup>1</sup>.

Quorum: 21 votes (= 1/3 of the Board members; Art. 24.1 Statutes); Votes present: 23 + 6 proxies = 29

→ The quorum is reached.

### 3. Minutes of the last meeting (2012-02 [13 June 2012])

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

## DECISION ITEMS

### 4. Composition of CHIPP: election of one member: for approval ([→ slides](#); [→ document](#))

The Chair recalls the withdrawal of Baudis for the end of the year and his call for nominations resulting in two names. Out of these two, Montaruli would be ready to serve.

In her statement, Montaruli introduces herself, mentioning her positions and activities. She declares her willingness to serve and to support the CHIPP activities in this way. In the absence of the candidate, the Board exchanges its views about the planned completion of the EB.

In open vote, the Board unanimously elects Teresa Montaruli as new EB member for a first term of two years (2013/2014).

→ Ruder: to invite T. Montaruli for the December EB meeting.

→ Ruder: to include T. Montaruli in search for meeting dates.

<sup>1</sup> Dissertori (for Pauss), Schneider (for Bay), Gehrman (for Anastasiou), Weber (for Ereditato), Nakada (for Shaposhnikov), Rubbia (for Wallny).

## 5. R-ECFA / P-ECFA: nomination of 2 members for recommendation ([→ slides](#); [→ document](#))

The Chair recalls the stepping down of Gehrmann and Wu for the end of the year and his call for nominations resulting in three names for the Restricted ECFA and one name for the Plenary ECFA.

Rivkin and Iacobucci present their motivation and views, while Dissertori reads out the statement from Wallny<sup>2</sup>. In the absence of the candidates, the Board exchanges its views about the planned completion of the ECFA and about the goal of getting a well balanced mix of competences in the Committee. Answering a question of Beck, Nakada states that the R-ECFA as such is not balanced, since its members are nominated on the ground of national decisions. Gehrmann completes this statement by saying that specific questions are delegated to panels with a balanced knowledge.

Voting by secret ballot, the Board recommends to the Plenary to elect Lenny Rivkin for a first term of three years (2013-2015) as R-ECFA representative.

The nominee for P-ECFA (Steinkamp) is shortly presented by Baudis, whereas Garvey, standing for re-election as P-ECFA representative, is briefly introduced by Rivkin.

In open votes, the Board unanimously recommends to the Plenary

- to elect Olaf Steinkamp for a first term of three years (2013-2015) as P-ECFA representative, and
- to re-elect Terence Garvey for a second term of three years (2013-2015) as P-ECFA representative.

→ Ruder: to prepare the documents for the Plenary.

## 6. ACCU: re-election of the representative for recommendation ([→ slides](#); [→ document](#))

The Chair introduces the matter by informing the Board that the present Swiss representative in ACCU (Weber) is willing to serve for another term.

In open vote, the Board unanimously recommends to the Plenary to re-elect Michele Weber for a third term of two years (2013/2014) as ACCU representative.

→ Ruder: to prepare Plenary doc/CV

## 7. CRUS Report: Cost-intensive Infrastructures for approval ([→ slides](#); [→ documents](#))

Pohl presents the report, pointing specifically to the fact, the CRUS has requested the drafting of such an analysis, which will serve as basis of its discussion regarding its future tasks of coordinating and harmonising the cost-intensive infrastructures throughout Switzerland. The report concludes that PP requires costly infrastructures, but is not cost-intensive at the level of an individual university. It highlights the high degree of self-organisation of the field, which would not benefit from an additional layer of coordination, and suggests that CRUS contributes to the cost of this self-organisation. It also underlines the need of a consistent and reliable long-term funding policy (including SER's FLARE and the SNF's infrastructure funding).

