

Minutes of the EB meeting 2009-03 on 27 March 2009

Time/place of the meeting: Buffet de la Gare Lausanne, 27 March 2009, 10.00 – 13.00h

Present:

Antonio Ereditato (AE), Martin Pohl (MP), Ueli Straumann (US, chair), Jean-Pierre Ruder (JPR, secretary).

The Chair opened the meeting at 9.50h

1. Agenda

US informs that item 16 will be dealt with after item 11 and that the ECFA conclusions – for the time being – are only informal; he announces three AOBs: an invitation for the March EB, the SNF site visits, and the NuPECC representative.

With these amendments, the agenda is approved.

2. Apologies

No apologies have been received; all EB members are present.

A. Administrative items

3. Minutes of the last meeting (2009-02)

MIN: distributed

Approved.

4. List of Action Items

[JPR]

List: attached

Checked and updated.

5. Next meeting

[US]

Calendar on Website

- Next EB meeting: 24 April 2009 (2009-03), 10.00-13.00h, Buffet de la Gare, Lausanne

B. Items for discussion

6. PostDoc at U.ZH

documents distributed

- Replacement for V. Chiochia (CMS) [US]

The EB has received the request from C.Amsler to replace the C-15 PostDoc selected early 2008 by a new person (A.Schmidt). V.Chiochia has been granted a SNF professorship.

The EB notes the slight deviation from the standard procedure and the unusual way of proceeding, but endorses – acting as Admission Committee for C-15 – the proposed way forward.

→ US: to inform C.Amsler about the decision.

7. SNF Forschungsrat

- Status (and decision) [US, MP]

US informs of the outcome of the consultation among the EB members. One name has been mentioned by a large majority of Board members, two others follow with just a few votes. During the further consultation process, one of the two minority nominations informs US and MP about his non-availability. In order to execute the decision of the CHIPP Board, two names are being suggested to the SNF. The EB agrees that the large difference in votes between the two candidates should be expressed in the nomination letter in a decent manner (the candidate of the majority vs. the candidate of the minority).

The two candidates, TN and AE sign the requested confirmation to accept to serve if elected; both are instructed to submit to SNF by 31 March an application letter together with the corresponding form, the CV and the publication list.

→ US: to send the CHIPP letter to the SNF by 31 March

→ AE, TN: to submit the application (form, letter, CV, publication list) by 31 March

8. SPS article

[US, TN]

- Status and way forward

TN informs about the status: the publication of the article has been delayed to mid-May, but G.Dissertori is still ready to write it.

→ TN: to make sure that the article is written and transmitted to the SPS in time.

9. CHIPP Board

[US]

- Enlargement of the Membership

US proposes that the Outreach Coordinator and the Computing Board Coordinator should become a full member of the CHIPP Board.

The EB endorses this proposal which will bring all CHIPP officers as members to the Board.

→ US: to propose this enlargement to the CHIPP Board for the August meeting.

A suggestion of AE to think about a new definition of the Board in the Constitution is considered to not be urgent.

In the context of this item, a short discussion took place about how one could involve the theory colleagues more strongly in the CHIPP. Lectures in the frame of the CHIPP schools and the ProDoc education module were mentioned, as well as the possibility, that Theory colleagues could also apply for research modules in the ProDoc scheme.

10. (informal) Conclusions from ECFA

[US]

- Education for PhD students

US mentions the statement of some R-ECFA representatives that there is no PhD education programme for a full year, the education is not too well structured and the courses are overlapping. MP hints at the – not yet approved – ProDoc proposal, which contains one person for setting up a website with the annual programme etc.

The EB is of the opinion that no action should be started before ProDoc decision is known.

- s-LHC upgrade – project definition and funding

US mentions that the CHIPP knows reasonably well which CH groups are involved in which experiments and that the programme for machine development is reasonably defined. What is missing is information to which extent CH groups will want to participate in the detector upgrade within the collaborations. MP recalls that also the items to be replaced before the upgrade should not be forgotten. Nevertheless, AE proposes that the evolution must be monitored and US underlines the need for a schedule of decisions (see also item 16 below).

