

## **DNP Meeting 2005-06-06**

### **Agenda:**

1. Outgoing Chair's Report
2. DNP Thesis Prize
3. Election Results
4. Treasurer's Report
5. Report from TRIUMF Directorate
6. Report from GSC-19 Chair
7. NSERC 5-Year Planning Exercise for DNP
8. Preparation of Nuclear Physics Brief
9. AOB

### **1. Outgoing Chair's Report and Remarks – Mike Hasinoff (MH)**

DNP is healthy, evidenced by having not only 100-110 members, but two candidates for each of the open executive positions. In recognition of their respective services to DNP, MH presented gifts to outgoing secretary-treasurer Gordon Ball (GB) and to Willem Van Oers (WvO). Garth Huber (GaH) is the incoming chair.

### **2. DNP Thesis Prize – MH**

The procedures for applying for the new \$750 DNP Thesis Prize were outlined. The requirements are that the thesis must be completed in the past two years; both the student and his or her supervisor must be DNP and CAP members; and a letter from the chair, describing the student's contribution to the work, must accompany the thesis. The deadline for the first competition will be Sept. 30, 2005. The winner will be notified by the end of the year. Further details will be posted on the CAP website.

### **3. Election Results – GB**

45 e-mail ballots and two paper ballots were counted. The new chair-elect is Malcom Butler (MB) with 35 votes. The new secretary-treasurer is Greg Hackman with 31 votes.

### **4. Treasurer's Reports – GB**

The most recent membership list included 102 people, but people who renewed in May were not on this list. For FY2004, DNP collected \$936 in membership fees, and recorded expenses of \$516 for CAP functions, namely lunch and NSERC liaison meetings. As of Jan. 1 there was ~\$10,000 in the account.

### **5. Report from TRIUMF Directorate – Jean-Michel Poutissou (JMP)**

JMP reported on the implications of the \$222M allocation to TRIUMF in the federal budget. For ISAC, this will delay ISAC-II accelerator completion; limit and delay ISAC-II experimental hall beamline construction; require reorganization and reduction in force for operations; and suspend indefinitely a second ISAC production beamline. This is further complicated by the need for TRIUMF support for EMMA. Supplemental funding is being sought for the ATLAS Data Hub; this is progressing with the hiring of the first two of nine positions for the hub. Any funds for support of JPARC accelerator research would come too late to be of impact. Support for K2K and Kopio will be dephased, and there will be minimal upgrades to muon beamlines.

Subsequent discussion was vigorous and very useful. GaH reported a lengthy discussion of TRIUMF funding at CAP Council, and that a letter-writing campaign was imminent. Pekka Sinervo (PS) encourages such a campaign, with caution. In particular, the letter must be positive and should recognize the extent to which the Liberal government believes it is supporting research. The first letter from CAP did not do this and was not well received. Approximately 100 letters is a reasonable threshold for sending an effective message. There is a fair bit of discretion within the ministry so it is important to influence the discussion of the urgency of restoring the funding for TRIUMF to the anticipated level. JMP said that the strategy is to

lobby for funding for the ATLAS Computing Hub by promoting the way it transcends subatomic physics. The president of NRC is receptive to this idea of tactical funding requests. A similar strategy may be adopted to fund the second ISAC beamline as a development beamline, especially as it can provide a unique environment for testing technologies that need to be developed of the next decade for Eurisol and RIA.

## **6. Report from NSERC GSC-19 David Sinclair (DS) for Ed Brash**

This report will be posted by GaH on the in-progress DNP website. DS reviewed the membership and term of the GSC and noted the help of Kate Wilson (KW), Sandra Zohar, and Valerie Augier, from NSERC, and participation by PS as Group Chair for Physics. This year's site visits were at Toronto & York, Carleton & Laurentian, Queens, Montreal, and McGill. Review committees for large projects (ATLAS, EMMA, KOPIO), and progress review committees for TIGRESS and SNO were noted. DS then went through the process. All applications are assigned to 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> readers, and the 1<sup>st</sup> reader recommends external referees. All applications are sent out just before Christmas. At Large Project's Day, oral presentations are given by the TRIUMF Science Director, IPP Director, and PI's for requests of typically >\$400k per year. In the February sessions, applications are presented by the 1<sup>st</sup> reader with additional comments from the 2<sup>nd</sup> reader, discussed, and scored on excellence of science, excellence of applicants, training of highly qualified personnel, and need for funds. Tentative decisions to award and allocations are done in this first round. Two more iterations are undertaken to match funds awarded to funds available. For all cases the 2<sup>nd</sup> reader writes the notification of decision. At the start the envelope was \$22.0M with \$13.7M already committed and \$8.3M available for new grants. \$15M in new funds were requested, and the money available was barely enough to renew existing grants. Some funds have been saved by deferring part of the KOPIO MIG until the next fiscal year. At the end of this year there was a small carry forward to next year, with no new large capital commitments.

