

Minutes of the Board meeting 2012-01 on 12 January 2012

Place of the meeting: ETH Zurich Höggerberg, Room HPK D24.2

Time of the meeting: 2 p.m. – 5 p.m.

The Chair opens the meeting at 14h and specifically welcomes the observer from the SPS, A. Schopper, who attends a Board meeting for the first time.

(→ [complete set of slides](#))

1. Agenda

The Chair puts the inclusion of the additional decision item (calculation of the membership fee, item 7) to the vote.

The Board unanimously (2 abstentions) approves the inclusion of the calculation of the membership fee in the agenda and approves the agenda thus revised.

2. Apologies and Proxy votes

Active Board members (as of 12 January 2012): 55

Active Board members present: Antusch, Baudis, Bay, Beck, Beisert, Chiochia, Colangelo, Derendinger, Desjacques, Dissertori, Durrer, Gehrman, Gornea, Grab, Hauri, Iacobucci, Kirch (Chair), Krusche, Montaruli, Nakada, Pohl, Ritt, Rivkin, Rubbia, Schneider, Shaposhnikov, Spira, Straumann, Weber, Wenger

Other participants: Pretzl (HM), Moor (Obs.), Schopper (Obs.), Ruder (Admin.)

The Chair informs about the apologies received and reads out the list of proxy votes as announced before the meeting¹.

Quorum: 19 votes (= 1/3 of the Board members; Art. 24.1 Statutes); Votes present: 30 + 8 proxies = 38

→ The quorum is reached.

3. Minutes of the last meeting (2011-03, 1/2 September 2011)

The Board unanimously (2 abstentions) approves the revised version of the minutes (with thanks to the minute writer).

4. NCCR 'THE UNIVERSE – Constituents, Forces, Space-Time' (→ [slides](#))

Status report, information and endorsement

Pohl briefly presents the status and highlights that the proposal has gone through 4 major revisions with 13 versions. He thanks the 48 authors for their contribution. After having mentioned the scientific content and the administrative structure, he explains the evaluation process and suggests that the proposal should only be continued if it gets an A ranking. He asks the Board for proposals regarding the list of referees and is ready to receive further comments and corrections regarding the text – consolidated by the Challenge Leaders – until 14 January 2012 (midnight). [*The final version of the NCCR proposal is available [here](#)*].

→ all Board Members: send referees' names to Pohl and corrections to the Challenge Leaders.

Deadline: 15 January 2012 (midnight).

¹ Beisert (for *Gabardiel*), Iacobucci (for *Clark*), Gornea (for *Vuilleumier*), Krusche (for *Thielemann*), Pohl (for *Courvoisier*), Ritt (for *Horisberger*), Shaposhnikov (for *Rattazzi*), Dissertori (for *Wallny*).

Pohl answers a question from Rubbia and states that he supports the idea that this nice document is made available for a wider usage, e.g. on the CHIPP internet page. He confirms to Dissertori that the table distributing the resources is preliminary and will have to be discussed in detail in case the proposal makes it to the second round. On a remark from Nakada, several speakers make it clear that the proposal is not submitted by CHIPP but by the two co-leading houses (Geneva and PSI) on behalf of the NCCR participants, but that the Board is free to endorse the planned submission. Derendinger underlines that the Institute for Theoretical Physics Berne is not to be considered as part of this project, and that further the CHIPP vote will not engage the participation of the Albert Einstein Centre as such.

→ Pohl: to find ways and means for making the scientific core part of the NCCR proposal available.

The Board endorses the submission of the NCCR proposal 'THE UNIVERSE – Constituents, Forces, Space-Time' by the two co-leading houses (Geneva and PSI) on behalf of the NCCR participants, with 30 votes in favour (1 vote against, 6 abstentions).

