

Minutes of the EB meeting 2015-06 on 23 September 2015

Time/place of the meeting: Wednesday, 23 September 2015, 10:45, ETH-Rat, Effingerstrasse 6a, Bern

Present: Teresa Montaruli (TM, via Skype), Olivier Schneider (OS, Chair), Adrian Signer (AS), Marc Türlér (MT, Secretary), Rainer Wallny (RW)

The Chair opens the meeting at 10:45.

1. Agenda

The agenda is approved.

2. Apologies

TM is attending remotely via Skype. OS reminds that he has to leave to attend the SCNAT MAP Platform meeting at around 14:00. RW also needs to leave by then.

A. Administrative items

3. Minutes of the last meeting (2015-05) ([→ document](#))

The minutes are approved with thanks to the minute writer.

4. List of Actions

The list of open and on-going actions is quickly reviewed. There is no major issue. TM proposes to add an action concerning the filling of the table for the ApPEC census. OS agrees and confirms that she is obviously the best person to be the contact person in her capacity of Swiss scientific delegate to the ApPEC General Assembly.

→ TM: to collect the data for the ApPEC census (deadline: 5 Oct.)

5. Next EB meetings

The following two meetings are confirmed without change:

- 2015-07: Friday, 2 October 2015, 12:15, ETH-Rat, Bern
- 2015-08: Friday, 27 November 2015, 10:45, ETH-Rat, Bern + EB lunch

B. Items for discussion

6. CHIPP EB nominations

OS reports he received 21 nominations from Board members from 5 different institutes. Three Board members have been nominated, but only two of them more than once. He did not yet check whether they are willing to serve. After some discussion, it is decided that OS contacts individually the three candidates – in order of increasing number of nominations – exposes them the received nominations and asks them whether they are willing to serve and to stand for election. It is agreed that the list of candidates presented to the Board will include all those who wish to stand.

→ OS: to contact the three nominees to see if they stand for election

7. Proposal for Swiss EPPCN member

OS reminds the letter he sent to SERI in early June with his hat of Swiss scientific delegate to the CERN Council asking for a financial support for the EPPCN mandate. He has now received an answer – the letter has been forwarded to EB members – stating that a sustainable funding source has been identified for the EPPCN activities. SERI is ready to provide 15 kCHF per year starting in 2016 to complement 5 kCHF from

CERN and 5 kCHF from CHIPP. The possibility that the current CHIPP Administrator (MT) takes this mandate is explicitly mentioned, following informal discussions about this possibility between OS and Martin Steinacher (SERI). OS concludes that this gives the EB green light to pursue. If the EB reaches agreement, we can include this in the planned activities and the budget of 2016 to be approved by the Board next month. As there was general agreement and no objection to this, OS adds that the simplest would be to increase MT's contract at the UZH by 10% for the EPPCN activities. He refers to the document prepared by MT and distributed to the EB prior to the meeting, listing all activities with an estimate of the working hours they would individually represent. The document has also been shown to Hans Peter Beck, who made a few suggestions, but found the activities and associated work estimates reasonable. TM clarifies that the CERN press releases are already both in French and in English and thus only the translation in German is needed. She suggests to reduce the corresponding working time and to increase the time for the promotion of the press releases to universities and institutes. In her opinion, the EPPCN mandate concerns all CERN approved experiments, including also some astroparticle-physics experiments like IceCube and wonders about a possible link with the CERN Courier. RW notes that the proposal shall not come from the Administrator himself, but from the CHIPP EB. It is agreed that a condensed version of the document is to be included in the planned activities and the budget of 2016 to be approved by the Board. It is also agreed that OS discusses with Ueli Straumann the increase by 10% of MT's contract and that the best solution is that support from SERI first goes to CHIPP and then to UZH.

→ MT: to draft out the document for the planned activities and the budget 2016

→ OS: to discuss with U. Straumann the increase by 10% of the Administrator's contract

