

## **DPF Executive Committee Meeting**

**February 13 , 2010**

### **At April APS meeting**

**DPF EC:** Chip Brock, Pierre Ramond, Patricia McBride, Boris Kayser, Alice Bean, Marge Corcoran (via phone), Joanne Hewett, Ritchie Patterson, Kevin Pitts, David Saltzberg, Kara Hoffman, Kate Scholberg

**Guests:** Kate Kirby (APS), Mike Lubell, Jim Reidy (NSF), Dennis Kovar (DOE), Harvey Newman(US LUO), Jack Sandweiss, Robert Garisto (APS), Gene Sprouse (APS)

### **Regrets:**

### **Agenda and minutes**

#### Open Meeting

#### 1. Dinner

The new executive director of APS, Kate Kirby, discussed APS activities. She started her position in August, 2009. The 2010 April APS meeting is joint with AAPT and also includes the Laserfest celebration for 50 years of Lasers. There were 1200 preregistered participants at the meeting from three APS divisions including DPF, DNP, and astrophysics. Many APS activities are funded by the excess publishing revenue so that should be considered in the open access discussions. The APS membership is up to around 48,000 with many student members. There are new sections including the Prairie section and new topical groups including the energy research and applications group.

#### 2. DOE Briefing (Dennis Kovar)

The administration for FY11 is still committed to try and double funding for physical sciences. High Energy Physics isn't among the priorities. For instance, the Office of Science saw a 6% increase while HEP only saw a 2.3% increase. HEP needs to make its case for funding. The Office of HEP is following the strategic plan based on the 2008 P5 report. In the FY11 budget, there is a request to support: Tevatron, LHC, ongoing neutrino experiments, important steps towards next generation for Microboone, mu2e, long baseline neutrino mission need. The Cosmic frontier includes: Fermi, Auger, Veritas, dark matter experiments including DES, and dark energy R&D. Some issues include the LHC where the changing plans cause uncertainties in the budget. For instance, the 2010 budget was reduced by \$9M for upgrades to LHC and Congress is concerned about the LHC investment. It is important that the LHC program succeeds. DOE is in partnership with the NSF for the Intensity frontier and the coordination takes more work. For the Cosmic frontier, HEPAP's 2009 PASAG report is going to be useful. They are now awaiting the Astronomy Decadal Survey report which is due in September, 2010 for more direction. The FY2011 Facilities and FNAL funding is flat while the Research programs have a 2%/year increase. It is an exciting time and we are poised in the next generation to discover something. There were 14 Early Career awards funded. This year, HEPAP will be charged to put a committee of visitors (COV) together to evaluate the DOE OHEP. The Office has positions to be filled. Last year's accelerator workshop was successful and they are using the output from that to develop a strategic plan to reorganize office for accelerator R&D.

Details are also given in his presentation at the DPF town hall meeting on Feb 15.

Discussion included:

- The Early Career Award funding for laboratory personnel as compared to university personnel. Kovar: This funding was specified above the OHEP and the program will be evaluated later to see how it is working.
- The DOE is now reviewing labs and has split out programs into “proton”, “electron”, etc. How is that going? Kovar: The review of the lab groups is working well. We are unsure how this is working for universities, but will look into it. Funding from the proton program will have to go towards growing the programs in the intensity frontier.
- What is happening for the negotiations of the CERN agreement with the US which is set to expire soon? Kovar: CERN is reexamining the model to be associate members. The CERN director general is meeting with each interested country and there will be a discussion with the U.S. which will include Brinkman in March.
- In the budget for CERN, how do you handle currency fluctuations? Kovar: Right now, the funding is put into U.S. actual dollars.
- What is the ILC/CLIC strategy? Kovar: This is an exciting time with great uncertainties. Over the next year, there will be a reexamination of the strategy for accelerator science. At the moment, the view is consistent with P5. The U.S. is putting \$35M/year into ILC research which provides a leading role. CERN is the lead on the CLIC project. The community is supposed to make a 5 and 10 year plan for a muon collider which will describe the technical issues and what resources are needed.
- Is there a programmatic approach for University people? Kovar: There always has to be money for very good people and very good ideas. We need to set up mechanisms for planning if we don't think we are getting the needed input. Ramond objected to this programmatic approach to science funding.

NSF Briefing (Jim Reidy)

HEP funding comes from the Experimental Particle Physics (EPP), Particle and Nuclear Astrophysics (PNA) and Theory groups of the Physics Division of the NSF. He discussed the budget numbers he was cleared for, but couldn't discuss the FY10 budget as it must be cleared by Congress after it is split. The Physics Division got a 10% increase from 09 to 10. FY11 request is \$298M. NSF is on a doubling track, but that 8% per year increase is not filtering down to HEP. The Physics division has a 2.8% increase from FY10 to FY11 which also may not filter down. HEP has done pretty well, but it is hoped that something will be forthcoming from the LHC soon. A big program in NSF is DUSEL. The DUSEL program will have to fit into the Physics division with zero sum gain so there will be some pressure. Over half of the funds for Universities are devoted to LHC. LHC is considered to be a premier program in EPP. This last year, the NSF spent the ARRA funds in a lump sum to make 3 year awards. This will cause pressure in FY2012 when those grants are up for renewal. In addition, there was the MRI competition for ARRA funds and HEP did OK in this competition as there were good projects. There will be a new NSF director as of June 1.

Discussion included:

- Isn't DUSEL going to be funded by an MRE? Reidy: Yes, probably, but the operating budget will be covered by the Physics division. This is still in the planning stage.

