Facility Coordination Group

M I N U T E S

DATE :	27/09/11	OBJECT :	1st FCG Meeting – 2011/09/27
N/REF :	ENSAR-FCG/2011.01	PLACE :	Belgodère, France

INSTITUTION	GANIL	RUG	GSI	INFN	JYU	CERN	CNRS
PRESENT	S. Galès M. Freer M. Lewitowicz K. Turzó	M.N. Harakeh K. Jungmann R. Calabrese	D. Ackermann W. Catford	R. Alba G. De Angelis R. Bougault	R. Julin	Y. Blumenfeld	F. Azaiez R. Casten
EXCUSED			H. Stöcker P. Giubellino	A. Vitturi G. Fiorentini G. Cuttone	L. Corradi	P. Butler	
DISTRIBUTION:	To all the participants and members of the FCG						

N°	TOPIC	SPEAKER
1	<u>Welcome</u> See corresponding presentation. Some goals of the FCG collaborative work: • Harmonization of the access procedures to the 7 ENSAR infrastructures • Harmonization of the support offered to users by the infrastructures • Recommendations on common policies Technical collaborations are also emphasized in other ENSAR WP's, as ECOS and EGAN. No deliverable for the FCG aside from the minutes of the meetings.	M.N. Harakeh
2	<u>GANIL</u> See corresponding presentation. After submission of proposals, a technical advisory committee looks into the feasibility of each experiment. Two referees are assigned per proposal who can communicate with the spokesperson before the oral presentation during the PAC meeting. Secret voting using an electronic system to rank the experimental proposals on scientific excellence. 1 UT = 8 hours GANIL hosts also atomic physics experiments and others. After the shutdown of GANIL from August 2012 to March 2013, there is a critical period when the SPIRAL2 LINAG will begin operation. Most probably, a mix of GANIL/SPIRAL/SPIRAL2 beams will be scheduled. Therefore, the GANIL PAC will take over the evaluation of the proposals for SPIRAL2 from the SPIRAL2 SAC during this period, and there will be fusion between the Scientific Council and the SPIRAL2 SAC. Probably, the PAC will meet first half of 2013 about one year before the first experiments at NFS and S3.	M. Freer
3	<u>GSI</u> See corresponding presentation. The beam time is allocated to each scientific field before the	W. Catford

	meetings of the corresponding PACs in yearly All-PAC meetings. Backlog management: projects submitted 3 years ago and not having taken their beam time should resubmit their proposal. An update report is requested after 2 years. Most proposals come from big collaborations, they are based on their priorities. For ENSAR, the G-PAC of GSI is relevant. The submission procedure at GSI is similar to the GANIL procedure. 2 referees are assigned to one proposal and encouraged to contact the spokesperson. There is a presentation. Ranking is made by consensus without voting. The team having an approved proposal shall apply for beam scheduling. The beam coordinator has to schedule the experiment, considering the complexity of the infrastructure. Paolo Giubellino (spokesperson of the ALICE Management Board) is the GSI PAC chairman.	
4	<u>INFN</u> See corresponding presentation. LNL: 1 PAC for applied physics and 1 PAC for fundamental research LNS: 1 PAC LNL: 2 referees are assigned to each proposal and encouraged to contact the spokesperson. Proposals are presented. Ranking is based on voting procedure (similar to GANIL) LNS: 1 referee assigned per proposal. The proposals are presented. The selection is based on consensus (like at GSI) In LNL and LNS, the PAC is also the Scientific Council. LNL: the amount of beam time allocated to PAC, backlog and applied physics is decided by the director before the PAC meeting. LNS: when there is beam time for medical treatment during the day, it is possible to use the beam time for experiment during the night. 1 BTU = 8 hours	R. Bougault
5	<u>JYFL</u> See corresponding presentation. No presentations at the PAC meeting. Therefore, the proposal should be well written. The spokesperson can be contacted by	R. Julin