8. Neutrino White Paper

OS reminds that so far, he only acknowledged the reception of the White Paper (WP) on neutrino physics received on 28 August and distributed to the EB. It is now time to discuss it and to give feedback. RW notes the increased prioritisation of the Short Baseline Neutrino (SBN) programme at Fermilab. In the executive summary document of last year, the T2K experiment in Japan was referred to as the "backbone", while it seems now that there is lower priority given T2K and its upgrades. RW wonders if the A), B), C), ... itemisation is an ordered list or not. It is felt that this should be clarified, and also for the 1., 2., 3., ... bullet list of funding requests. The fact that the running T2K, GERDA and IceCube activities are recognized as the "highest scientific priority" at the beginning of section 5, and are not included in the A), B), C), ... list of priorities (restricted to "new financial investments") is found to be misleading. OS notes that the indicative share of the neutrino pillar is of 1.25 MCHF in 2016 and of 5 MCHF for 2017–2020, which is basically enough to cover the sum of 6.3 MCHF for the requests listed under points 1. to 5. What is missing is the concrete contribution to the experiments in particular for the 3MCHF of the SBN. What is the share between MicroBoONE and the Short Baseline Near Detector (SBND), and between operations, R&D and core contributions? Part of the information could be extracted from the CHIPP tables – which are indeed referred to – but it would be important to have this presented more clearly in the document. Another problem is that any additional Lol and request from the "in perspective" bullet list 6. to 10. will explode the budget, unless this is really only for after the period 2017–2020. This list with all the conditional "might" for funding requests is seen as a potential source of problem. If DUNE sends a Lol next year we will have a high priority project (B) in 2017–2020 that has no free funds available. There is the need to make some room for this. RW goes to the whiteboard and draws a graph with the temporal evolution of the funding, with e.g. DUNE increasing from 2017–2018, and also Hyper-K, SHiP, the ton-scale successor to GERDA, etc. He notes the difficulty to prioritise these upcoming developments and the lack of resources. OS notes that the WP is not meeting the requirement, because it fails to give a short description of the expected contributions from the Swiss community to each of the relevant neutrino physics projects. TM sees the following needs for clarification and update: the addition of operations for T2K and GERDA in the list of priorities, the inclusion of DUNE in the funding of the next 5 years together with WA105 in bullet 1. and the clarification of the SHiP funding needs and its prioritisation. OS proposes to summarise what has been discussed here and to ask the editors of the WP for updates.

→ OS: to provide the feedback from the EB to the editors of the WP

9. Project prioritisation within pillars

OS guesses that the neutrino pillar did not meet yet to set the FLARE funding priorities and notes that the deadline for this (20 September) is now past. RW expresses the problem to prepare the LA FLARE priorities based on the current information in the WP. He would like Tatsuya Nakada – as the convener of the neutrino

pillar – to provide more information, which would remain confidential, unlike the WP. OS reminds that the EB actually asked for some funding information to be part of the WP. He wonders if the detailed funding amounts should be removed in the final version. RW and AS, both think that the content of the current WP is in between the expectations for the WP and the missing prioritisation information. Maybe part of the current WP on the last page should rather go to a non-public prioritisation memo. It is agreed that OS sends on behalf of the EB a message to Tatsuya Nakada to ask for the missing information towards preparing a meaningful LA FLARE prioritisation. Having very little time until the next EB in ten days, OS asks RW whether he could prepare a suggestion for the LA FLARE priorities based on a pre-digestion of all the available information. OS suggests showing to the Board the outcome of the discussions per pillar, the overall outcome when everything is put together and then the proposed LA FLARE priorities. RW agrees to try to come up with something on a best effort basis.

