

Minutes of the EB meeting 2009-07 on 26 October 2009

Time/place of the meeting: Buffet de la Gare, Lausanne, 26 October 2009, 10.00 – 14.00h
Present: Laura Baudis (LB, observer), Antonio Ereditato (AE), Tatsuya Nakada (TN), Martin Pohl (MP), Ueli Straumann (US, chair), Jean-Pierre Ruder (JPR, secretary), Maurice Bourquin (MB, guest for item 6), Hans-Peter Beck (HPB, guest for item 7).

The Chair opens the meeting at 09.50h.

1. Agenda

The agenda is approved; a few AOB items are mentioned.

2. Apologies

None.

A. Administrative items

3. Minutes of the last meeting (2009-06)

Approved.

4. List of Action Items

Checked and updated.

→ TN: to see George Meylan re CHIPP membership.

→ US: to check status and content of CHIPP membership database.

5. Next EB meeting

The next meeting is confirmed for 23 November 2009, Lausanne, Buffet de la Gare.

→ JPR: to check the possible 2010 meeting dates with MP and make a doodle survey.

B. Items for discussion

6. ApPEC & CHIPP

MB starts with a presentation about ApPEC and the work connected with it (ASPERA ERA-Net, future calls) [see slides on [http://dpnc.unige.ch/~bourquin/Report to EB Oct 09.ppt](http://dpnc.unige.ch/~bourquin/Report%20to%20EB%20Oct%2009.ppt)]. He points to the discussion within ApPEC regarding its legal form: several possibilities (association, foundation, European Research Infrastructure Consortium, ...) are under evaluation. He is wondering whether CHIPP could represent CH in such a set-up.

The EB is inquiring about the functioning of the ASPERA and the different committees set-up therein. Further question deal with the funding situation in Switzerland, where the SNF is ready to contribute to a virtual common fund (6 FTE-years have been accepted by the Division II of

SNF).

In the ensuing discussion about the CH representative(s), several ideas and worries come up (CHIPP; it is not wise to change the character of CHIPP from an interest group to a “funding agency”; a new committee composed of SER, SNF, and “LA FOLIS”; one should do something sustainable, as the representation in such European bodies will become more and more frequent; should the representatives not be able to sign for CH participation?). In the end, the proposal of a common body (like the CERN Council delegation) with CHIPP, SER, SNF and CRUS is supported by all. Its task would be (1) to clarify on a case by case basis the representation of CH in international bodies and projects and (2) to ensure a sustainable funding mechanism including a long-term commitment as required by the projects. At present, it is left open whether it should be a committee for astroparticle physics only or deal with all research fields. *(HPB enters the room)*

→ MB: to sound out the SNF.

→ US: to discuss with the SER (Burri) together with MP.

→ US: to put the matter on the agenda of the next EB (23 November) for developing a strategy on the basis of the inputs from the contacts and discussions.

→ US: to invite MB for that meeting.

(MB leaves the room).

7. Outreach: proposal by HPB & BG

HPB presents the proposal from the Communication Group (Gerber, ETHZ): it is not too big in order not to fail, but large enough to give a signal to other potential funding agencies. 35k is budgeted for preparative work (Website, travelling exhibition), 110k for activities in 2010 (travelling exhibition, general PR [leaflets, folders, information material for schools, media work, etc.]). For later years, the funding should continue at this level.

- Discussion of content

The discussion judges the content as ok and adequate for the level of involvement possible.

HPB insists that the Outreach Group should act as consultant and not as an actor for producing information material or exhibition panels.

Although the ETHZ is confident that the company envisaged for doing the work is trustworthy, the EB is strongly of the opinion that another company should be asked to do the job (because the result of the company's work on the Swiss LHC website has been very disappointing).

HPW will transmit this message. *[information received from HPB after the meeting: Gerber will ask another company for an offer, but thinks that this will be more expensive, because the company has first to familiarise itself with the subject and the players]*

- Discussion of financial envelope

The envelope as such is also judged to be ok. The discussion centres on the possible funding sources. HPB underlines that dealing with foundations is cumbersome and usually not sustained. The suggestion of US to use part of the overhead paid back by SNF to the universities is not possible for some universities. MP proposes to look into the chances for a Synergia request to SNF, whereas AE would prefer a normal SNF request, which would trigger a discussion about the matter. HPB adds that the SER funds (50k/3 years) could possibly be used for documentation to schools etc. (funds reserved for education and research). JPR suggests that industry be included in the action plan and that the SATW be contacted.

US proposes that the cost for the preparatory work is covered by the institutes and administered by CHIPP account at U.ZH. For the possible SNF request and the pre-discussions about it, one should consider the years 2010 and beyond with a level of some 150k/year.

→ AE: to start informal discussion with the SNF.

→ MP: to approach CRUS for possible funding.

→ US: to inform the institutes about the cost of the preparatory work and send out bills once he has received the corresponding documentation from HPB.