Burkhard, pointing to the recommendation concerning the SNF, expresses his satisfaction. Rivkin joins in, also from the PSI's point of view. Dissertori, thanking the authors warmly, notes a number of very good messages, but is a bit uncomfortable with the statements regarding AEC and CAP. Bourquin asks himself why the position of Switzerland in the international context is not mentioned at all [answer from Pohl: the CRUS mandate deals with the national coordination]. Rubbia suggests to define a mechanism for making a proposal for participation [answer from Pohl: mechanism exists: submit proposal to the Round Table, which will decide on top level projects and then instructs LA FLARE and SNF]. Despite the suggested strengthening of the Round Table, Bourquin is of the opinion that there should be a clear relation between the infrastructure needs shown and the Round Table's decisions [answer from MP: this is up to the political level and the political process]. Moor agrees with the need to strengthen the Round Table.

The Chair informs that last minute additions regarding projects are still acceptable during the next two days.

The Board unanimously

- endorses the report 'Cost-intensive Infrastructures: Particle and Astroparticle Physics', and
- entrusts Martin Pohl with handing the report over to CRUS.

<sup>2</sup> absent

- Ruder: to liaise with Pohl re final version.
- Pohl: to hand over the report to CRUS.

#### **8. ApPEC Membership:** for approval ([→ slides](#); [→ document](#); [→ resolution](#))

The Chair introduces the topic, briefly sketches the evolution of ApPEC and mentions then the Resolution drafted by the Swiss ApP community pushing Switzerland to become member of ApPEC.

Nakada expresses his general support provided that the corresponding decision is taken by the Round Table. The Chair confirms that this will indeed be the case.

The Board unanimously

- is in favour of Switzerland becoming a member of ApPEC;
- entrusts the Chair with bringing this request to the attention of the 'Round Table International', together with the request to designate the organisation that should join as well as the Swiss representative, and
- approves the submission of a corresponding funding request to the SCNAT to cover the ApPEC membership fee of 5'000€

- The Chair: to bring the matter to the RT.

#### **9. CHIPP activities 2012: planning and budget:** for approval ([→ slides](#); [→ documents](#))

The Chair introduces the topic, highlighting the fact that the budget follows the list of activities, as requested in January. He presents the planned activities, which follow to a large extent the work of previous years (education, outreach, national and international networking, long-term financial monitoring, administrative and financial support) and bases itself upon the militia work of the Board members, the in-kind contributions of some institutes and the work of the CHIPP Administration. The overall expenditure costs for 2013 amount to 289 kCHF. These costs are outweighed by the contributions from the members, expected support from SCNAT, expected funding for the SNF's Agora project, continued funding from SER, and complemented by the carry-forward of 2012. The total expected income stands at 313 or 317 kCHF.

The Chair then presents the two options regarding the membership contributions, one increasing the individual fee compared to 2012, and the other one keeping the individual fee unchanged from 2012 but complemented by an institutional fee (institution = university).

The Board

- unanimously approves the CHIPP activities for 2013;
- unanimously approves the CHIPP budget 2013 as resulting from the approved activities (above); and
- approves (one vote against, one abstention) the membership fee 2013 of 110 CHF per individual member plus an institutional fee set at 7'500 CHF/institute, except for Basel (2'500 CHF) and Fribourg (250 CHF).

#### **10. CHIPP Long-Term Financial Tables:** for discussion ([→ slides](#); [→ documents](#))

The Chair introduces the subject, recalling the history of the tables, the June Board meeting, and the up-date since then. He points out to the table serving best the today's discussion ('FLARE shares'), which summarizes the funding needs of all the projects listed. He underlines to need to discuss the open issues (some 8, and 10 MCHF missing for the two periods under consideration; the link between manpower and funding; and the questions whether the Swiss university system can absorb the envisaged participations).