### 3. The situation in Washington (Mike Lubell)

He echoed the comments by Kovar and Reidy which suggest that HEP needs to continue promotion of the benefits of this research. The 2011/12 budget focus was on reducing spending in key areas and the Administration has made science a special case, especially for Energy, Climate Science, and Innovation. HEP needs to focus the educational effort on innovation as well as our training for the future work force. The overall picture for budgets is good, but we don't know whether this will hold up. Politics dictate that there will be some pressure. He mentioned that several U.S. congress people who have been friends of science will be leaving after this term. There is a strong condemnation of: business as usual and anything that smacks of elitism. Public is not happy with Universities. Landscape has changed dramatically in the course of the year. Science has to align itself with something the average person can understand. The Washington office began a blog aimed at APS members and is looking for guest bloggers on science policy.

Discussion included:

- Who will take over from retiring members? Lubell: Science is supposedly nonpartisan, but noone wants to get together on anything. However, the reauthorization of America Competes Act will come up this year so need to emphasize innovation return on the investment in visits.

### 4. APS journals (Robert Garisto with Jack Sandweiss)

Garisto discussed the status and changes for the journals supported by APS. In July 2009, PRL reinvigorated their standards, which has resulted in 10% fewer receipts and 17% fewer acceptances. PRL now has several ways to highlight papers. "Suggestions" highlight a particular paper (about 5% of PRLs). "Synopses" have an editor written summary which highlights an important result (2% of PRLs). "Viewpoints" are written by outside experts on papers which are judged to have the potential to be influential (1.8% of PRLs). Statistics indicate that these highlighted PRLs are downloaded by readers, covered in the press, and cited at a higher rate than the mean value for PRL.

### 5. Briefing on SCOAP3 and open publishing & LHC groups (Gene Sprouse)

SCOAP3 (Sponsoring Consortium for Open Access Publishing in Particle Physics)

<http://scoap3.org/>

For the APS journals, a letter was presented to the CERN Director General which waives fees for experimental papers for the LHC in 2010. The APS would appreciate any help in steering important publications to APS journals. The goal with SCOAP3 is to convert 5 HEP journals to be author-pays Open Access funded by a consortium which is led by CERN. The problem for APS is what will happen if someone in the consortium can't make their contribution. Currently, SCOAP3 is gathering members who will contribute at the expected 2007 budget. APS would support the measure if the business model was sound. It is unclear what happens next with APS concerned about the sustainability of the funding and CERN who won't guarantee funding. Japan has already said that they

won't contribute. There are three kinds of open access: Green – arXiv, delayed open access, or Gold (somebody pays the publisher who makes it free). Many institutions are supporting open access and there may be legislation submitted requiring open access.

Discussion included:

- What is the government's issue? Research findings need to be public. So should the government maintain arXiv? This might be dangerous as the press isn't independent.
- What are the plans for 2011 for LHC papers? Thoughts are that it should be open access.

#### 6. US LUO and structured support (Harvey Newman)

For the US LHC Users Organization, there is no national lab that can host it so it has no visible means of support. The first activity that the US LUO wants to support is the annual visit to Congress. Last year, the DPF supported travel for young physicists to make this trip. How can USLUO keep doing this? One way is to become a tax free organization. However, the proposal is to have APS or DPF provide the framework and administrative support as opposed to making a new organization.

Discussion included:

- Can you become an APS forum? This would require 200 members.
  - Are there any other constituencies that also need this support and what are the potential complications?
  - What would USLUO do with dues besides sending young people to Washington?
- Newman: There could be a newsletter. He is looking at the scale of the total money needed of around \$40K/year and he thinks USLUO could easily raise half that amount.

#### Executive Session

Patricia McBride was thanked for her extensive effort in the April APS meeting organization.

1. What will be the DPF EC in person meeting frequency this year? (Chip Brock)  
It was decided to do 3 meetings and the times will be determined via a doodle poll
2. DPF finances (Alice Bean)  
There is a total of \$161K in the account at the end of December 2009. The 2009 income was \$32,628 while the expenditures were \$33,693.
3. Discussion of the US LUO request –  
The EC needs to understand from the APS accountant what the issues are. A meeting should be set up with him to discuss this.
4. Update on subcommittees (Chip Brock)  
There are the prize committees, the newsletter committee, and the DPF meeting subcommittees.
5. Recommendation from the DPF meeting subcommittee (Chip and Kevin)  
The meeting should be held in the summer of 2011 and happen every two years around the Lepton/Photon conference time. Having the meeting joint with DAP was thought to be a good idea.
6. Town Hall meeting agenda  
Chip presented the agenda which was agreed to.

7. Discussion of the proposal for DPF roles (Chip Brock)

Chip believes that the DPF EC should do something active to promote HEP. He suggested possible initiatives:

- a. Public speaking team with help for organization.
- b. Meetings such as Snowmass around a particular topic
- c. State of the Field document
- d. DPF working with HEPAP and arranging meetings around subpanel work to assure that the Core Research program has appropriate representation.

Discussion included:

- What should the intended audience be for items a and c and how much effort would be required.
- Fermilab wants an R&D workshop cosponsored by DPF that might fit under b. Should DPF cosponsor this? The consensus was that yes, this would be a good idea if there was adequate time for planning by having it at the end of the summer.

8. AOB

It was decided to continue the discussion on topic 7 on Sunday, Feb. 14 at 5p.m.

**END Minutes**

Alice Bean