The EB decides that this discussion will have to be done at the Appenberg Board in August (see also item 13 below).

- longer-term future (ILC, neutrino factory at CERN, common astro, ...)

In his introduction, US points at the next agenda item, which includes the long-term future. At the same time he informs about the new wording used by Prof. Heuer in order to avoid any favouritism towards either CLIC or the ILC: the new expression is “future linear collider”

(hereinafter referred to FLC).

11. Roadmap

- Way forward after the discussion at the Board [all]

AE recalls that the Roadmap should be a self consisting edition, referring to the first one and update it where necessary; there should be a fil rouge (no break between the two). He suggests to have a very small group (not some 10 people as mentioned at the Board in March, but rather 2-3), led by a coordinator. The members of the group should profit from contacts and collaboration with experts. In his assessment, the first step (easy) is to talk to people. He sees the real difficulty in the establishment of the RM, whereas the editing is again rather easy. According to AE, a number of iterations are necessary.

US is of the opinion that the content should also be discussed in Board; the Appenberg meeting would be an excellent opportunity. MP thinks that there are not too many alternatives, but the Swiss community will have to “follow” the global evolution. Although agreeing, US says that decisions will have to be made regarding astroparticle, dark matter, neutrino factory, and the collider front (FLC or s-LHC). AE suggests to address possible clustering, e.g. for dark matter, double β -decay, or CP violation. In any case, the CERN view must be taken up.

The worry that CH might loose contact with the worldwide FLC activities is somewhat attenuated by the remarks from TN (ILC is pushed by people not involved in LHC) and MP (this will be a natural process as soon as things evolve; nowadays, nobody would put all his activities in ILC). Nevertheless, US and MP are of the opinion that something should be done to not loose contact with the worldwide FLC activities. Is the revival of the FP7 Infrastructure proposal a possibility? AE is more relaxed on this issue, as – according to him – most people involved in FLC matters nowadays will all be retired in a few years; the FLC will be developed and pushed by a community of young scientists will all be retired.

The EB is of the opinion that this matter should be treated at the Appenberg Board (see item 16 below).

For the Roadmap, the EB decides to go ahead with a horizon of 2020 as follows:

→ US: to ask L.Baudis and R.Ratazzi to be part of editing group, led by AE.

→ AE: to organise the work of the editing group in such a manner, that the strategic discussion can take place in Appenberg; beforehand, the first input will be generated by the small group, followed by talks to individuals.

12. LHC Webpage

- Feedback from meeting with M.-Ch. Sawley [TN]

TN reports with a certain frustration that he did not get anywhere in the discussion and that no improvement is in sight.

- The way forward [all]

The EB is clear in its wish to change the present situation. The first keyword is updating. US proposes that the outreach coordinator should think about possible ways and make proposals to the EB. TN reminds the EB that the RECFA proposes a dedicated outreach person; this person could then also look after the webpage. MP notes that the PSI disposes of such people and takes the excellent PSI webpage as an example. Would it be possible to outsource the new LHC webpage to PSI (alone or possibly together with the CHIPP webpage)?

→ US: to discuss with HP.Beck, then with R.Horisberger and possibly J.Mesot.

13. Plenary Appenberg

- First exchange of views about programme [all]

Taking into account the discussion under items 10 and 11 above, the EB considers the following topics as relevant and appropriate for Appenberg:

- LHC: talks about CMS, ATLAS, LHCb incl. organisation in general context;
speakers: project leaders or working group conveners of the experiment collaborations.
- FLC: invite someone from CERN (Lucy Linssen?)
- Roadmap

→ US: to set up the programme.

- Organisation? Registration? Social events? [all]

The EB proposes to use the CERN Indico system which has proven its efficiency at the September Plenary at EPFL.