Rubbia hints at an increase of the FLARE funds, pointing out that the Swiss participation has a total sum and that part of this money should come from FLARE. Pohl concludes from the table that FLARE is severely underfunded and that the 'new' experiments should follow the way successfully explored by the LHC experiments, i.e. to apply for cantonal funding. On a question from Iacobucci, Rubbia explains that Laguna has an ApP part as well as a programme connected to the CERN beam, and that therefore the support funds should come from both the FORCE and FOLIS part of FLARE. Nakada is asking himself, whether or not Switzerland can afford all these planned participations. In addition, he is convinced that Laguna, Darwin, Xenon, Gerda and EXO are PP driven, whereas he is not sure about the support being equally strong from PP and astronomy in the case of CTA. Montaruli makes clear that other funding for CTA is not yet decided and asks if and how CHIPP can help the projects in case they follow the way mentioned by Pohl, i.e. seeking additional cantonal funding. Pohl hints to the Round Table, where all the actors concerned are present. Bourquin seconds this statement and underlines the fact that astronomy is now also part of the Round Table participants. The Chair

is convinced that the cantonal road can only work, if the projects demonstrate and show the support from other funding sources, to which belong, according to Pohl, also the EU. Nakada touches on another point, mentioning his uncertainty about how the FTEs (i.e. the manpower) will increase in the new large projects. Rubbia finds it problematic to highlight in the table only the number of professors and asks that total manpower is shown. Iacobucci would agree, but prefers to see a timetable with the evolution manpower. Baudis injects that it's not only a question of manpower – in some cases even not at all – since the funding increase comes simply from funding the construction of a large infrastructure installation.

→ Ruder: to add column with manpower to FLARE share Table.

Taking into account the discussion and the problems at stake, Pohl suggests that the actors 'at the bottom' get together, explain the Swiss leadership, interest and participation in the project, show where the money is needed and why, and formulate a concrete proposal to the Round Table in a white paper. This suggestion is strongly supported by Straumann. Rubbia concurs and asks when it is the appropriate time to prepare such a paper, covering the period 2017-2020. In Pohl's opinion it's now, and Burkhard specifies that the Research Bill 2017-2020 to the Parliament will be written in 2014.

Wrapping up the constructive discussion and aiming to implement Pohl proposal, the Chair concludes that the actors concerned are strongly invited

- to get together and to write a white paper
- to discuss the issue of the evolution of manpower, and
- to extend the number of funding sources.

→ Rubbia et al: to develop the white paper, a first draft possibly to be ready for the next meeting of the Round Table (21 November).

#### **11. Technology Transfer: a regular item for the Board?** for discussion and possibly for approval (→ slides; → documents)

The Chair introduced the subject, noting that the last Technology Transfer report had been heard in Board in 2008 and underlining the importance the national funding authorities (SER, SNF) are attaching to the matter.

The Board unanimously

- approves the introduction of a TT talk at every second CHIPP Plenary meeting starting in 2013, and
- entrusts the Chair with bringing the matter up before in one of the Board meetings if need be.

#### **INFORMATION ITEMS (→ slides)**

#### **12. European Strategy for Particle Physics: Status und Outlook**

The Chair recalls the document submitted in July and the decision of the Board to produce a second input in September (after the open symposium in Cracow). He continues by informing the Board about Gehrmann's decision to withdraw and his suggestion to include some of the persons who had expressed specific opinions about this second paper in June. He stresses that work will have to be completed quickly in September to respect the deadline of 15 October for this input. Nakada encourages CHIPP to invest the necessary efforts in this paper, which will have – according to him – a big impact for the strategy update. The Chair mentions that he is willing to invest this effort, but needs the support of the Board Members. Several of them agree to read and comment the draft of this second input paper.

→ The Chair: to submit the second draft strategy paper to the Board by end Sept.

#### **13. CERN Council Delegate**

The Chair informs that the SER has appointed Olivier Schneider to succeed Ueli Straumann as Scientific CERN Council Delegate for the period 2013-2015 (applause).

#### **14. NCCR Universe: publication of application; information re evaluation**

The Chair informs about unforeseen difficulties in the print shop, which have further delayed the publication of the scientific part of the NCCR. He is confident that the matter will be solved in a couple of weeks. Burkhard informs that the international evaluation panel met last week, and that the Research Council will take decisions in his next meeting of 18 September.