→ HPB: to contact SATW

(HPB leaves the room)

8. FORCE: Preparation for the “Lenkungsausschuss”

- Status of CHIPP tables

AE presents the latest table, which is still incomplete. A discussion about the attribution of funds to individual budget lines within the LHC experiments shows that the category “local items” is not used everywhere for the same purpose.

→ AE: to try to find a more uniform way to distinguish between “local items” and “CtC”.

The EB asks AE to continue his investigations with individual discussion per project. The following guidelines should be applied:

- for 2008 and 2009: real expenditures,
- for 2010: a reasonable expectation for 2010,
- for 2011-2013: educated guesses,
- for 2014-2016: sketch estimates.

The numbers should contain investment only (also from SNF), but not the staff requests within FORCE. For consistency, FOLIS numbers should be used where applicable.

The EB asks AE to prepare the next version before the 23 November, because the table has to go to the SER by the end of November.

→ AE: to discuss individually with the people (using the guidelines above) and prepare the next version before 23 November.

- Participants from the CHIPP EB

US suggests inviting also the new CHIPP Chairman for the next LA FORCE meeting on 11 December (as in the past). This is agreed.

→ JPR: to send information / minutes from LA FORCE to MP.

9. Redistribution of tasks among EB members

- Ideas? Proposals? Status of discussion among EB

The responsibilities for the following tasks change or are newly listed:

- CHIPP Website: MP
- FOLIS: MP
- Maintenance and Operation request for LHC Exp.: TN
- CHIPP money table: LB
- Implementation paper Roadmap: AE

10. CERN Council

- Extension of the mandate of the scientific delegate

The Mandate of US would end on 31 December 2009. MP proposes to extend his mandate for another three years and propose this to the SER. He considers that US has done an excellent job. In addition, the extension could also provide some continuation within the Swiss CERN Delegation, because JPR will step down from this function at the end of this year.

The EB agrees with this proposal but would prefer to get a confirmation by the CHIPP Board.

→ MP: to collect the opinion of the Board members within one week.

→ MP: to propose the extension to the SER.

C. Items for information

11. M&O request

- Status

JPR informs that all documents are ready, but that technical difficulties slow down the uploading to the SNF. He thanks the EB and the other CHIPP Board members for their support.

TN thanks JPR for the good work, which takes a big burden from the shoulders of CHIPP.

→ JPR/US: to submit the remaining documents to SNF on 28 October at the latest.

12. SUK/C-15 2009 Annual Report

- Status and planning

JPR explains the planning leading to a delivery of the report by the end of January 2010. He invites the group leaders to submit ideas about topics to be covered and underlines the need for a special focus of the work of the PostDocs.

→ JPR: to send the 2008 text again to the EB members.

→ JPR: to inform the group leaders concerned about what to do by 15 November (topics).

13. Status of future meetings

- CHIPP PhD School 2010 Ascona: Neutrino physics & modern particle detectors

JPR informs that the registration stands now at 40 people. AE asks about the possibilities for support to PhD students whereas MP recalls that he has offered some support from ProDoc funds (possibly for reducing the fee for all?).

→ AE, MP: to talk to G. Dissertori and Th. Gehrmann regarding the funds.

- WS U.ZH 28/29 Jan 2010: High Energy Frontier

US informs that he is about to start organising the Workshop. The EB shortly discusses possible topics.

→ US: to start organisation now.

- Saas Fee Astrophysics School (15-20 March)
- PSI/Zuoz Summer School LHC Physics (1-7 Aug)
- Plenary 2010 (23/24 August)

JPR informs that the 2010 Plenary will take place in Gersau on the shores of Lake of Lucerne.

14. A.O.B.

- FP7 detector request: MP informs about the status and the activities of the ECFA WG. GE & ETHZ will stay as participants in this proposal, which has no link to s-LHC. According to MP, no other CHIPP Board member has signalled his/her interest to participate.

- SUK C-15 extension to 2012: JPR informs that SUK offers the possibility of a cost neutral extension in 2012. The EB concludes that there is definitely a need for a discussion with the SUK in order to try to improve the situation. If additional funds can be generated only for 2013ff, there will be a year with no funding and no activities, if the present spending level is not reduced (e.g. by not replacing people who leave early).

→ JPR/US: to establish a new budget with options.

→ US: to discuss with SUK (if possible with JPR).

- Plenary ECFA: TN mentions the next Plenary ECFA (26/27 November at CERN) and sketches the agenda.
- SNF Div II: AE ask for a discussion at the next EB about his “double hat” as CHIPP EB member and member of the SNF Forschungsrat.
- Roadmap status: AE briefly informs that the first meeting has taken place and the work distributed. The EB is of the opinion that the final document should be available earlier than June 2010.

→ AE: to inform his group about accelerating the process.

The Chair closes the meeting 13.50h

26 October 2009

written by: JeanPierre Ruder
approved by: Ueli Straumann