→ TN: to help/teach JPR on how to use Indico.

→ JPR: to start setting up the administration/organisation.

The EB is also of the opinion that the location (Appenberg) serves as a “permanent” social event and that no specific other social event should be foreseen.

C. Items for information

14. Annual Report 2008 for the C-15 Project to be distributed on Thursday

- Status of submission [US/JPR]

JPR informs that the annual report 2008 (incl. financial report and the SUK request) has been submitted to SER, ETH-Rat and SUK on 26 March. A hardcopy in the form of a small booklet, containing all documents and reports, will be distributed soon to the EB members plus G.Dissertori and A.Clark.

→ JPR: to produce and distribute the booklet.

15. Status of future meetings

- Workshops, Schools etc. in 2009 [all]

Astroparticles: TN informs that the invites speakers have been identified and contacted; the organisers benefit from the support of Ribordy; a more extensive update will be given at the April EB. On a proposal by US, TN agrees to launch a round of advertisement.

→ TN: to launch a round of advertisement.

Winter School Ascona: AE reports that the organisation is under control, the speakers are identified and have confirmed; information about the School will be made public at the Appenberg meeting.

→ US: to inform in Appenberg about the School.

Although experimental results from the LHC might still be somewhat scarce, US proposes to maintain the date of the Jan 2010 WS on the High End Frontier.

US reminds the EB that the 2010 WS should be planned soon (detector R&D in ZH; neutrino physics in GE).

16. Research Bills 2012 and 2013-2016

- Status, consequences [JPR]

JPR informs about the latest news: the 2012 Research Bill will cover just one year, but will not simply be a blueprint of the 2011 projects and spending. New projects might find their place if inserted in a longer-term strategy and planning, covering also the next Research Bill period 2013-2016. For the 2012 Bill, input (especially financial input) to the SER for the period 2012-2016 will have to be given by the 1st quarter 2010. JPR confirms to MP that this corresponds in a certain way to a 5-year planning. The CHIPP input will (certainly) have to include FORCE incl. M&O, but might also address the interest to participate in other large infrastructures, the funding of which is not covered by FORCE and for which a new mechanism is sought.

In order to produce and update the CHIPP planning tables, AE asks to receive a copy of all the SNF requests.

→ US: to ask the Board of copying the SNF requests to AE.

→ TN, MP: think about redistribution of the task of doing the CHIPP tables (AE involved in the Roadmap).

17. A.O.B.

- The Board agrees to the proposal by US to invite HP.Beck to the EB in April to have an exchange of views about outreach.

→ US: to invite HP.Beck for the April EB

- SNF site visits, cuts, etc: not many members of the EB have suffered from the discontinuation of the site visits. TN states that the problem is rather the missing communication that really the physical site visits. US considers the site visits to be useful to very useful, because the new system does not allow anymore updates of the request to the project evolution. MP stresses the fact that the information about the decision comes too late (especially when a person should be hired or dismissed); he would prefer to have advanced information.

→ US: to phone Imboden and then write a letter.

- SNF Synergia: AE informs that T2K has received 2 MCHF from SNF Synergia, whereas US reminds about the 2 MCHF Synergia grant for CTA.
- SNF NuPECC representative: US is upset, as the successor of C.Amsler has been selected by SNF without having contacted CHIPP. This negligence should be avoided in the future, as CHIPP is the umbrella organisation also for nuclear physics. The new NuPECC representative is B. Krusche (BS).

→ US: to write a letter to SNF and complain about the non-involvement of CHIPP.

- Heuer in Berne; WBK at CERN

JPR informs about the introductory visit of the CERN DG in Bern (Federal Councillor Couchepin) on 30 March and the visit of the Parliamentary Committee for Science, Education and Culture at CERN on 1 April.

The meeting ended at 13.25h

8 April 2009

written by: Jean-Pierre Ruder

approved by: Ueli Straumann