

Minutes of EB meeting 2017-02 on 10 April 2017

Time/place of the meeting: Monday, 10 April 2017, 13:15, SCNAT (room Jungfrau), Laupenstrasse 7, Bern
Present: Günther Dissertori (GD), Tatsuya Nakada (TN, Chair), Adrian Signer (AS), Marc Türlér (MT, Secretary), and Michele Weber (MW)

1. Agenda

The agenda is approved with the addition under item 15 of the issue on the possible organisation of the International Cosmic Ray Conference (ICRC) in 2021.

2. Apologies

None

A. Administrative items

3. Minutes of the last meeting (2017-01) (→ [document](#))

AS reports two typos to be corrected. With these amendments, the minutes are approved with thanks to MT.

4. List of Actions

TN goes through the list of actions. Concerning the on-going action 2016-07 – 9, he reports discussing with Hans-Rudolf Ott the procedure for nominating candidates as future ESFRI representatives. There is no need for an immediate action on this. SCNAT will initiate a nomination process after the Round Table meeting. TN reports on the strategic meeting held on 20 March at CERN with representatives of SERI, CERN and the US. SERI expressed again the wish to put the Long Baseline Neutrino Facility (LBNF) in the 2021–2024 message to parliament (“Botschaft 2019”). However, this shall be for the funding of infrastructures rather than specifically for the DUNE experiment. CHIPP shall see how this can be used most effectively and needs to formulate the Swiss inputs to SERI. There is the need to contact the neutrino PIs to write this up.

→ TN: to contact the neutrino PIs to formulate the Swiss inputs for LBNF to SERI

5. Next EB meetings

The EB agrees on the two following meeting dates:

- EB 2017-03 on Friday, 12 May 2017 at 10:15
- EB 2017-04 on Monday, 3 July 2017 at 13:15

B. Items for discussion

6. Next CHIPP administrator

TN reports to have received three applications with CV and motivation letter to succeed to MT as CHIPP administrator. TN and MT met the three candidates in the last few days. All are current or ex particle physicists. After briefly presenting the three candidates, he notes that Angela Benelli would have the most availability for a quick start in the coming months and is also likely to engage on a longer term than the two other candidates. MT agrees that she would be a good choice for the position. TN proposes to the EB to discuss a bit more with her in terms of availability and timescale before taking a decision. The EB agrees on this.

→ TN: to discuss with Angela Benelli her availability

7. SCNAT contract for administrator

TN started discussing with Christian Preiswerk (SCNAT) the possibility of having a contract for the future CHIPP administrator handled by SCNAT, rather than by the University of Zurich. He reports that this should

be possible in principle, but the issue is not yet fully settled.

→ TN: to further discuss the modalities of a contract

8. Workshops of 2018

TN mentions that the foreseen date of the first workshop – the week after Easter – is not optimal for families as it falls on holidays in several cantons, as pointed out by Anna Sfyrla. He however does not see many alternatives since one needs to hold it early enough in the semester, but after the Moriond and other spring conferences and not during teaching periods. This makes quite a lot of constraints and therefore the EB agrees to keep the foreseen date from Tuesday, April 3rd, 2018 after lunch until the 6th on mid-afternoon (around 4 PM). The second meeting should avoid the “Jeûne genevois” on Thursday, 6 September 2018. The following week would still be before the start of the semester. The retained dates are from Thursday, September 13th at lunch to Friday, 14th at ~16:30. This will be about 1.5 days and should be enough for a second wrap-up meeting. Concerning the location, it was felt better to not hold it attached to an institute, but in a more remote location. A few ideas from previous CHIPP Plenaries or other meetings are mentioned. As the workshops shall be open to the whole community, the estimated attendance is of about 100 people.

→ MT: to look at possible locations for the next EB

→ MT: to send out a save-the-date e-mail to CHIPP members

9. Roadmap update

As mentioned at the Board meeting, the executive summary of an updated CHIPP Roadmap shall be the Swiss input to the update of the European Strategy for Particle Physics (ESPP). TN reminds that the goal is to finish the update of the Swiss roadmap by the end of 2018 following the second workshop of 2018. MW notes that the CHIPP roadmap is also needed for the “Botschaft” message to the parliament of 2019 for the funding period 2021–2024. The schedule is to be clarified at the next Round Table International (RTI) meeting.

