Minutes
of the First Meeting of the
Nuclear Physics European Collaboration Committee
(NUPECC)

held on October 1 and 2, 1988
at the Technical University of Darmstadt

Participants:
R. Bergère
C. Détraz
C. Gaarde
W. Gelletly
W. Henning (local secretary)
B. Jonson
P. Kienle (acting chairman)
E. Otten
M. Piiparinen
R. Seltz
I. Sick
P. J. Twin
J. Vervier
P. de Witt-Huberts
A. van der Woude

Agenda
1. Welcome and Introduction
2. Information on the Meetings of the Initiative Group
3. General Aims of the Committee
4. Work Plan for the Near Future
5. Organisation and By-laws
1. Welcome and Introduction

P. Kienle, local host and acting chairman, welcomes the participants. It is generally regretted that the Italian delegation could not participate and hope is expressed that they will be able to do so at the next meeting. The proposed preliminary agenda is accepted as agenda for the meeting.

2. Information on the Meetings of the Initiative Group

C. Detraz reports on the two preceding meetings by the initiative group. Before discussing details, he mentions that this is not the first time a committee is concerned with collaboration in nuclear physics in Europe. Indeed, a major effort was devoted to an EPS report "Nuclear Physics in Europe" prepared in 1984 under the chairmanship of Meyer-Kuckuck. The first meeting of the present initiative group was on December 7, 1987 in Paris and resulted in the Memorandum given in Appendix I. It emphasized 5 objectives:

- European schools in nuclear physics
- Exchange of young scientists
- Accessibility of a network of European facilities
- Forum for regular meetings to face the challenges of nuclear science

The second meeting was held on February 9, 1988, in Paris resulting in the statement given in Appendix II. It was concluded that an advisory committee in nuclear science should be established with the aim of fostering the following objectives:

- To optimize the collaborative use of present facilities
- To encourage the pooling of resources towards the development of new instrumentation
- To provide a forum to discuss the future development of larger facilities in Europe
- To promote the exchange of scientists
- To stimulate inter-European schools and conferences.

The presentation by C. Detraz is followed by extensive discussions. Most of the comments are concerned with the goals of the Committee. The question is raised to what extent it should/could be linked to the EPS. It is generally felt, that the Committee should be an independent body. Detraz reads a letter from G. Goldring, president of the EPS promising general support for the Committee "should it be needed".

The discussion then addresses the general direction of the Committee’s charge and whom it should address. It is generally felt, that the Committee by itself should establish its charge. It should take into account the encouragement from the funding agencies, as expressed by these in preliminary contacts, which support the idea of interaction and collaboration between countries, laboratories and facilities and optimum use of the latter.

In connection with the funding agencies the question is raised, how the various delegates were selected. A head count reveals, that about one half of the delegates are selected by the national Physical Societies and about on half by the respective funding agencies. It is felt, that a uniform approach should be pursued. It is pointed out that the essential tasks of the committee might be connected with major facilities and their optimum use, and consequently the scientific bodies of the funding agencies need to be involved in the selection of the delegates to this Committee.

3. General Aims of the Committee

The discussion is organized along the main objectives stated in the draft of the initiative group (Appendix II):

i) "To optimize the use of the facilities".
   - It is felt that this implies two major operational characteristics of a facility:
     a) a facility should be open to international use
     b) the program at a facility should be subject to the scrutiny and the advice of a scientific program committee.
   - Several aspects are discussed in the discussion which follows:
Evolution of a facility should go beyond pure accounting. "Open facility" needs to be defined. There needs to be support by the facility for the outside users. The EC program on 'EC Support for Easier Access to the Major Scientific Facilities of European Interest', scheduled to start in 1989 should be utilized. It is proposed that the Committee study this program and its possibilities. It is pointed out, as an example, that for nuclear physics increase in usage of a facility by simultaneous multiple use (i.e. beam ports) in general is difficult to achieve.

It is questioned whether it is prudent to compete for equivalent facilities in different countries rather than to try to establish a network of complementary facilities. Should a starting point for the Committee be to attempt a status report? Should it be limited to those facilities which have an international program? Is a quality judgement appropriate; or should that be only for new facilities? It appears a general consensus of the Committee, that quality judgements are not the primary task of the Committee, it rather should facilitate interaction and exchange, and provide scientific advise in attempts to establish a network of complementary facilities.

ii) "Pooling of Resources towards New Instrumentation".

