

 <p>13 October 2005</p>	<p>Summary/Action List, CHIPP Board Meeting</p> <p>DRAFT</p>	<p>PSI 28-09-2005, 17:10 29-09-2005, 13:45</p>	<p>A. G. Clark</p>
--	--	--	--------------------

Participants

- A. Blondel, A. Clark, M. Bourquin (UniGe)
- A. Bay, T. Nakada, T. Schietinger, O. Schneider (EPFL)
- J.-L. Vuilleumier (UniNe)
- P. Minkowski, K. Pretzl (UniBe)
- A. Denner, R. Eichler, K. Gabathuler (PSI)
- C. AMSLER, U. Straumann (UniZh)
- G. Dissertori, U. Langenegger, F. Pauss, A. Rubbia (ETHZ)
- J.-P. Ruder (SBF)

Invited

- A. Ereditato (Naples), C. Grab (ETHZ), Q. Ingram (PSI)

Agenda

1. Approval of Agenda
2. Approval of Summary of meeting of the CHIPP Board held in Bern on 16 June 2005.
3. Matters arising
4. Discussion and agreement on LHC Computing Requirements and the FORCE request by CHIPP in 2006.
5. Final discussion on requested financial requirement in experimental particle physics until 2011.
6. Discussion on the Strategy Group of the CERN Council to advise on future European particle physics activities.
7. Preparation for CHIPP elections in the period 2006-2007
8. Report on CHIPP activities (A. Clark, A. Rubbia)
9. Divers
 - a) CHIPP data base
 - b) NUPECC, APECC activities

0. Introduction.

- a) A. Clark opened the meeting, and introduced A. Ereditato, who will succeed Prof. K. Pretzl at Bern University and who was invited by the CHIPP EB to attend the meeting.
- b) The SPS meeting would be held at Lausanne on 13-14 February, 2006. The Particle Physics section is being organized by Klaus Kirch (PSI).

A strong participation by the CH groups was requested by Klaus, and encouraged by CHIPP.

1. Approval of Agenda

The Agenda of the meeting was agreed with slight modifications (see above)

2. Approval of Meeting Summary

The Summary of the meeting of 16 June 2005 was agreed with minor corrections, and is now posted on the CHIPP web page.

3. Items Arising – Education activities of CHIPP

- a) F. Pauss recalled the importance of Outreach activities within CHIPP. In the discussion that followed, the role and so-far unsuccessful educational efforts by CHIPP were recalled. It was noted that the FNRS did not so far support Outreach efforts (is it a mission of the FNRS?).
- b) The importance of the existing Zuoz Workshop currently organized by PSI was emphasized, and the possibility to adapt that school should be studied.
- c) **Actions** for the next CHIPP Board
 - make a clear statement of the aims of CHIPP in education
 - discuss possible future ideas at a future CHIPP Board meeting.
 - discuss possibilities with the Academy of Science,

4. Discussion of LHC Computing requirements.

- a) Ch. Grab reviewed the expected resource requirements for LHC computing (see his transparencies in the Plenary meeting). These included Tier 2 Grid computing needs, and Tier 3 needs within the individual institutes. He noted a total expenditure need of ~3MCHF in the period to 2008 for hardware at the Manno T2 centre, with hardware for a 10% system totaling ~670 KCHF in 2006. This is being requested via FORCE.
- b) A. Rubbia and U. Straumann emphasized the preparations in respectively in Spain and the Netherlands (much larger than CH). Other interventions supported the GRID activities.
- c) A. Clark and Ch. Grab emphasized the need for at least one computing physicist or professional in each experiment to liaise with the physicists to ensure efficient and competitive analyses. It was proposed to submit a specific and dedicated FNRS request next year.
- d) With 2 abstentions, it was agreed to proceed with the CHIPP request to FORCE for funding in 2006 to increase the LHC Tier 2 CSCS centre.
- e) R. Eichler stressed the need for University groups to state clearly the need for the Tier 2 centre at CSCS, and to communicate that to the CSCS via the University authorities.
- f) **Actions**
 - as funding requirements increase it was agreed to investigate all possible funding sources in addition to FORCE for the Tier 2 hardware (e.g. EGEE European funding, ETH etc)

- ensure (via the CHIPP Computing Board) that there is adequate follow-through following the hardware expenditure.

