

The role of CHIPP and its Board in defining strategies and priorities

Olivier Schneider (EPFL)

CHIPP Board

O. Schneider, June 29, 2015

1

Preamble

□ Recent history of strategy and priority discussions (exemple of the neutrino pillar):

- since March 2014, general agreement by the CHIPP Board and the neutrino PIs for the need to produce in 2014 a white paper on neutrino strategy in Switzerland
- in November 2014, the Board discussed a draft version of an executive summary of the white paper and had a very lively discussion about the CHIPP input to the LA FLARE meeting
- today, despite encouragements from the CHIPP EB, the neutrino PIs do not want to prepare a white paper before at least 12 months. judging their initial executive summary as sufficient for the time being
- so far, the whole exercise is inconclusive and CHIPP does not have an agreed or endorsed strategy in neutrino physics

Is CHIPP unable (or not willing) to come up, within a two-year period, with a coherent strategy for one of its pillar ?

CHIPP Board

O. Schneider, June 29, 2015

2

Let's take one step back

- CHIPP is a bottom-up organisation
 - the EB members have no power over the Board members
 - the Board decides what CHIPP does and how

- The CHIPP EB has decided to ask the Board to clarify today a number of key questions about the role of CHIPP:
 - should CHIPP define strategies for its pillars ?
 - should CHIPP set priorities among its projects ?
 - should CHIPP agree on how to cope with the fact that available funding resources are insufficient to fulfill everyone's wishes ?

 - and if so:
what is the process by which CHIPP achieves this ?

So far, CHIPP has ...

- ... defined strategies:
 - 2004: initial roadmap defining three pillars
 - 2011: updated roadmap (« implementation » document)
 - 2013: white paper on ground-based astroparticle physics infrastructure

- ... recommended funding priorities to the LA FORCE and LA FLARE meeting
 - discussed within EB + recommendations posted on CHIPP web site
 - discussed openly for the first time in the CHIPP Board in Nov 2014

- ... collected data from the different PIs and compiled the famous « Long Term Financial Tables »
 - basis for discussion on plans and priorities (or moderation of the ambitions, as in 2012-2013)
 - basis for defining and communicating the needs of the CHIPP community

Art. 3:

— **The purpose of CHIPP is to strengthen particle, astroparticle and nuclear physics in Switzerland by being active in particular in the following fields:**

- help towards a successful participation of Swiss groups in projects;
- advise the Universities/ETHs on vacant professorships and academic strategies, and coordinate teaching activities;
- ensure a proper Swiss representation in relevant national and international bodies;
- promote public awareness on particle, astroparticle and nuclear physics

Art. 27, al. b) and c):

— The Board in particular

- **makes recommendations on projects on request, discusses and eventually publishes future strategies, recommends policies and priorities regarding the Swiss participation in international projects, and initiates studies as required;**
- actively helps to secure the financial resources needed to fulfil the Swiss obligations in an approved or existing project;

In fall 2012, when setting up the LA FLARE body, CHIPP has been given a fairly large influence

LA FLARE composition:

— representing particle physics:

- CHIPP chair (or vice-chair), as member
- Swiss scientific delegate to CERN Council, as observer

— representing astroparticle physics

- Astroparticle physicist nominated by CHIPP, as member
- Swiss scientific delegate to ApPEC general assembly, as observer

— representing astrophysics:

- Astrophysicists, nominated by CHAPS, as member
- Swiss scientific delegate to ESO Council, as observer

— + representatives of SNSF and SERI

} 4 CHIPP members sitting in LA FLARE

LA FLARE (cont.)

