



Facility Coordination Group

MINUTES

DATE :	12/10/12	OBJECT :	2 nd FCG Meeting – 2012/10/12
N/REF :	ENSAR-FCG/2012.01	PLACE :	Amsterdam Schiphol, The Netherlands

INSTITUTION	GANIL	RUG	GSI	INFN	JYU	CERN	CNRS
PRESENT	M. Lewitowicz M. Freer K. Turzó	M.N. Harakeh R. Calabrese K. Jungmann	K. Peters	S. Lunardi R. Alba L. Corradi	R. Julin S. Freeman	M. Borge P. Butler	R. Casten F. Azaiez
EXCUSED			H. Stöcker P. Giubellino	R. Bougault G. Fiorentini G. Cuttone			
DISTRIBUTION:	To all the participants and members of the FCG						

N°	TOPIC	SPEAKER
1	<u>Welcome</u>	M.N. Harakeh
2	<p><u>GANIL</u></p> <p>See corresponding presentation.</p> <p>Question of communication and posting of proposals on internet once the experiment is approved. ISOLDE does so, due to CERN policy. GANIL expressed some objections to post the PAC results on the Web due to the growing competition in the field.</p> <p>In GANIL the whole process from the call for proposals up to the realisation of experiments is following the procedure fulfilling requirements of the ISO9001 quality insurance standard.</p>	M. Freer
3	<p><u>GSI</u></p> <p>See corresponding presentation.</p> <p>The PACs have suspended their activities due to GSI beam constraints. GSI PAC is still active for detector tests.</p> <p>Massive rearrangement of personnel and divisions until the end of 2012. Afterwards, GSI will be able to deal with the backlog.</p> <p>GSI backlog is decreasing since 2010. Mostly, the A-ranked experiments get their beam time.</p> <p>Question: what is a healthy backlog? It should not be longer than 6-7 months.</p> <p>What will happen after 2014? Open question of UNILAC that is an injector for the other machines.</p> <p>Question of GSI use of ENSAR TNA budget? M. Harakeh will speak with Y. Leifels.</p>	K. Peters
4	<p><u>INFN</u></p> <p>See corresponding presentation.</p> <p>LNS: agreement with a hospital for cancer studies. The hospital does not pay the beam time (some weeks per year) but it participated in the equipment purchase.</p> <p>The forms to apply for experiments at LNL and LNS are not exactly the same. The application for ENSAR support is the same. The homogenisation of the application forms between Italian labs could be a starting point for other European labs.</p> <p>Backlog at LNL in October 2012: 2 days.</p>	S. Lunardi

	<p>The philosophy at LNL is that the team is ready to perform the experiment within 6 months after the approval by the PAC.</p> <p>At LNL, many experiments are now dedicated to reaction mechanisms \Rightarrow lower number of experiments but with beam time requests still substantially higher than the available time.</p> <p>Concerning the cancer treatments at LNS, INFN receives a fee of 2 K€ for each patient treated.'</p>	
5	<p><u>JYFL</u></p> <p>See corresponding presentation.</p> <p>One PAC member is allocated to each proposal. Everybody is expected to have read through all the proposals in order to discuss them.</p> <p>Asking questions by e-mail allows getting thoughtful and detailed answers. Presentations are not absolutely necessary. To travel to PAC meeting is very costly and time consuming (carbon footprint is also very high). Other possibility: video presentations.</p> <p>In GANIL, the users are prepared to the questions asked by the PAC.</p>	S. Freeman
6	<p><u>KVI</u></p> <p>See corresponding presentation.</p> <p>This year, KVI did not organise any PAC meeting due to the backlog. Uncertainties on resources beyond 2013.</p>	R. Calabrese
7	<p><u>ISOLDE</u></p> <p>See corresponding presentation.</p> <p>Only 2 PAC meetings in 2012 due to shutdown. Shutdown of ISOLDE 2013 – June 2014</p> <p>HIE-ISOLDE (Spring-2015). First call for physics proposals (not instrumentation) done (deadline October 3, 2012). 0 day 1 experiment submitted. Further experimental proposals for HIE-ISOLDE should be mostly accepted. They cannot be performed somewhere else.</p> <p>A large magnetic spectrometer is not currently pursued foreseen for HIE-ISOLDE. The TSR - new storage ring - and instruments as ACTAR are preferred.</p>	P. Butler