5. Final discussion on requested financial requirement in experimental particle physics until 2011.

- Following the CHIPP Board discussion of June 2006, A. Rubbia and A. Clark had presented revised funding estimates presented as requested by the meeting. The tables were distributed at the meeting and by email in advance.
- There was a lively discussion of the financial needs in each sector, and a wide range of viewpoints. For time reasons the meeting was adjourned and continued the following day.
- Following a request for his viewpoint, J.-P. Ruder noted the importance of collecting the best possible estimates for particle physics experiments. This was especially important because of the long time scale of these experiments. He noted that the request was a logical extension of the previous CHIPP roadmap that had concentrated on scientific aspects. He emphasized the ongoing activity of the SEB in preparing budget lines for the period 2008-11.
- Key issues that were debated/argued included:
 - There was a concern that the M&O for LHC experiments was, although necessary, effectively an additional contribution to CERN operations not seen by the CH physicist community. Some other way should be identified to make these payments, in order to free the CH community to effectively exploit CERN facilities and to achieve its roadmap.
 - As noted in (4), additional funding sources for LHC computing should be encouraged.
 - The LHC is the primary CERN activity in the coming years and involves >2/3 of the CH experimental community. However, there was concern that construction for T2K should be adequately funded given the complementarity and interest of its physics programme.
 - There was concern by LHCb that outstanding CORE commitments in 2006-7 were not included (agreed to insert an additional table).
 - Within the neutrino community, it was agreed by vote (5 to 1 with 3 abstentions) that the MICE experiment should be listed as accelerator R&D. It was emphasized by several speakers that success and cohesion of the planned T2K involvement was a priority, and that choices may be necessary to achieve this.
 - The priorities of R&D within the different "pillars" of the roadmap were discussed. It was agreed that a good balance should be maintained, and that (in particular for tracking) a start on R&D had to be made for LHC tracker upgrades to cope with increased luminosity. It was agreed that CH participation in SLHC and/or ILC would be important, consequent to decisions on constructions at the international level. This would be noted in the revised tables.

- There was some concern about the “vagueness” of the “non-accelerator” program, but it was noted that the ISDC Workshop in May 2005 had been a success, and that more scientific discussion was needed.

e) *Actions*

- A. Rubbia and A. Clark agreed to distribute a final version of the needs for final comment (distributed with this summary), taking into account the decisions made. It was agreed that the document would then be forwarded to the funding authorities, with an explanatory letter that would be distributed for comment in advance.

- The CHIPP EB requested the approval of the CHIPP Board to create a “Program Committee” with independent external representation to review the large experiments, and to make recommendations as needed to the funding agencies. The CHIPP Board agreed to this request.

6. Discussion on the Strategy Group of the CERN Council.

a) Following the presentation by R. Eichler at the Plenary meeting, A. Blondel reported on the strategy in more detail. Members from Switzerland were the PSI Director (R. Eichler), the CHIPP Chair (A. Clark) and A. Blondel from the CERN SPC (also part of the preparatory group). The Strategy Group is chaired by the SPC Chair (K. Peach) and the ECFA Chair (T. Akesson).

b) He explained that the preparatory group would meet October 10 to define the procedure of the Group in the coming months. Following a Symposium early in 2006, country delegates would ensure a 2-way exchange prior to a 1-week meeting at Zeuthen in May 2006.

c) He agreed to seek 1st input prior to the preparatory meeting (done).

d) Many questions/issues were noted in the discussion. A few of the issues are noted below.

- J.-P. Ruder emphasized the importance of a European strategy, not merely CERN, and maybe including synergies with activities in other geographical regions.

- That being said, the future activities of CERN were central to the field (and to the CH community) and this would be discussed in the context of ILC, LHC and other accelerator R&D activities (CLIC, high intensity neutrino beams, etc). It would provide input for decisions on the CERN program post-LHC.

- The question of whether related “non-accelerator” activities should be included was raised (there was considered important by the Board).

- The issue of larger and fewer experiments was raised in the discussion. Will (should) this trend continue, is it inevitable because of the physics, etc.?

- A. Blondel said that issues such as “education” would not be neglected by the group.

- A. Rubbia noted that the relationship between the EU (FP7, ESFRI etc) and CERN needs to be better defined and

coordinated, especially for what concerns the funding of large projects or R&D towards large projects.

- e) R. Eichler and others also noted the significance of a reduction in the number of large international particle physics accelerator labs, and the transfer of accelerator techniques to other user communities (e.g. DESY, SLAC).

7. Planning for Election of CHIPP EB, and other CHIPP appointees.

- a) Following discussion by the Board, K. Pretzl and R. Eichler were requested by the Board (and agreed) to consult with the community to provide a short list of candidates for the 3-man EB. They agreed to complete this work by November 14. The election would be held at a meeting of the CHIPP Board in Bern, at 3pm on November 21 (meeting room tbc).
- b) U. Straumann noted his preference to vote for a “package” of 3 persons, rather than 3 individuals.
- c) At request of the Board, A. Clark noted his intentions. He said that he considered CHIPP to be essential for the community, and would serve CHIPP in whatever capacity it requested. He considered however that the rotation of EB members was in the best interest of CHIPP. He also noted that (in retrospect) he thought a 3-year term would be preferable to the current 2-year term.
- d) The election of other office holders would follow the EB elections (at a time to be determined but before 31 December 2005).

8. Report on CHIPP Activities

- a) This item was deferred because of a lack of time

9. Divers

- a) Following the discussion on NuPECC activities at the Plenary the question of NuPECC and APECC activities was discussed at the end of the 1st Board session.
 - It was agreed that CHIPP would request the FNRS that it would be consulted before the nomination by the FNRS of a NuPECC representative.
 - It was noted that APPEC membership was important to the CH community. The expected annual membership of APECC was 10000 CHF, and it was agreed that this sum should be requested by CHIPP from the FNRS. M. Bourquin is currently the CHIPP member of APECC.
 - It was agreed by the Board that APECC membership was of higher priority than NuPECC membership.