In a short statement, Gornea explains his abstention: he believes that it is too early to submit such a proposal now and considers the present version to be not shaped enough to be convincing and to not demonstrating sufficiently the plus-value of such a project. Replying to this statement, Durrer agrees that the proposal has weaknesses, because here and there compromises between the sometimes diverging interests of the many groups involved had to be made, which are not always optimal. But she is convinced that if the community does not submit it now it will miss a great opportunity. Straumann – speaking on behalf of many colleagues – expresses his thanks for the tremendous effort made by Durrer and Pohl and for the resulting nice document (applause).

5. **European Strategy for Particle Physics: Update** ([→ slides](#))

- Status and timetable – Information

The Chair briefly introduces the subject, hinting at the additional 2012 Board meeting in June devoted to this topic and invites Nakada to provide the details. Nakada explains process of upgrading the European Strategy in Particle Physics, which will be lead by him as Scientific Secretary, and mentions the two groups that have been set up by the European Strategy Session of (CERN) Council: the Preparatory Group and the Strategy Group. The latter is composed of representatives of all Member States (CH: CHIPP Chair) and will produce the draft strategy document based on the scientific input collected in the open symposium in Cracow (open symposium). He calls on all Board Members wishing to contribute to the process to send their input to him or to the Chair.

→ all Board Members: input regarding the work of the Strategy Group to be sent to Nakada and/or Kirch.

- Input from CHIPP – What had been done in 2006 ([→ document](#))

The Chair recalls the work done in 2006 and suggests basing this years' work on the CHIPP input paper from 2006.

- Setting up a Working Group ([→ document](#))

The Chair suggests creating a small Working Group for updating the 2006 paper; the WG is asked to produce a first draft for March to be circulated among the Board Members. The second (final) draft will be discussed and approved in the June Board meeting.

The Board unanimously approves the setting up of a WG composed of Kirch (Chair), Ereditato, Gehrman, Wallny, Pohl, and Schneider.

→ WG: to have the first draft ready in March.

6. **CHIPP Prize: Revised procedure and setting up the Selection Committee** ([→ slides:](#) [→ document/selection;](#) [→ document/procedure](#))

The Chair briefly introduces the matter and underlines the most important change: the creation of a Selection Committee with Colangelo as an EB Member being the Chair. The experience of the past years has shown that there was very little involvement of Board Members. He calls upon all Board Members to encourage their students to apply!

The Board unanimously approves the revised procedure for the CHIPP Prize.

Colangelo as Chair of the future Selection Committee presents the proposed composition of the Committee and appeals to all Board Members to encourage their students. He is looking forward to many applications. Iacobucci would like to have some indications about the term of the mandate. Since several of the members are Honorary Board Members, the Chair suggests to leave the term open-ended and to replace Committee Members after their resignation.

The Board unanimously approves the composition of the Selection Committee composed of Colangelo (Chair), Bay, Bourquin, and Truöl.

7. Alternative calculation method ([→ slides](#); [→ document](#))

The Chair introduces the proposal from the Albert Einstein Centre to substitute the Board Member fee decided in Leysin (2'400 CHF) by a membership fee applicable to all CHIPP Members (approx. 100 CHF). He underlines that such a membership fee would have to be collected mandatorily by each institute and then transferred to CHIPP in one go. Otherwise the administrative effort would be too high. He continues by pointing to the loss of income resulting from such a change and mentions possible ways out being the NCCR or a mandatory institutional fee. He proposes to take a decision on the principle of a CHIPP Membership fee and to set the 2012 value at 110 CHF:

In the ensuing discussion, a number of clarifications are made:

- Will the invoice increase if (Board) Members drop out (Gornea)? Chair: in one way or the other, the loss of income has to be compensated.
- Did all institutes agree in Leysin (Beisert)? Chair: yes (see minutes approved).
- Would it be possible to use FORCE funds for funding CHIPP (Weber)? Chair: The Membership fee serves for providing services to the Members and should therefore come from the Members [*information received after the meeting: the FORCE rules would not allow for funding an Association*].

From these factual questions, the discussion shifts to more ideological grounds, when Derendinger strongly opposes four basic facts:

- 1 the Leysin decision of funding CHIPP through substantial contributions from the Board Members;
- 2 the existence of any added value created by and through CHIPP,
- 3 the high level of the administrative budget,
- 4 the Gersau decision of CHIPP to transform itself into an independent association.