→ TN/MT: to inquire at RTI meeting about the schedule of the “Botschaft” 2019

10. FLARE issue on ATLAS computing

MW presents the reasons why there is the wish to reallocate some of the FLARE computing manpower from the CSCS in Lugano to Bern. Actually, ATLAS is changing their computing structure with the formation of so-called ‘nucleus’ and ‘satellite’ sites, with a corresponding re-definition of required CPU and disk resources and support service, compared to the original Tier-2 and Tier-3 structures. ATLAS-CH would like to go for a nucleus site. However, the staff at CSCS has not the needed competences to properly fulfil the tasks required for ATLAS. The idea is to outsource the concerned ATLAS tasks to have them done by Gianfranco Sciacca at the University of Bern. This corresponds to a 0.5 FTE position to be taken out of the 1.5 FTE at CSCS funded by FLARE. TN sees a few issues with this reallocation described in a draft MoU document to be signed by Christoph Grab for CHIPP. In his understanding, there is no practical change in terms of the computing requirement compared to the original LCG picture. Therefore, it is not obvious to motivate the modification. TN further notes that the FLARE computing request clearly states where the people work and even the names of who is in charge at CSCS. In his opinion, any change has to be agreed by SNSF. MW does not see so much of an issue, because although there are two persons identified in the FLARE request, the work is in practice much more distributed among a group of about 10 persons. TN also sees an issue that the common FLARE LHC computing request in both hardware and manpower is based on the LCG MoU with fair and common share among ATLAS, CMS, and LHCb. The proposed change would deviate a bit from this idea, which is the reason why the computing request is granted without scrutiny. MW argues, however, if CSCS cannot fulfil the requirement of the ATLAS computing one needs to find another solution elsewhere. TN agrees that a solution must be found but would find it much better to have CSCS decide to outsource part of its work to Bern. MW sees however a problem in the fact that Grab gets the FLARE funding that is then provided to CSCS, which is in a difficult position to then outsource part of it to Bern. TN thinks that if it was Grab to send part of the funding directly to Bern, this is to be agreed by SNSF. He also states that for the next round of FLARE the Board can discuss and adapt the request, but for this round, we need to make any change properly. It is agreed that Grab, TN and MW discuss further to find an appropriate solution.

11. ECT* membership case

TN reports that he informed Gilberto Colangelo about the discussion at the Board meeting and suggests inviting him at the next Board to present the case. AS agrees that this is to be presented then and the Board shall decide if we want to go into this or not.

→ TN: to ask Gilberto Colangelo to present the issue to the Board

12. School payment of SNSF grantees

AS raises the issue that SNSF does not pay anymore summer/winter/whatever schools for the PhD students that are hired through an SNSF grant. He talked about this to several colleagues who agree that this is a surprising decision that causes problems. He notes the explicit SNSF position stating that schools are for education, not for research, and thus that they are not directly related to the fulfillment of the granted project. TN can understand this point of view and notes that he discussed this with Olivier Schneider and that EPFL indeed pays schools of PhD students from operational money. GD wonders if this decision by SNSF was discussed at the strategic level of SNSF and therefore a contact person could be Felicitas Pauss. TN wonders if this decision is to indicate that the overheads received by the universities should be used for education. AS suggests GD to ask Pauss on the occasion about this issue and whether it has been already discussed at length.

→ GD: to inquire by Felicitas Pauss to get some feedback

C. Items for information

13. News from MAP meeting

TN reports from the MAP Platform meeting, which took place on 24 March 2017 in Bern. He reminds SCNAT being concerned by open data, open access publication, and public awareness. Herwig Schopper – former CERN DG – gave a talk about scientific metric. The science evaluation, especially in physics and astronomy, is indeed a major issue with the increasing demand of governments to evaluate fundamental science. GD notes that he is very sympathetic with Schopper's concerns, especially concerning the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) (cf. EB 2016-06 – 13). TN mentions that astronomers claim there is no public interest in basic research, but he sees that people at Open Days never ask why we are doing this. In his view, the general public is quite receptive to fundamental research, although politicians think otherwise.