8	<p><u>ALTO</u></p> <p>See corresponding presentation.</p> <p>The committed number of hours to the ENSAR project is already exceeded. ALTO will be able to provide more beam time for ENSAR2.</p> <p>A legal authorisation from the safety authorities for use of 10 μA electron beam on target was obtained in July 2012.</p> <p>ALTO: first photofission facility in operation.</p> <p>At ALTO, in addition to other usual criteria the PAC evaluates the uniqueness of the ALTO facility for the proposed experiments. The concern being the coherence of the TNA's scheme within ENSAR.</p>	R. Casten
---	---	-----------

Summary table

	GANIL	GSI	LNL	LNS	JYFL	KVI	ISOLDE	ALTO
Beam unit	1 UT = 8 hours	1 shift = 8 hours	1 BTU = 8 hours	1 BTU = 8 hours	1 day	1 shift = 8 hours	1 shift = 8 hours	1 UBT = 8 hours
Proposal presentation	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	Yes	yes	yes
Referees	2 / proposal	2 / proposal	2 / proposal	1 / proposal	1 / proposal	2 / proposal	2 / proposal	2 / proposal
Voting procedure	Secret vote	Consensus	Open vote	Consensus	No secret vote	Consensus	Consensus	Consensus
Ranking	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes
Backlog	266 UT (10 experiments) in the end of 2012	1480 shifts	6 BTU	Superconducting Cyclotron: 0 BTU Tandem: 253 BTU	220 days	292,5 shifts		212 UT

10	<p><u>Discussion – 2013-2014:</u></p> <p><u>Shutdown of major European labs</u></p> <p><i>GANIL</i> See timeline file. Short shutdowns each year. Current shutdown: July 2012 – March 2013. 2015: it is not clear yet if GANIL will be able to run in parallel current GANIL facilities and SPIRAL2.</p> <p><i>ISOLDE</i> Long shutdown (December 2012 – June 2014). Already 90% beam time delivered for ENSAR. School programme during the shutdown to keep the community coming to ISOLDE. Data acquisition activities.</p> <p><i>GS/</i> The absence of PAC during several years may be a problem for ENSAR2.</p>	All
11	<p><u>Discussion – EC consultation</u></p> <p>See corresponding presentation by M.N. Harakeh.</p> <p>It is better not to prolong ENSAR, due to the possible early date of the 1st project call in Horizon 2020 (rumours: call in July 2013). It is also necessary to get prepared well in advance.</p> <p>ENSAR2: bottom-up approach in order to get the best ideas with a project committee to select these ideas. This committee will probably comprise experts nominated by funding agencies.</p> <p>Request for an EC funding until 50% of the real beam costs. In other domains (astrophysics, nuclear wastes, ...) the beam funding is higher by factor 5 to 50 to current ENSAR access cost.</p> <p>Addition of iThemba, RCNP Osaka and ANL to the list of international collaborations.</p> <p>ISOL@MYRRHA will not be available during Horizon 2020.</p> <p>Question of other Integrating Activities where ENSAR2 Research Infrastructures could be involved.</p> <p>Activities to add:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JRA on data analysis • Network on ion traps • Network on fundamental interactions <p>Next steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • October 22: Submission of the ENSAR2 pre-proposal as answer to the EC consultation • End of October: e-mail to the community (through NuPECC) 	All

	and to the ENSAR WP Leaders to ask for ideas.	
12	<u>AOB</u> The director of ECT* will change soon.	All