On 1: Derendinger states that he would not be willing to contribute at all, if the method was not changed to a more reasonable individual membership fee. In addition he has no funds available for such a payment. Straumann points out that if a new discussion about the item and a new decision regarding an alternative method makes more Board Members happy than after the Leysin decision, he would be willing to vote positively on the new calculation method.

On 2: In Derendinger's view the added value of CHIPP is very small and fraction of the budget going into productive items (= science) is less than 50%. This is contested by several of the Board Members:

- The production is much more than 50%, because a fraction of the work of each Board Member goes also into CHIPP (Dissertori).
- The association has been professionalized in the past, and this level should be maintained. If funds were missing, volunteers from the Board would have to be recruited (Pohl).
- The submission of the joint M&O request – which benefits all institutes – would not be possible without the administrative support (Nakada).
- The main goal is indeed science, but it is exactly the administrative support that leaves more time for science to the Board Members (Baudis).
- If the Board does not find added value in the CHIPP activities, then CHIPP should be dissolved. The past experience shows that CHIPP is rather successful with taking initiatives that benefit science (e.g. FOLIS/FLARE, NCCR) (Pohl).
- The statement that theoretical physicists do not profit from CHIPP is wrong because theory needs experimental physics (and vice versa) and the profit is on both communities (Spira).
- One should not forget the CHIPP workshops (and schools), where the interaction and the discussions between theory and experiments is taking place (Straumann).
- An important element of CHIPP is the fact that people have to come together and decide together about priorities. In this respect it is very important for theory that the experiments continue.
- Several ECFA countries see CHIPP as good example; CHIPP does not science, but allows scientists

to do science (steering, coordinating, setting priorities, ...) (Nakada).

Others express some understanding:

- Rubbia: A professional organisation is needed but he has some understanding for worries that the level of administration becomes too high. A balanced approach has to be taken. The main goal of the Board Members is science and CHIPP should promote science and funding for science: this is the added value. In this context he is interested in the discussion about CHIPP activities under item 10 of the agenda.
- Pretzl: One should not underestimate the impact CHIPP has on the outside world, because the existence of CHIPP shows that the community can (and is willing to) organise itself and can define its priorities. He understands the monetary arguments against a high fee and would support a FORCE contribution.
- Colangelo reminds the Board that he had been the only discerning voice in Leysin and that in his opinion the added value of CHIPP is bigger for experimental physics than for theory.

On 3: Derendinger explains that he considers wrong to determine the membership fee starting with the budget needs. More general, it is wrong to base the budget on an estimated expenditure; it should look at the possible income from a membership fee of approx. 100 CHF, which would be acceptable. In his mind, the administration budget is way too high; the funds would be better spent on science. He suggests putting the administrative budget to zero, and use instead the overhead funds from SNF for the local CHIPP administration.

- These statements are contested by Straumann and Bay, judging the administrative budget as small compared to the annual funding for particle physics (10 M from the confederation) and even smaller when adding to this number the approx. 20 M of salaries of the institutes' staff.
- The Chair – supported by Pohl and Straumann – adds that he would not be able to assume this task (and to prepare the meetings etc.) without an administrative support.
- Pohl confirms that he plans to use the SNF overhead funds for paying the Geneva contribution to the CHIPP Association.
- Ritt suggests asking the universities for paying a support fee, in case the Board values high the support from the CHIPP Administration.
- Beck adds, that CHIPP should be able (and do so) to ask for funds at SUK, SNF, SER, and others; this is possible because CHIPP has acquired legal personality.

On 4: Derendinger is of the opinion that the CHIPP decision to become autonomous (taken in Gersau) makes no sense.

At the end of the discussion, Rubbia suggests to discuss at present only 2012, for which he is ready to find the necessary funds. The discussion will have to be held later in the year and in the broader context of what the Board Members want CHIPP to do.