14. Strategy Secretary position at CERN

TN reminds Olivier Schneider's message to the Board to get candidates for the CERN position of Strategy Secretary for the update of the European Strategy for Particle Physics (EPSS). The new strategy is to be endorsed in May 2020. There will be a special session in January 2020 and maybe the organisation of two workshops in 2019. He recalls that he was the secretary of the European Strategy Group (ESG) and proposed then to get rid of a secretary except during the time of the EPSS update. As this was approved, he got relieved from this function... GD wonders if there are already high-level names identified for the position. TN sees a problem with people being very strongly involved in ATLAS or CMS and gives a couple of names that have been mentioned. TN clarifies to MT that this is a community service to the community without remuneration. He adds that there is still some time to think about it and the possibility to propose somebody from outside Switzerland.

15. Other news

TN reminds the message sent out today by Teresa Montaruli and forwarded to the EB on the wish to submit to the IUPAP commission C4 on astroparticle physics a proposal to hold the International Cosmic Ray Conference (ICRC) in 2021 in Geneva. Montaruli would like CHIPP to support this candidacy. The EB quickly recalls the locations of the next ICHEP conferences to avoid a concurrent proposal CHIPP members could wish to submit for organising ICHEP or another conference (cf. Board 2016-02 – 12). It is found out that there are expressions of interest to host ICHEP 2020 by Edinburgh and Prague. This would mean that ICHEP 2021 will likely be outside Europe. The EB agrees that the Board should be contacted to see if there is any objection to support this candidacy.

→ TN: to inform the Board on the intent to apply for the organisation of ICRC 2021

16. Status of future meetings

- Joint SPS/CHIPP Annual Plenary 2017, 22–25 August 2017, Geneva: Registration and abstract submission is not yet out. The foreseen overall agenda is displayed on screen. It is agreed that the Board meeting should be on Monday the 21st of August from 13:00 to 16:00, followed by the Plenary meeting from 16:30 to 18:00.

→ MT: to announce the date of the Board and Plenary meetings

17. A.O.B.

GD wishes to discuss the point raised at the end of the Board meeting on the question of CERN fellows. Florencia Canelli, was apparently wondering why this came so late in the Board meeting and wishes to have clearer a process. TN reminds that the ranking of Swiss candidates for CERN fellows comes up twice a year and is done currently by SERI, but Xavier Reymond feels a bit uncomfortable doing so. The suggestion is that CHIPP somehow does the ranking and transmits this to SERI. Currently, there are three Swiss candidates to evaluate, all experimentalists. TN suggests the best way being that the EB does the evaluation. Ranking A is exceptional, B is excellent, while C and D leave basically no chances. In an e-mail sent after the meeting, GD got the information that the national rating is only looked at for the very first pre-selection, and basically only A or AB candidates are considered. Afterwards the committees don't look at that ranking any longer. Actually, TN already contacted GD and MW, both as experimentalists, and compiled their inputs. He sees a problem giving to all a ranking A as is apparently done by some countries. Indeed, doing this systematically does not help the evaluation and should thus be ignored by CERN, while giving an A to only one person of a country should increase the chances for him to get the fellowship. SERI apparently followed the suggested evaluation by the EB. Reymond would be in favour of continuing like that in the future. The EB agrees to handle this informally and to explain the whole process to the Board.

→ TN: to explain the CERN fellow ranking process to the Board

AS asks MT to please send a reminder for the CHIPP Prize about 2 weeks ahead of the deadline.

→ MT: to send out a reminder for the CHIPP Prize nomination deadline

MT mentions the call for nominations to the Charpak-Ritz Prize 2018 just received per e-mail from the SPS. It is agreed not to send it now to all CHIPP members – as many may have received it directly – but to send a reminder by mid-May.

→ MT: to send a reminder for nominations to the SPS Charpak-Ritz Prize 2018

The Chair closes the meeting at 15:40.

8 May 2017

written by: Marc Türlér

approved by: Tatsuya Nakada