

Minutes of the EB meeting 2016-06 on 3 October 2016

Time/place of the meeting: Monday, 3 October 2016, 12:15, SCNAT (room Jungfrau), Laupenstrasse 7, Bern

Present: Günther Dissertori (GD), Teresa Montaruli (TM), Tatsuya Nakada (TN, Chair), Adrian Signer (AS), Marc Türlér (MT, Secretary)

1. Agenda

The agenda is approved with the suggestion by TN to add a short discussion on the debriefing of the Plenary meeting (see item 6 below).

2. Apologies

None

A. Administrative items

3. Minutes of the last meeting (2016-05) ([→ document](#))

The minutes are approved without comments and with thanks to MT.

4. List of Actions

TN sees nothing special to be discussed as all actions are either done or on-going.

5. Next EB meetings

- 2016-07: To be defined

TN wishes to have the last EB meeting of the year still before the FLARE deadline on 15 November 2016. It is thus agreed to have the next EB meeting on 11 November at 14:30 in Bern following the EB lunch¹.

B. Items for discussion

6. Agenda of Board 2016-03

The agenda of the Board meeting is to be sent out tomorrow. The draft distributed to the EB prior to the meeting is discussed. It is agreed to have the signature of the IPPOG MoU as the first decision item as it affects the budget of 2017. The proposed item 9 on the White Paper on Pillar 1 is renamed as “Summary of the SWHEPPS workshop”. GD warns that it is possible that Rainer Wallny will not be present to give this presentation, but he can prepare it. It is suggested to add information items on the new Swiss Data Science Center to be presented by Aurelio Bay (see also item 11, below) and another one on the new CERN Thematic Forum on education (see item 10, below). Finally, an information item on “News from the community” shall allow people to bring up a topic, make an announcement, etc. TN then suggests to include a short discussion item on the debriefing of the Plenary 2016 held in Lugano. He notes that talks at the PhD/ Postdoc days were not so well attended by senior staff and sometimes even the thesis advisor was not present. He finds this not so nice for the presenting PhD student. GD agrees, but notes that the general attractiveness of the Plenary is not so good compared to other meetings. TN finds the format of the Plenary we had in 2015 at the Château de Bossey to be much more interesting. AS recalls, however, that it was much worse in the last session in Fribourg back in 2014, when almost everybody left, but the remaining speakers and the chairman... TN agrees that the audience was better in Lugano, but there was still a lack of senior staff. TN suggests bringing this up at the Board in view of the format to be adopted next year.

→ MT: to make the needed updates to the agenda

¹ This date had to be moved later on to 30 November 2016, due to unavailability of the Chair.

7. Activities and budget 2017

The draft of the planned activities and the budget table of 2017 were distributed to the EB prior to the meeting. The document is briefly discussed. It is agreed that the detailed breakdown of the administrator and the EPPCN member are included without changes compared to last year, because it is too early – with less than one year of experience – to properly update the EPPCN activities. This shall be stated in the proposal text. Several small updates and reformulations to the activities of 2017 are proposed and shall be implemented. The budget table itself is found to be fine. GD wonders how much we want the asset to reduce over the years before trying to stabilize it. It is however agreed that for the next year, there is no strong reason to change the membership fees.

→ MT: to make the needed updates before distributing the document to the Board

8. FLARE priorities

The updated FLARE Table based on the inputs received from the PIs has been distributed prior to the meeting. TN presents the numbers per pillar and informs that the independent funding of CTA outside FLARE has been approved. This is very good news, although TM mentions an issue with manpower to be solved. TN reminds that the total FLARE budget for 2017–2020 is of 32 MCHF. He feels that CHIPP should not saturate the programme given the fact that astronomy projects shall also be funded by FLARE. He proposes to limit the FLARE requests from CHIPP to about 28 MCHF. Half of the reduction should come from CHIPP self-moderation and the other half is to be left to the judgement of the FLARE evaluation committee. If this is agreed by the EB, we shall then see how we can reduce the total amount of the requests. In absence of strong a priori opinion, the discussion started on where things can be reduced a bit. TM notes that without CTA in FLARE, there is just one PI (Laura Baudis) for all projects in the astroparticle pillar. She also notes that pillar 1 is taking a very big share with the Phase-II LHC upgrade. TN agrees, but thinks that the share between pillars shall evolve with time. He foresees the DUNE experiment to ramp up when the LHC needs will decrease. Until now, DUNE is only for R&D, since SERI has the wish to fund the LBNF with infrastructure money out of FLARE in a similar way as for CTA. This would of course help a lot in the future. The weight of the SBN programme is found to be rather high, in comparison with for instance LHCb, and given the fact that the SBN is now basically only supported by one institute (Bern). There is also the uncertainty on the continuation of the Japanese neutrino programme after Alain Blondel's retirement. Currently we still have 600 kCHF/year on this programme in 2019–2020. Overall, the EB thinks that some reduction in the neutrino pillar should be possible. Concerning Pillar 1, TN could see the possibility to delay a bit the funding needs by a 10% level for CMS and ATLAS, but not for LHCb having a tighter schedule for the update. GD agrees that this is not a too big issue for CMS as the ETH-Domain funding can be used to compensate, but this is not the case for ATLAS. He reminds that ATLAS already reduced its request by nearly a factor of two compared to the original plan about a year ago. Other possible reductions are on SHiP that will most likely not be approved before 2020 and maybe on Tier-2 computing with the extra manpower that is not in the RRB. GD notes however that keeping the ETHZ support for one FTE on Tier-2 is not easy. He needs to discuss with Christoph Grab the future of the CSCS in a context of worldwide homogenising of computing resources to reduce maintenance. Given these possibilities, the EB agrees to try about 10% self-moderation by contacting the PIs individually. The first step is to discuss what we shall implement within CHIPP, what shall be presented in January will be discussed later.