In subsequent discussion it was noted that there would be similar funds available next year. A low score on "need for funds" means that the committee judges that more resources were requested than actually needed. DS mentioned that one of the difficulties he had in evaluating grants was identifying the real commitment of people. A large number of people committed to a major grant but at a small level like 10% was not meaningful. The next site visits will be Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta. Art Olin (AO) asked if the criteria were really measuring what they were supposed to measure; KW reported that NSERC periodically evaluates all its programs, including discovery grants and the criteria used to evaluate them, to ensure that the programs continue to meet their objectives.

## **7. Report on NSERC 5-Year Plan – Kate Wilson (KW)**

The tentative Terms of Reference (ToR) of the next 5-year plan (5yp) are that it should cover 2006 through 2016 and should consider three funding scenarios: status quo, significant increase, and significant decrease. It should emphasize science goals, in particular how to best support the present program and incorporate new initiatives. The draft, tentative timeline is that in June 2005 the committee should be established and ToR finalized. In mid-July the committee should first meet. It is expected that an announcement will be made to the community in late July. Fall 2005 (as late as November) will be the likely deadline for submissions. The committee should meet to begin on the draft report in December 2005. The draft report should be completed Feb. 2006 and the final report, May 2006. Town-hall meetings will be part of the process established by the committee. Currently the committee is being formed. KW is seeking advice from DNP, IPP and other interested parties on membership. The ToR are being refined.

Much of the subsequent discussion focused on two main items. First, many people raised concerns about the 5yp being extended to 10 years. Many people pointed out that a specific 5-year plan was reasonable, but that beyond that it would be difficult to commit to a rigid plan. The 10-year plan was feasible only if it was viewed as a 5-year plan with a 10-year view-of-the-horizon; after the first 5 years the outlook would have to be reviewed and amended as appropriate to form a new 2011-2016 5yp. KW agreed, and MH insisted that this should be stated explicitly in the ToR. KW reported that one person from outside Canada

has been invited to join the committee. JMP pointed out that TRIUMF would be beginning its next 5yp process in 18 months and that TRIUMF would need to understand that plan as well. PS noted that the GSC is expected only to look at this document for guidance in long-term decisions. KW stated that the draft report should be available for the February GSC meeting. The reduced funding scenario will be a 20% decrease bad-case scenario, while the increased funding scenario would represent a doubling of funding, which is consistent with the NSERC president's lobbying efforts. The second major item was reallocation. KW stated that a final report on the reallocation process went to council, and expressed her personal opinion that reallocations as they exist now will cease. As such the 5-year-plan document is the best opportunity to make the case to the broader scientific community for additional funding. There was a statement that some sort of reallocation process was not only reasonable but necessary to reflect discipline dynamics. PS pointed out that the supplementary funding for new investigators was an effective response to discipline dynamics.

## **8. Preparation of Nuclear Physics Brief discussion -- Garth Huber.**

In a meeting between TRIUMF, TUEC and DNP representatives, it was decided that the committee to write the Nuclear Physics brief would comprise six members total. TRIUMF will be represented by JMP. There will be two representatives each from TUG and DNP, and a designated theory representative. Jens Dilling (JD) reported that TUEC had called on TUG for nominations, and that the two selected were JD and Paul Garrett. For the Theory Representative, GB nominated Malcom Butler, seconded by Kumar Sharma. For the first DNP member, Garth Huber was nominated by JD, seconded by MH. For the second DNP member, Willem van Oers was nominated by Shelley Page, seconded by Richard Lee.

Byron Jennings noted that he was on both the nuclear subcommittee and the full subatomic committee, as were people from IPP. He said this worked well with no conflict of interest. Mikota Fujiwara asked what happens if your interests lie partway between nuclear and particle physics; he was encouraged to present his brief to either committee, at any Town-Hall meeting, or directly to the subatomic committee, whatever he felt fit to do. The Town Hall meeting will likely be late August or early September, after the mandate is established. The two-step process was defended as providing better advocacy. BJ noted that the subcommittees did much of the hard work about what would and would not fit into the budget. There are in fact several subcommittees in addition to Nuclear, namely particle astrophysics, neutrino physics, theory, and particle physics.

## **9. Other Business**

By a show of hands, the most favoured town-hall meeting location was Vancouver (over Winnipeg and Guelph). GaH is working on a new DNP website and proposed a DNP logo. GaH also reported that he was asked to raise the issue of some sort of joint New Zealand, UK, Canada (preferably Montreal) effort to honour the upcoming centenary of Rutherford's Nobel Prize. No one volunteered.

## **Motion to adjourn at 14:07.**

Recorder: Greg Hackman