OS then suggests to go through the other prioritisation memos provided by Maurice Bourquin for the astroparticle physics (ApP) pillar and by Ueli Straumann for the high/low-energy (HE) pillar. This triggered a discussion about the (60:20:20) share for the three pillars. TM thinks that a slightly higher percentage should be attributed to the ApP pillar based on the FTEs of professors and mentions that Razvan Gornea has now left academia, thus lowering the share of the neutrino pillar. If one has to be at the 10% level in discussing FLARE request amounts, it is also fair to be precise with the (60:20:20) share, which should rather be (60:25:15) when considering the FTE distribution of the permanent staff (professors and senior scientists) after the departure of Gornea. OS does not think that changing this would change anything in the ApP prioritisation memo. He understands from it that XENON/DARWIN and CTA are of equal priority and that DAMIC has lower priority. In case of a need of reduction, the same reduction shall be applied to CTA and XENON/DARWIN. RW thinks, however, that the (60:20:20) share shall be somehow included in the LA FLARE recommendation. OS proposes to leave this issue for the discussion at the next EB. Concerning the HEP pillar, the memo answers the precise questions. It states the need to have about 1 MCHF for the LHC maintenance and operation (M&O). A reduction of 10% on the computing would be affordable. The accelerator R&D is important but cannot be funded at high level. For the other experiments, the proposal is to share this according to the M&O category A fractions based on the number of PhD equivalent persons in the collaboration which is 23:39:27 for ATLAS:CMS:LHCb in 2015. RW points out the importance to discuss this now, because of forthcoming Resources Review Board (RRB) meetings at CERN in October, where recommendations based on a preliminary and confidential cost matrix shall be presented. It would be bad that Swiss institutes pledge too high and would later need to reduce it. Actually already now, the numbers are discussed and circulated within the ATLAS and CMS collaborations. The main worry is ATLAS who wants to make a large investment but, so far, only counts on FLARE. TM thinks that the conclusion of the HE memo is unbalanced because ATLAS would have the smallest fraction of its needs funded by FLARE in 2017–2020, corresponding to 2 or 3 MCHF out of 10.3 MCHF according to scenario Y1 or Y2, respectively. OS recognizes the difficulty, but notes that LHCb will probably object to a scenario where FLARE funding corresponds to a fraction of the needs that is the same for all experiments (indeed LHCb already refrained to ask for more than what can be reasonably expected from FLARE). Compared to CMS, the difference, as pointed out by RW, is that CMS early on sought funding for phase-2 outside FLARE and was eventually successful to receive priority in the ETH Domain strategic planning in a competitive process that may result in additional funding outside FLARE. TM sees this as a privilege for federal institutes compared to cantonal universities. RW agrees, but thinks that the SNSF is already somehow taking this into account by granting more resources to cantonal universities according to some figures in the P3 database. TM objects to this generic statement. RW mentions that ATLAS would like CHIPP to help secure an extra contribution from SERI. TM is in favour of the CHIPP EB writing a letter stating that the funds in FLARE are insufficient to cover all needs, but OS thinks that this would have little impact and sees very little chances of getting extra funding besides FLARE. RW agrees that given the general context of reduced funding (as written in the newspapers), it would already be good that FLARE can indeed get an increase. Asking for more could be badly perceived by SERI in this context. OS would be more in favour of supporting an initiative to the cantonal government/parliament of Geneva and Bern. The initiative shall come from the PIs, but CHIPP can give support to this. He recalls that in the past, ATLAS got a lot of money (~10 MCHF) from the canton of Geneva.

→ OS: to ask T. Nakada to provide more information on neutrino pillar priorities

→ RW: to prepare a draft of the LA FLARE prioritisation proposal

10. Questions re. PhD Winter School organisation

Because of lack of time, this item was treated very briefly. Everybody agreed that the questions prepared by AS for the Board members in relation to the continuation of the PhD Winter School are interesting and good. The next step is to collect answers and to show the results at the next Board meeting. RW suggests to use a web questionnaire. AS and OS agree if this can be set up easily. Otherwise asking for simple e-mail answers would be fine as well.

→ MT: to see whether a web questionnaire is useful

→ MT: to invite Board members to answer the questions

11. Agenda of the Board meeting

Due to lack of time, this item was postponed to the next meeting.

C. Items for information

12. Balzan Prize Winners 2015

OS informs that Francis Halzen will be awarded (on November 13 in Bern) one of the Balzan Prizes 2015, in the field of astroparticle physics including neutrino and gamma-ray observation. He was nominated by the MAP platform of the SCNAT, on the proposal and with the help of the CHIPP EB (see EB 2015-02, item 13).

13. Status of future meetings

- RECFA country visit 2016, 1–2 April 2016, ETH Zurich
- SWHEPPS 2016, 8–10 June 2016, Ägerisee, ZG
- Zuoz Summer School 2016, 14–20 August 2016, Zuoz, GR
- Joint SPS/CHIPP annual plenary 2016, 22–25 August 2016, Lugano, TI
- PSI 2016 workshop on Physics, Symmetries and Interactions, 17–20 October 2016, PSI

Due to lack of time, this agenda item was not treated.

14. A.O.B.

OS gives some additional information on a few topics.

- CERN. The CERN Council has accepted the proposal of the next DG, Fabiola Gianotti, concerning the new directorate structure for 2016–2020. Martin Steinacher will become the Director for Finance and Human Resources. CHIPP will miss him as one of the SERI observers in the CHIPP Board.
- FCC. Hans-Rudolf Ott has received an encouraging answer to the letter asking SERI for support of the FCC study (see Board 2015-02, item 13).
- FLARE. The funding requests of 2016 will be only for one year and there will be no possibility to submit a new Lol. Starting next year, for the period 2017–2020, new FLARE rules and procedures may come into force, which are currently being discussed within the SNSF (procedure for new projects requesting funding, number of calls during the period, duration of the grants, FLARE panel composition, LA FLARE setting, ...). If timely, Tristan Maillard could be invited to present these changes at the next Board meeting.
- RECFA country visit. OS received a formal answer from Mauro Dell’Ambrogio, confirming his participation to the meeting on 1 April 2016.

The Chair closes the meeting at 13:50.

29 September 2015

written by: Marc Türlér

approved by: Olivier Schneider