

## Minutes of the EB meeting 2012-03 on 16 March 2012

Time/place of the meeting: 16 March 2012, 15.45h-17.45h, Schweizerische Akademie der Naturwissenschaften SCNAT, Schwarztorstrasse 9, 3007 Bern

Present: Klaus Kirch (KK), Laura Baudis (LB, via EVO), Gilberto Colangelo (GC), Olivier Schneider (OS), Jean-Pierre Ruder (JPR, Secretary).

Guest for item 6: M. Bourquin (MB)

The Chair opens the meeting at 15.45h.

### 1. Agenda

The agenda is approved as is.

### 2. Apologies

None.

## A. Administrative items

### 3. Minutes of the last meeting (2012-02)

The minutes of the last meeting are approved (with thanks to the minute writer).

### 4. List of Action Items

2011-01 – 6.2:

→ JP to remind MB re his contact with Ch. Leibundgut for CTA cooperation.

2012-02 – 4.1: OS informs that it is not yet clear, for which international conference the EPFL will apply.

Possible candidates are the Lepton Photon Conference 2015 (where SL and IT have already signalled their interest), the ICHEP 2020 (or 2018, if a swap with Asia would be feasible), or the EPS 2015, where the call for proposal will go out soon. T. Nakada is contacting CERN to make sure that there is no unilateral action.

Once the EPFL has decided, the Board will be informed.

### 5. Next EB meeting

2012-04: 20 April 2012, Berne, 16.15h

The meeting is confirmed; the EB notes that LB can't be present physically (but possibly via EVO or Skype).

## B. Items for discussion

### 6. ApPEC & other Astroparticle Physics themes

- New draft MoU ApPEC

MB explains the ApPEC's idea to change its structure, in order to make it more formal and stronger by also creating a permanent 'office'. After the first step ('Letter of intent' in 2011 [where the Round Table

had decided that CHIPP should sign it)), the present draft MoU is the logical next step. The text will be discussed on 11 April, and MB would like to have the CHIPP EB's opinion on certain points. He explains to KK that the people working at present in the frame of the ASPERA programme would like to continue without interruption, which would need the new structure ready in June. He confirms to GC that except for Switzerland all participating institutions are funding agencies, but he also underlines that this does not pose problems. MB explains to OS that the participants (funding agencies) will pay a membership fee. GC is of the opinion that the open points should be solvable, although some of them could prove to be rather difficult.

CHIPP as a member of the new ApPEC? KK suggests contacting the Swiss scientists involved in astroparticle physics project and potentially interested in ApPEC. In case there is a positive outcome, the matter should be brought to the attention of the Round Table (JPR). → EB agrees.

Membership fee? KK considers this not as a decisive element, since the SCNAT encourages their members to establish institutional links with international organisations. Funding sources could be SCNAT, but possibly also the SNF or – in the last resort – the astroparticle physics professors.

→ KK: will contact LB directly for support.

→ LB: to contact the Swiss scientists working in astroparticle physics (together with MB).

→ KK: to put the item as 'information item' to the June Board (info to sent out before the meeting) and organise a discussion in September (if needed).

→ MB: to provide KK with the revised text after the next ApPEC meeting.

→ KK will check with LB to see if she is ready to help with coordinating the input.

MB thanks the EB and in particular JPR for their constructive comments.

- ASPERA census report

MB mentions the publication of the ASPERA census report 'Funding methodologies in European astroparticle physics research' (see: <http://www.aspera-eu.org/images/stories/frontpage/census2011.pdf>). Concerning the 2011 ApP Roadmap, MB confirms to LB that some of the data are already a bit outdated, but he considers the report still to be a valuable collection of information. The ApPEC SAC will prepare a paper concerning the interface between the Roadmap and the European Strategy for Particle Physics.

- APIF: preparation of next meeting

MB informs that APIF (the OECD Astroparticle International Forum), where Switzerland is represented by the SER (M. Steinacher and MB), plans to discuss the necessity and the value to establish a global astroparticle physics Roadmap. He would like to get the CHIPP members input on this question. GC is sure that there is an interest from the research community, but wonders if officially countries will not be a bit reluctant. MB confirms that there is of course the risk that some projects will get a 'negative' priority. LB is also sceptical that all the APIF member states would agree to such an undertaking, but she finds it a good idea and is ready to contribute. OS mentions that usually Roadmaps are used to talk to funding agencies, but since there is no world funding agency he is not so sure about the need and the success of such an undertaking. KK suggest again to sound out the Board Members working in astroparticle physics.

→ MB and LB: to sound out the Swiss community and report to next EB.

- ECFA at PSI: Speaker

MB is looking for speaker at the PSI ECFA conference who will attend the ICHEP Conference in Melbourne and would be ready to report about it on ApP.

→ MB: to contact Allan Clark, the Swiss coordinator for ICHEP.

## 7. Plenary 2012

- Philosophy regarding the themes

KK refers to statements at the September 2011 Board and the January EB, where the question regarding the thematic coverage of the 2012 Plenary has been brought up. He continues by favouring the usual way, covering all topics, because he considers it a bit difficult to highlight not all topics in a year with many interesting results, and with the ongoing update process for the European strategy. OS supports this view of putting the topics on an equal footing. Both agree that also in a year where the Board is dissociated from the Plenary, a broad coverage would be essential.