→ MT: to update the CHIPP Table to the actual status

→ GD: to discuss with Christoph Grab the Tier-2 computing

→ TN: to discuss with other PIs the possibility of some reduction

9. IPPOG MoU

TN asks MT to introduce the topic. MT reminds that Hans Peter Beck is the Swiss representative in the International Particle Physics Outreach Group (IPPOG) and currently the Co-Chair of the organisation. The main activity of IPPOG is the organisation of master classes allowing high-school students to put their hands on the analysis of LHC data. Beck informed us that IPPOG is now in its transition to become a Collaboration of its own right. In this view, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was prepared after long discussion involving all current members and most importantly, the CERN Legal Service team. CHIPP – as representative of Switzerland in particle physics – is now asked to sign this MoU to become a member of IPPOG. The associated yearly membership fee is based on the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of the country and is projected to be about 3'000 € for Switzerland. Given the deficit we have in the yearly CHIPP

budget, CHIPP submitted at the end of August a funding request to cover this amount via the MAP Platform of SCNAT. We received full support according to the budget table of SCNAT for 2017, although official confirmation will only come in March. With the funding secured, we can now go on at the Board meeting to get agreement to sign the IPPOG MoU. Asked by AS, TN clarifies that the support has indeed to be requested every year to SCNAT, but this should be fine given that SCNAT is keen to support outreach activities. It is therefore agreed to ask for Board approval at Board 2016-03.

10. CH representative in new CERN Thematic Forum on education

TN informs that Olivier Schneider, as Swiss scientific delegate to CERN Council, received a message from Jorg Wenninger, who is the management liaison person at CERN for Switzerland. Wenninger informed him about the creation of a new CERN Thematic Forum on education (both for students and teachers) with one representative per member state. Schneider discussed the issue with Bruno Moor and as a result proposes CHIPP to find a suitable person for this position. TN wonders why CERN cares so much about pre-university education. According to the original message by Pippa Wells (Head of Member State Relations) the idea is to see how to best propagate CERN interests in high schools. TN notes that there is already a high-school teaching programme at CERN that has not much Swiss participation. He does not see a strong need for a 1-2 week teacher programme. GD reports on his experience of having a high-school teacher on sabbatical for 3 months in his group at CERN. TM mentions also the Athena programme at the University of Geneva, which is coordinated by Michele Maggiore and is oriented towards high-school education. After considering the two names mentioned in the e-mail by Wenninger as possible Swiss members, it is agreed to ask Hans Peter Beck to identify possible candidates.

→ TN: to contact Hans Peter Beck and maybe Michele Maggiore to identify candidates

11. Big data computing in CH (CHIPP – CHAPs)

TM reports very briefly on the meeting 'Science Data ↔ Data Science' held in Geneva (ISDC) on 29 September 2016. There was a presentation of the new Swiss Data Science Center (SDSC). The funding of this center which will have some 40 collaborators, comes from SERI via the ETH-Domain. She notes that for CTA a possible use of data science is for machine learning developments on image analysis or on the 3D representation of the atmospheric showers induced by gamma-rays. The principle of the future centre is not to provide own data storage or computing facilities, but to rent the machines to big companies like Google, Amazon, etc. They would assist the data mining, especially in fields not familiar with data science, like for health applications, traffic light optimisation, meteorology, etc. GD comments that this kind of phenomenological approach aims at finding patterns from the data volume and then one has to try to understand them. He adds that the creation of the centre looks a bit like providing a solution to problems that are still to be identified. It is however agreed that given this new opportunity, one should think about possible usage in the particle physics domain. The talk by Aurelio Bay at the Board meeting will make this known to the community.