The Board unanimously (with 10 abstentions) approves the introduction of an individual membership fee, which is set at 110 CHF for 2012, and which will be collected by each institute and then transferred to the CHIPP administration.

The Chair makes the Board aware that the discussion will be taken up in the September Board, where the budget as well as possible additional income will be on the agenda.

→ Chair: to take up the additional income and budget questions in September.

8. CHIPP Association: Budget 2012 – 2015 ([→ slides](#); [→ document](#))

The Chair briefly presents the budget 2012, which will have to be voted by the Board. He underlines that the financial plan is merely giving an indication about a possible evolution, but contains several unknowns.

The Board unanimously approves the 2012 Budget for the CHIPP Association.

9. CHIPP Long-Term Financial Tables: preparation for the discussion re moderating the ambitions ([→ slides](#); [→ document](#))

The Chair introduces the subject. The problem centres on the fact that for the next 4 years FORCE is over-subscribed by a factor of at least 2, FLARE even by a factor of 4-5. He explains his intention to hold a thorough discussion about these numbers (and the scientific content behind) in June.

In a short exchange of views, Pohl mentions that the problem of oversubscription has immediately been taken up by the representative of the ETH domain in the Lenkungsausschuss FORCE. In direct discussions with

the project leaders, alternative funding sources are sought. Rubbia adds that in the past (during his chairmanship) extreme worries had existed around the M&O and Computing needs. Thanks to the joint requests – coordinated by CHIPP – this is now under control. He underlines that for some projects, the priorities are set by external bodies; this is the case for instance for the Laguna project, which will be dealt with in the update process of the European Strategy in Particle Physics.

The Board takes note of the 2011 edition of the CHIPP table and the forthcoming discussion about moderating the ambitions.

→ Chair: to take up the discussion about priorities in June.

10. Report on CHIPP activities (September – December 2011) (→ slides)

- CERN Council

Straumann reports orally from the CERN Council. Regarding the machine, the LHC will operate at 4+4 TeV in 2012, most likely with 15 ns bunches. He reminds the Board that there will be no beam in 2013. CERN Council has been informed that there are at present no funds available in the CERN budget to embark on new projects (like neutrino beams or the Linear Collider). This situation might be eased when new Members States and Associate States join the organisation. Recently, Romania has acquired the status of Member for accession, Israel and Serbia have become Associate Members; more countries are interested in a closer relation, but no specific progress is to be reported. The CLIC design report is under preparation and CERN has received 17 offers for hosting the second Tier0 centre (!). The selection committee for the next DG (2013-2017) will be established in March. Straumann ends his report by mentioning that his term will come to an end in 11 months, and he calls upon CHIPP to start the procedure for nominating his successor to the SER.

→ Chair: to start the process for nominating 2 candidates on behalf of the SER.

- FORCE Requests 2011 (→ document)

The Chair shows the document distributed listing all the FORCE requests submitted to the SNF in fall 2011.

- LA FORCE (→ document)

Pohl reports from the meeting and recalls the priorities for 2012: mandatory requests (M&O, Computing), consolidation and upgrade of LHC (detectors & machine), CERN approved experiments, CERN recognized experiment. He underlines that the Lenkungsausschuss will be continued also in the future, when FORCE, FINES (for ESO) and FLARE (other large infrastructures) are merged and transferred to the SNF. SER will provide basic guidelines in the Leistungsauftrag, whereas the LA each year will set the priorities for the year to come. *[Information received after the meeting: the new nomenclature is now fixed to FORCE, FINES, and FOLIS being the content of the new merged funding instrument FLARE.]*

- WS (NNN11)

Rubbia gives a short report about the NNN Workshop.

- Outlook for 2012 (→ <http://www.chipp.ch/chipp-meet-doc.html>)

The Chair points to the CHIPP internet page, where the list of activities is available. Regarding the 2012 schools and workshops, he invites the colleagues to report:

Phenomenology WS, Zurich (Spira): a highly successful workshop with lots of discussions and high quality talks; he is happy about the outcome.