- Talks and Speakers

Regarding possible themes, talks and speakers, LB suggest looking at new physics results, a position supported by GC and OS. In addition, OS would like to promote young researchers. After a short exchange of views, the EB agrees on five sessions: LHC-I: Higgs and direct new physics searches,

LHC-II: indirect searches, neutrino physics, dark matter and astroparticle physics, low energy precision physics. The EB also agrees to start each session with an overview theory talk and insists that the experiments should focus on science results. The EB members agree on a distributed search for speakers and to deliver the information to JPR (deadline 10 April):

- GC: to think about potential candidates for the introductory overview theory talks for each of the five sessions.
- OS: to consider candidates for 6 LHC talks.
- LB: to reflect about speakers for up to 6 talks in neutrino and astroparticle physics and dark matter.
- KK: to look after the low energy precision physics (2-3 talks).
- GC, OS, LB, OS: to send the information by 10 April to JPR
- JPR: to establish a draft programme on the basis of the input received and to circulate it ahead of the next EB meeting.

## **8. June Board meeting**

- FORCE/FOLIS presentations: list of questions

KK presents the extended list of questions and the planned procedure. GC considers the principle of this exercise as convincing and reasonable, but asks himself whether it will really work. OS According to OS, CHIPP will find out and is positive about starting the survey. After an exchange of opinions regarding the question 'what should be presented in the talks' the EB agrees that the numbers and the way they have been established should be explained, the content and the value of the contribution described, highlighting what is the essential added value of this contribution. Depending on the degree of diverging information the EB will work after the June meeting to present the conclusions in the September Board. Then, a sensible discussion must take place with possibly even debating and setting priorities on the basis of the resources available. KK and OS insist that the Board members must be made aware of the fact that the numbers will be compiled in one table. The table will be subject to a few plausibility tests (like e.g. the sum of FTE professors is not larger than the number of professors in Switzerland, or the evolution in size of any given group up to 2020) and will be handed out to the Board ahead of the meeting.

- JPR/KK: circulate 'draft instructions to the Board' ahead of the next EB, including a definition of the numbers requested for the table (comments from the EB see below).

- FORCE/FOLIS: proposal for compiling the information

Regarding the table, the EB provides valuable comments for the text defining the content of each column (ranking or marks, abbreviation for funding sources, split between investment and operations costs [with R&D going into investment], costs without salaries [FORCE/FOLIS salary costs will be calculated from the FTE information using a typical multiplier])

- JPR: to provide a revised table to the EB.

## **9. Assembly of the Delegates SCNAT: Suggestions for the agenda?**

KK explains that CHIPP as a SCNAT member is invited to suggest agenda items for the SCNAT Assembly of Delegates. The EB agrees that no agenda item should be suggested.

→ KK: to inform the SCNAT.

## **10. SUK PhD Programme: To be used for CHIPP Schools? Action by the EB)**

KK introduces the topic which consists of a subsidy system partially replacing the SNF's ProDoc programme. Joint courses, lectures, schools etc. can be funded from a SUK pot, in case the home university supports the request and other universities are joining in. GC would be in favour to exploit this opportunity and will work on it, by contacting in the first place M. Pohl, who has already received a positive feedback from his rectorate.

## **C. Items for information**

### **11. SwiNG bill: Status report and the way forward**

OS reports about his contacts with Ch. Grab. The tasks have been analysed with all the parties involved and it was shown that several tasks can be performed in-house. This will reduce the bill from Switch/SwiNG from 108k to approx. 60k. It seems that this can be covered from the running FORCE computing funds and from

the EGI reimbursement. Therefore, no payments are expected from individual institutes for 2012. However, new and suitable solutions will have to be identified for 2013 onwards. OS suggests including this in future FORCE computing request.

→ OS: to brief Ch. Grab on the EB's suggestion regarding the solution for the future.

## **12. Short reports**

There was none.

## **13. Status of future meetings**

- WS 2011: Due to lack of time, no exchange of information took place.
- Other meetings 2012:
  - SPS Annual Meeting, 21/22 June, Zurich  
Due to lack of time, no exchange of information took place.
  - European Strategy Session, 10-12 Sept  
KK reports about the first meeting of the Strategy Group (at CERN), where a number of deadlines have been fixed: 31 July for community input for the Cracow meeting, 15 October for input to the drafting session, which will take place in January 2013 in Erice. He wonders whether it would not be sufficient to have the Swiss input ready for the mid-October (instead of end-June). In view of the short time (1 month) between the Cracow meeting and the October deadline and taking into account the fact that there is no Board meeting planned in this timeframe, JPR advises to stick to the original schedule. KK agrees and will send out the first version to drafting group soon. He suggests to plan for a joint meeting between CHIPP, SNF and SER.
    - KK: to send out the first draft of the Swiss input in March.
    - JPR: to seek a meeting date between CHIPP, SNF and SER.
  - CHIPP Plenary, 13/14 Sept: was dealt with under agenda item 7.

## **14. A.O.B.**

There was none.

The Chair closes the meeting at 18.45h.

19 March 2012

written by: Jean-Pierre Ruder

approved by: Klaus Kirch