DRAFT -- DNP Annual Business Meeting

2006 CAP Congress, Brock University

June 12, 2006

Recorded by Greg Hackman (GSH), DNP Secretary

ATTENDANCE: 36 people

Call to Order

Meeting was called to order by DNP Chair Garth Huber (GMH) at 12:37.

Chair's report and remarks

GMH strongly encouraged all to attend the Long Range Planning Committee presentation at 17:15 that afternoon. As a written report has not yet been circulated, this is the first public presentation of the draft report, and feedback is important.

GMH reported that DNP was unable to award the Ph.D. prize this year. The purpose of the award is to recognize the best Ph.D. thesis in nuclear physics in the last year. However, by policy, if fewer than three theses are entered in the competition, no award will be made; however, theses submitted for consideration will be carried forward to the next competition. GMH asked all in attendance if they knew of any recently awarded theses that could be submitted for consideration. Details of the award will be circulated to the membership. In discussion, Kumar Shamra (KS) asked about the membership requirements: GMH replied that both the advisor and student must be members of DNP when the thesis is submitted.

GMH closed by reminding people that next year's CAP Congress will be in Saskatoon and that he is looking for people willing to organize sessions.

Treasurer's report on finances and membership

GSH reported that there were 117 members as of end of 2005. There is a surplus this year since no thesis prize was awarded. A small operating deficit is anticipated due to covering a plenary session speakers' expenses and in anticipation of awarding a thesis prize.

GSH asked the membership to bring to his attention any employment opportunities, so that they could be distributed to DNP membership by e-mail. It is hoped that this will help encourage young scientists to join and remain members of DNP. Roby Austin (RAEA) asked if DNP would charge for this service; GSH replied no, and that he would personally deal with distributing these

TRIUMF Report

The TRIUMF report by Jean-Michel Poutissou (JMP) is given as a separate PowerPoint presentation.

In discussion: Pat Walden (PW) asked about the status of a second proton transfer beamline to ISAC. JMP described it, explained why it was cut, and discussed alternative funding sources. CFI is a complicated avenue to purse as TRIUMF staff are ineligible and building funding must come from the province of BC. There have been some preliminary discussions with U.S. Department of Energy officials but it is a remote possibility – their interest is in using it to develop an American super-facility. Alan Shotter (AS) reiterated that a successful CFI application would succeed if it was a consortium of universities led by a BC university, with technical support from TRIUMF. AS also mentioned that in any arrangement with the U.S., one would have to be careful to make sure that Canada remains master of the program.

GSC-19 chair Report

David Sinclair (DS) delivered a report on NSERC GSC-19. The PowerPoint presentation is attached separately. The PowerPoint covers all the points in the presentation in suitable detail; however, DS made a special point of the need for proposals to have consistent and meaningful time commitment estimates.

In ensuing discussion: Shelley Page (SP) asked how much money was available for new capital projects in the future. DS reported \$200,000 in 2007, \$800,000 in 2008. AS pointed out that the constant funding scenario shown was in fact a decrease, and asked NSERC staff in attendance if they expected the funding to go up. Samir Boughaba (SB) stated this was a hope more than an expectation and that all communities are being hit by the same problems. SB stated that it we will all have to work harder to get more money for research as the government will be asking for a value of their investment. Art McDonald (AMcD) asked if NSERC will be seeking community input; SB responded that once they knew what the definition of "value" was, yes.

Institute of Nuclear Physics discussion

Malcolm Butler (MB) led discussion of an Institute of Nuclear Physics (INP). A draft Mission Statement, Scope and Implementation Process were circulated prior to the business meeting. A presentation by MB, referenced as a separate PowerPoint highlighted these points, and also some of the limited feedback so far. The goal of today's meeting was twofold; discuss and approve mission, scope and process, and determine founding members for the purpose of formulating by-laws. MB also pointed out some items that were explicitly missing from the INP mission and scope: It would NOT provide project support or research scientists. It may request funding from external sources like NSERC but those funds would be modest.

Ensuing discussion:

- Willem van Oers (WvO) thanked the committee for pulling this together and providing background, and suggested that all institutions with a large nuclear physics component must come forward to become founding members.
- GSH suggested adding "the public" to the mission statement; MB concurred.
- SP pointed out that IPP's success comes from setting priorities, and that we should expect that if INP is going to have any impact or credibility, it will eventually have to set priorities. MB said that INP would be able to provide a "big picture" of priorities in terms of general physics goals within nuclear

physics, and would give the funding agencies insight into how distinct nuclear physics experiments, programs and grants contribute to those science goals and complement one another. However the INP would not prioritize individual experiments or grants.

- MOTION TO ACCEPT MISSION, SCOPE AND PROCESS: Juris Svenne (JS) moved to accept, IN PRINCIPLE, the proposed mission, scope, and process; seconded by KS. Motion Carried by show of hands.
- MB asked that one person from each interested founding institution should commit to going through the discovery phase (costs, access to legal advice, etc.), and that that institutional representative should identify themselves to MB by e-mail by June 16. SP pointed out that each institution really has to go back to its Dean and President to get a real commitment.
- Founding Members: Attendees from each of the following institutions, expressed interest in being a founding member: McGill, Manitoba, Guelph, Regina, St. Mary's, McMaster, Northern British Columbia, Mount Allison, Saskatchewan. All are to be confirmed by e-mail. PW asked if TRIUMF could count as a member; MB said yes. SEE APPENDIX FOR CONTACT INFORMATION
- KS asked how the community could find out how things were going. MB and GMH will use the mailing list.
- There was much discussion of fees. Nicholas de Takascsy (NT) asked what the financial commitment would be. Several people discussed that the fee for incorporation of a institute would be small but that the legal costs of each academic institution becoming a member was unknown. Discovering these costs will be part of the job of the institutional representatives. Elie Korkmaz (EK) requested that the institutional financial commitment be proportional to the size of the group; GMH & MB concurred.
- MB also pointed out that the astronomers have employed a professional lobbyist through their equivalent institution, ACURA.

AOB

WvO asked that the IUPAP Young Scientists Award be brought to the attention of the membership. This award is available to a young scientist within 6 years of her or his Ph.D. The prize is a citation; an invitation to the triennial International Conference on Nuclear Physics; and \$1000. Further information can be found at the IUPAP web site, section C12:

http://www.triumf.info/hosted/iupap/C12/IUPAP prize.html

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at approximately 13:49.

Appendix

Institutions and Representatives Expressing Interest in Founding INP:

Guelph	Paul Garrett	
Manitoba	Sumar Sharma	
McGill	Charles Gale	
McMaster	Alan Chen	
Mount Allison	Dave Hornidge	
Northern BC	Elie Korkmaz	
Regina		
Saskatchewan		
St. Mary's	Malcolm Butler	(to be confirmed)
TRIUMF	Pat Walden	