	mail or the local contact person, directly. Beam time unit = 1 day Backlog management: after 2 years, the team should resubmit the proposal. 1 referee per proposal. The vote is not secret. Marks are given by PAC members and an average is made to set ranking.	
6	<u>KVI</u> See corresponding presentation. 2 referees per proposal All the proposed experiments must be presented at the PAC meeting 1 UT = 8 hours Most experiments have a high number of UT's. 3 categories: • accepted • accepted for test experiments (reduced beam time) • rejected	R. Calabrese
7	<u>ISOLDE</u> See corresponding presentation. In case of development of new beam or instrument: LoI needed Proposal submitted to 1. TAC 2. INTC (=PAC) 3. Research Board (in most cases does not modify the INTC advice) Only scientific excellence and feasibility taken into account; no "a priori" limit on number of shifts awarded. 1 UT = 8 hours about 2 years of backlog waiting time to be scheduled: 1 year on average shutdown of ISOLDE: November 2012 – March 2014 (final decision in January 2012)	Y. Blumenfeld

	Another shutdown is expected in 2017.	
8	ALTO See corresponding presentation. 2 referees per proposal unanimous consensus -> ranking 2009-2010: about 4000 h/y of beam delivered to users Recently the ALTO Laser ion source has been successfully working. The operation in an online mode is being tested. Running full intensity (10 μA) electron beam for ALTO is still waiting for green light from the safety authorities.	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 UT = 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	Secret vote	Consensus	No secret vote	Consensus	Consensus	Consensus
Ranking	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes
Backlog	About 250 UT (6 months)	2613 shifts in 2010 (UNILAC + SIS + ESR + PHELIX)	141 BTU in 2011-2012	51 BTU in 2011-2012	300 days in 2011	Program for 1.5 years	935 UT in 2011	296 UBT

10	<u>European theory Initiative</u> See corresponding presentation. • The MoU has first to be discussed by the management of the 3 labs that will sign: GANIL, JYFL, INFN. There will be further contacts with colleagues from other labs in Europe. Question of how to manifest the interest (e-mail to M. Płoszajczak)? Question of the Governing Board: o 3 signing labs o rest of the community (N.B. It was remarked that the process should be bottom-up and consequently the theory community should endorse the initiative and convey their interest to the lab directors) Two-side situation: o The dynamics comes from the theory groups o The budget comes from the directorates of the labs The theoreticians have to convince their directors. • USA theoreticians are very enthusiastic about the TALENT initiative. • FUSTIPEN is approved for funding in 2012 by the DOE. There is also a Japan-US initiative (JUSTIPEN).	M. Płoszajczak
11	<u>Discussion: 2012-2013:</u> <u>Shutdown of major European labs</u> 1. GANIL First shutdown: August 2012 - March 2013 2013-2014: 6 months of beam time per year Exact dates are still not decided. 2. GSI 6 months of beam time in 2013-2014 Afterwards, 3 months of beam time every year until 2017 3. ISOLDE Shutdown of ISOLDE: Nov 2012 - March 2014 The plan is to finish the TNA T&S budget by the end of 2012. The number of beam hours for ENSAR should be fully used. The ENSAR management needs early signal if any difficulty arises about TNA's. During 2012-2014, 3 main facilities will have a decrease of 50% of beam time delivery. Physicists may go abroad (Japan, US, …). Question of the move of detectors to other facilities. Possibility for users to move to other European Labs during the shutdown periods of	All

	GANIL, GSI and ISOLDE if there is available beam time. <u>User selection panels for TNA's in ENSAR</u> ALTO: PAC + TNA coordinator + Director JYFL: PAC CERN: 3 CERN physicists + 3 "outside" physicists. The meeting is done by phone and/or e-mail. The panel decides how many days to reimburse to: • senior scientists (with permanent positions) • junior scientists The spokesperson sends the names of the supported persons. CERN reimburses only subsistence but no travel expenses. INFN: The president of INFN appointed the user selection panel: • 2 LNL PAC members • 2 LNS PAC members • 1 coordinator KVI: PAC GSI: subset of the PAC GSI supports subgroups of experimental teams in order to avoid the spokesperson issue. The subgroup should have a specific activity in the larger experiment. GANIL: PAC <u>How to harmonize the procedures in Europe?</u> Main difference between the RI's: voting procedures (traditions, chairperson) Common basis: scientific excellence. More criteria exist, as the ability to perform the experiment. ALTO proposes a template for a good proposal: good practice to be shared? The personal presentation could also be performed via video or by the local contact person.	
12	<u>AOB</u> Question of the coordination of the 8 PAC's.	All