CHIPP PhD School Engelberg (Chiochia): the registration is closed with 27 registrations, the programme is about LHC physics with 5 lectures and evening discussion sessions.

Astroparticle/neutrino WS (Chair): Due to a high density of other specialised meetings in the field, the WS has not triggered enough interest and will therefore not be organised. The Chair will contact the astroparticle & neutrino colleagues. Rubbia adds that CERN, Geneva and ETHZ have organised a neutrino town meeting as part of the strategy process.

DarkAttack (Baudis): Theme: Dark matter; a website has been set up and the list of invited speakers is final.

Summer School Zuoz (Spira): takes place every second year; the list of speakers for summer 2012 is final and the registration open. He asks the colleagues to encourage their students to register and to attend.

Detector R&D (Chair): the responsible person (Hildebrand) is contacting people to check for dates.

The Board takes note of all the reports.

11. Swiss PostDocs and PhD students: an yearly gathering: Discussion/Approval ([→ slides](#); [→ document](#))

The Chair introduces the subject, which consists of having an annual PhD/PostDoc day in conjunction with the SPS Annual Meeting and the CHIPP Plenary Meeting, alternating annually between the two events. In the ensuing discussion, Straumann would like to know if this means that an additional day is added (Chair: at SPS rather as parallel session, at the CHIPP plenary probably one additional day). Durrer expects an increased participation of particle physics at the SPS if this scheme is implemented. Pohl reminds the Board that such a meeting is mandatory already for the CUSO universities and that he looks forward to extend this also to the German speaking part of Switzerland. Weber gives his enthusiastic support to the idea, because he considers the C15 mid-term workshop as a very beautiful meeting. Bay cautions by saying that the organisation of these meetings in CUSO is always a painful matter! Nakada is somewhat sceptical and asks himself whether the participation will have to be made mandatorily. The Chair is less pessimistic, because if the Board approves such a gathering, he expects all Board Members to encourage their students to participate.

The Board unanimously (with one abstention) approves the proposal of organising a yearly gathering of PhD students and PostDocs, starting in 2013.

Nakada suggests, that the 2013 meeting could serve also as concluding event for the C15 project.

12. Technology Transfer: how to keep the Board informed: Preliminary discussion ([→ slide](#))

The Chair provides this piece of advanced information; the matter will be taken up later this year.

→ Chair: to take up the matter in September.

13. Next Board meetings

2012-02: 13 June 2012 (Wed), 1 p.m., Berne

2012-03: 7 September 2012 (Fri), 2 p.m., ETHZ Zentrum (dissociated from the Plenary)

14. Next Plenary meeting

13/14 September 2012 (Thu/Fri), Kartause Ittingen (near Frauenfeld)

15. A.O.B.

- SwiNG bill: Grab reports about the discussion in the EB: SwiNG represents Switzerland in the European Grid Initiative. At national level, Switch assumes the role of the leading institution. The service rendered has to be paid from 2012 onwards. The long-term solution consists of either getting funds from SER or from FORCE. For 2012, the 108kCHF will have to be covered proportionally from the user institutes involved in ATLAS, CMS, and LHCb (40:40:20).

Straumann is of the opinion that such an unforeseen bill is unacceptable and suggests that it is paid out of the running Computing FORCE funds. Grab sees this as feasible, even if this would lead to buying less hardware and fulfilling the pledges a few months later. For this, Grab asks for a clear decision from all the co-applicants to the Computing FORCE request. He will prepare a corresponding proposal to the institutes concerned.

→ Grab: - to investigate a possible reduction of necessary services performed so far;
- to evaluate the consequences on the Tier-2 operation and Switzerland's pledges, if money was to be taken from the present Tier-2 FORCE computing budget;
- to prepare a proposal about paying Switch from the FORCE computing funds.

- Meeting documents and meeting preparation: Dissertori expresses his thanks to the Chair and the Administrator for the timely availability of the documents and the high quality of the overall preparative work for the meeting.

The Chair closes the meeting at 17.00h.