12. Distribution of job announcements

MT reminds about the e-mail exchange of last June on the wish of Rainer Wallny to inform CHIPP members about an open position at DESY. It was then decided to discuss a CHIPP policy on job announcements at the next EB meeting. MT also reminds that on the CHIPP website we have currently links to the pages listing open positions in the different institutes. AS thinks that we should not send out too many e-mails, as the information for people looking for a job is available on-line. GD agrees and reminds that INSPIRE is the main site for posting jobs on particle physics. He suggests to add a link on the CHIPP page on open positions to the INSPIRE High-Energy Physics Employment Database. It is agreed that this would be enough.

→ MT: to add a link from the CHIPP website to the INSPIRE job database

C. Items for information

13. SCNAT MAP Platform meeting

TN gives a short report on the MAP-Platform meeting held on 23 September in Bern. As usual, each representative gave a short report on the activities of the past 6 months. There was also a discussion on higher education ranking with the issue that papers with more than 1000 co-authors are excluded from the ranking, which is obviously an issue for the big collaborative papers of ATLAS and CMS, for instance. Herwig Schopper was supposed to talk on this point, but could not attend. There was also a discussion on the San

Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA). He reports that ETHZ signed it, but EPFL not yet. SNSF probably also signed it, since they adopted the new CV format suggested by DORA.

14. FLARE LHC M&O request

GD briefly gives the status of preparation of the M&O request. It will be a four-year request 2017–2020 with a much-reduced scientific part – basically only one page per experiment – according to the new guidelines of the FLARE call restricting the scientific justification to 5 pages. GD wonders if the M&O funding shall go to ETHZ rather than to the UZH now that he became the new PI. TN notes that the handling of the money by the UZH worked very well in previous years. There was no problem with this, although Olivier Schneider (EPFL) was the PI. GD will discuss with Tristan Maillard (SNSF) the way to proceed in the following years. He adds that the change of the CV and output (publication) list format imposed by SNSF is annoying as it implies additional work for all the co-applicants. The next steps are rather straightforward: one needs to prepare a template with the skeleton of the request before contacting Giuseppe Iacobucci for ATLAS and TN and/or Olivier Schneider for the LHCb part. Final numbers will be inserted after the RRB meeting at the end of October.

→ GD: to prepare the overall template of the LHC M&O request

→ GD: to contact Tristan Maillard on where and how to handle the M&O money

→ MT: to ask the one-page contribution to the instrument PIs

15. APPEC draft recommendations

TM just mentions that the APPEC draft recommendations have been linked from the CHIPP home page for information. There is nothing special to point out.

16. Status of future meetings

- PSI 2016 workshop on Physics, Symmetries and Interactions, 17–20 October 2016, PSI: AS reports that everything is going well. All the info is on the website.
- CHIPP PhD Winter School 2017, 13–18 February 2017, Sörenberg, LU: It is mentioned that we shall encourage Board members at the next meeting to send students.
- Gender in Physics Day 2017, 26–27 January 2017, Geneva
The discussion quickly widens on the issue of lack of women in physics, especially at the professorship level. TN suggests compiling statistics on PhD students and postdocs in CHIPP. AS notes that asking this as part of the CHIPP Table is difficult as we need to justify what we do with the information and we would also miss the theorists. The best way would be to ask this as part of the membership database. TM mentions that the University of Geneva has gender information at hand, but they do not follow individual career paths. She sees a bias in the sense that PhD women are hired to lower level positions. A high qualification is often requested for women. She also mentions the need of a “crèche” (“Kindergarten”) at the universities. Childcare should also be provided at conferences. These are important concrete actions, while she finds that some actions done by the “Bureau d’égalité” are rather useless like the organisation of breakfasts for women professors. GD notes that the physics department at ETHZ is now discussing the gender issue very concretely to change the situation. Exercise groups in the first years are reorganised to avoid isolating the women among many men. This is achieved forming a group with equal number of male and female and a 2nd group with only men. AS notes, however, that one cannot change to a 50–50% gender ratio very quickly at professor level without lowering the quality. One shall increase the number of women PhD students first and then Postdocs, etc.
→ MT: to ask for gender information from the CHIPP database

17. A.O.B.

None

The Chair closes the meeting at 16:05.

24 November 2016

written by: Marc Türler

approved by: Tatsuya Nakada