- ❑ SNSF expects recommendations to be formulated in LA FLARE for particle and astroparticle physics
 - we are basically offered the possibility to take part in the decision on how to share FLARE
 - this is a unique opportunity to control a significant source of our own funding, but we must use this wisely (avoid a « tragedy of the commons »)
- ❑ Two possible models for the role of the LA FLARE members representing particle and astroparticle physics:
 - they speak in the name of CHIPP
 - they speak in their own name
- ❑ In either case, if the recommendations are to fund all CHIPP projects with equal priority, we basically relinquish our prerogative
 - consequently, SNSF will decide themselves, or may set up a completely independent evaluation process which will ignore any CHIPP strategy

Round Table International

- ❑ Forum to exchange ideas and information (but not take decisions) about Swiss involvement in large scientific projects, mostly in particle physics and astrophysics ...
- ❑ Invited institutions:
 - SERI
 - SNSF
 - CRUS
 - CHIPP
 - SCNAT
 - SCFA (Swiss Commission for Astronomy)
- ❑ Great opportunity for CHIPP to
 - convey our strategies and priorities
 - flag important issues and bring them to the attention of SERI, SNSF, CRUS, ...

□ CHIPP has / CHIPP members have

- responded to the SERI/SNSF call for new RI in Jan 2014
 - 3 submissions: XENONnt/DARWIN, CTA, MicroBoone/LAr1ND
- provided SERI with relevant info about the ongoing CHIPP projects (inventory)
 - ATLAS, CMS, LHCb, Tier2, HL-LHC, CLIC, NA61/T2K/HyperK, WA105
- consistently repeated that a significant funding increase is needed to carry out a first-class scientific programme in PP and ApP in the next decade
- lobbied for a special contribution from the ETH domain for the Phase-2 CMS upgrade

□ SNSF (div II)

- has advocated a strong increase of FLARE (26.5 MCHF → 40 MCHF for 4 years)

□ SERI

- has presented on June 24, 2015, a preliminary version of the roadmap to the Federal Council
 - see <https://www.news.admin.ch/message/index.html?lang=en&msg-id=57808>
 - only in German (so far ?) + interesting appendices A & B missing



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

SBFI/NFI

Eidgenössisches Departement für
Wirtschaft, Bildung und Forschung WBF
**Staatssekretariat für Bildung,
Forschung und Innovation SBFI**
Nationale Forschung und Innovation

Schweizer Roadmap für Forschungsinfrastrukturen im Hinblick auf die BFI-Botschaft 2017-2020 (Roadmap Forschungsinfrastrukturen 2015)

Vom Bundesrat als Grundlagenpapier für die BFI-Botschaft 2017-2020 am 24. Juni 2015 zur Kenntnis genommen

□ Some interesting elements:

- XENONnt+DARWIN (UZH): SNSF rating A
- CTA: SNSF rating B and on ESFRI roadmap since 2008
- Neutrinos@FNAL: SNSF rating B
- 15 MCHF for CMS upgrade through ETH domain
- 38.4 MCHF for FLARE 2017–2020

I take these numbers as upper limits for the final roadmap

- Funding needs (and sources) as declared (and expected) by the different CHIPP PIs for the period 2017–2020
 - from the latest version of the CHIPP tables

	Funding period 2017–2020	
Expected from home institutions	9.6 MCHF	11.9%
Expected from SNSF (non FLARE)	5.4 MCHF	6.6%
Expected from FLARE	48.9 MCHF	60.0%
Expected from other sources	17.5 MCHF	21.5%
Total needs	81.4 MCHF	100%

- The current total expectation from FLARE probably exceeds by a factor ~ 2 what will be really available for CHIPP projects

- CHIPP is not limited to
 - organization of nice activities for its members
 - meetings and workshops, schools, prize, ...
 - representation in various international bodies
- CHIPP wants to examine and discuss its portfolio of projects and remain (become) a strong(er) partner of SNSF and SERI for particle and astroparticle physics

- For this, CHIPP should
 - define strategies for its pillars
 - set priorities among its projects
 - agree on how cope with the fact that available funding resources are insufficient to fulfill everyone's wishes

First concrete issues

- ❑ How do we continue the strategy discussion on the neutrino pillar ?
 - we should decide something

- ❑ How do we formulate a recommendation to LA FLARE in Nov 2015 ?
 - set priorities ?
 - prioritize projects or spending categories ?
 - prioritize projects within CHIPP ? within pillar ? within PI ?
 - set a cap per pillar ?
 - « moderate » ambitions, to match available funding + 10–20% ?

 - discussion scheduled tomorrow afternoon