→ Pohl, Kirch: to inform the Board as soon as possible about the outcome.

## 15. SCNAT

- Funding request 2013: The Chair informs that the request has been submitted in time for a total amount of 31 kCHF. It covers the CHIPP PhD School 2013, the Outreach project 'Dialogue' as a continuation of 'Verflixtes Higgs', and the ApPEC membership fee. He expects to know more about the chances of success after the preliminary decision to be taken by the MAP platform in October.  
→ The Chair: to inform the Board about the MAP decision.
- Bicentennial celebration 2015: The Chair informs about the planned events, which will be – according to him – an opportunity not to miss for CHIPP to strengthen its outreach impact. He will keep the Board updated.  
→ The Chair: to keep the Board updated.
- Parrainage Maturaarbeiten: The Chair explains that the SCNAT keeps a list of people ready to serve as contacts and experts for Maturaarbeiten. He calls upon interested Board members to inform the SCNAT.  
→ all: to make their interest known to SCNAT.

## 16. CHIPP Prize: preliminary information

Colangelo informs about the today's success with eight applications received. After their discussion in the Selection Committee, an interview session had been held with the three short-listed candidates. The name of the prize winner will be made public at the Plenary. On a question from Nakada, Colangelo presents the statistics: theory – 2, experiments – 6.

## 17. FORCE requests for 2013

The Chair briefly presents the main changes in the FLARE rules compared to FORCE (one request per experiment, submission of a 'Letter of Intent' 12 months before a request can be placed, M&O and GRID computing remain two separate individual requests). Burkhard explains that the changes will most likely affect more the new communities, whilst the information is mainly already available for PP and ApP. Nevertheless, the two stage process will facilitate the planning process at SNF. He underlines that the rules can be adapted for 2013 and that SNF is willing to learn from experience. He stresses that only projects not funded until now by FORCE will need a Letter of Intent and that in the future two-year requests will be possible. Straumann is very positively impressed by the evolution and mentions the facts that (1) long-term plans can be submitted, (2) experiments are no longer sliced into several requests, and (3) the FLARE panel takes account of the communities' opinions. The Chair invites the Board members to give feedback and input regarding the rules; he also mentions the fact sheet to be made available soon on the CHIPP web page.

→ Ruder: to finalise the fact sheets.

→ Board members: to provide input and feedback to the Chair regarding the FLARE rules. The Chair will bring the matter to LA-FLARE.

## 18. SwiNG bill 2013

The Chair informs about a rather positive situation regarding the SwiNG bill in 2012, and about the good prospects to find a solution for 2013 at no additional cost for the institutes concerned.

## 19. Outreach: 'Verflixtes Higgs', Agora request, and interviews

The Chair informs about the submission of the revised Agora request 'Interactions' by Beck (applause).

## 20. Board meetings 2013

The Board meetings for 2013 are set as follows:

- 31 January 2013 (p.m.), Berne
- 1<sup>st</sup> week Sept 2013 (in conjunction with the Plenary 2013), Mittelland

## 21. Next Plenary meetings

The Chair reminds the Board members about the forthcoming Plenary meeting at Kartause Ittingen (13/14 September 2012) and informs about the 2013 Plenary which will be held on three days during the 1<sup>st</sup> week of September 2013.

## 22. A.O.B.

Dissertori asks his colleagues how they handle the SNF publication output data base. Specifically, he is not sure whether to put all papers in or just those written by the own PhD students. He would prefer to have a common CHIPP position. Weber and Pohl suggest to hand in just a list of publications (as they do), and Beck, supported by Straumann, suggests to list all papers. The Chair will prepare a letter to SNF.

→ The Chair: to draft a letter to SNF and will circulate the draft to the Board for input.

The Chair closes the meeting at 17.15h.

18 September 2012

written by: Jean-Pierre Ruder  
approved by: Klaus Kirch