The basic issue addressed is to what extend the Committee can promote this point. The questions raised in that connection are: To what extend is pooling already happening nationally? Is there already a tendency in and between the funding agencies to pool equipment? Is there duplication of equipment going on right at the moment? Is pooling intrinsically forced by the magnitude of some of the nuclear physics projects? To what extend is dissemination of information already useful. A point in question is the duplication of software development for data analysis. Aren't there already meetings and workshops concerned with this? Are there already too many meetings? Or inappropriate ones? It is generally felt, that this is an area where the Committee could have substantial impact in fostering the distribution of information and initiating pooling projects. It is also felt that the Committee cannot exert major influence on projects that are underway other than disseminating and helping with information.

iii) "Future Developments of Larger Facilities"

It is agreed to restrict the discussion to facilities in Europe. Impact of this Committee can only be expected if it is connected to the funding agencies in some form. A 'free-floating' body is considered less effective. What energy-range or maximum energy of a facility should be still considered by this Committee? It is argued that the ultra-relativistic heavy-ion program with the highest absolute energies obtained is funded by nuclear physics and largely run by scientists from the field of nuclear physics; consequently there should be no restriction from maximum energy on the facilities to be treated by this Committee. It is also emphasized that current construction programs and projects exist in various countries and laboratories, and that the Committee by itself cannot interfere but rather provide a forum for discussions concerning the construction and use of future major facilities.

iv) "Promotion of Exchange of Scientists" 

It is first pointed out that programs exist with this objective through the EC and through several bilateral agreements. The Committee could contribute by distributing information on the existing opportunities and by lobbying at the EC. It was not considered a real problem that not all countries represented in the Committee are member of the EC.

v) "Stimulation of Inter-European Schools and Conferences"

The desirability to have national schools (in the national language) was stressed, but the interaction through international schools (in an international language) is highly desirable. It was felt that this Committee can add by providing information on existing schools, encouraging participation and possibly by concentrating the many diverse activities; also by encouraging existing well-known general schools to have nuclear physics schools. Facilitating getting support and distributing information on support (for example from NATO) may be useful. A particularly useful activity may be in helping to avoid unnecessary overlap between schools. All these activities should not be independent of EPS, but
rather result in efforts to guide and support EPS to certain directions. European schools are considered most useful if located centrally in Europe.

There is an extended discussion on the topics of conferences. It is then focussed on the specific issue to support an initiative to have a combined nuclear physics spring meeting, very much along the same lines as the ones already exercised by the German Physical Society and the societies from the neighbouring countries. A current initiative aims at a meeting including participation of the French Physical Society in Strasbourg. The general feeling is expressed that this is an interesting approach and that the Committee should lobby for a wider participation. In connection with this specific proposal, more general aspects are discussed: How often should such a meeting be held; every 3 years? Where should it be located (recess periods at universities may offer opportunities for inexpensive conference costs)? Could there be EC support?

On a side-note it is suggested that information on this and other activities in European nuclear physics shows the need for a "CERN Courier"-type publication in nuclear physics. The important issue of its financing is raised. There seems general support for the idea to start it from an already existing news letters in a major laboratory.

5. Work Plan for the Near Future

A list of suggestions is made for specific or general activities. In the order that they are raised:

- Assure Italian participation at next meeting. The acting chairman P. Kienle will contact the Italian colleagues about this matter.
- Acronym for the Committee:
  NUPECC: Nuclear Physics European Collaboration Committee
  COCONUPE: Committee on Collaboration in Nuclear Physics in Europe
  By majority vote NUPECC is accepted as the official acronym.
- News letter, computer news or combination of both. Its content should first emphasize collaborative aspects. 1 or 2 full-time personnel appear necessary; should be located at one of the major facilities/institutions with already a news publication.
- Publication of the first steps of the Committee by providing informations to the EPS News, the CERN Courier, NATURE etc. The chairman to be elected will organize these steps.
- Support of specific initiatives (EUROBALL, CW Electron Facility etc.). It is felt that for such steps the status of the Committee is yet not sufficiently defined. It is necessary first to formulate the charge and mission of the Committee and then go back to the agencies for approval and an official mandate. A statement on the charge and mission will be prepared by C. Detraz and the draft circulated until consensus. It will be provided to the funding agencies for information and confirmation. The advisory role of this Committee should be emphasized.
- It is agreed that a letter is sent by the Committee to all national (West-) European Physical Societies informing them about the Committee and its purpose, and to inform other (West-) European countries not yet represented in this Committee (Austria, Greece, Ireland, Luxembourg, Norway, Portugal, Spain) that the Committee is open to anybody interested in its subject matters and issues. The chairman to be elected will write these letters.

5. Organisation and By-Laws

The length of the term of the chairman, location of his office and the question of a scientific secretary is discussed. The Committee agrees on a 2 year term for the chairman with the possibility to renew once. It is agreed that a scientific secretary is essential and that he should be located at a major laboratory. It needs to be explored to what extent he can be part of, or can be attached to an existing structure.

It is agreed that for the initial term of the chairman and the multiple tasks and decision involved in establishing the Committee, an Executive Committee be appointed consisting of 3 persons including the chairman to be elected.
Nominations for the chairman are requested. C. Detraz is proposed as the only candidate. He is unanimously elected by secret vote.

The Committee also votes by acclamation that the Executive Committee consist of the chairman and the 2 organizers of the current meeting at Darmstadt (P. Kienle), and of the next meeting in Amsterdam (P. de Witt-Huberts).

It is restated that the chairman, with the help of the Executive Committee, undertakes all the steps listed under section 5. He is asked in addition to make contacts in Brussel on scientific support programs.

The meeting is adjourned on Sunday noon by the acting chairman P. Kienle, by thanking all participants for their contributions to what is considered a very fruitful and productive working meeting.

Date of the next meeting:
Friday, January 20, 1989, beginning at noon, and Saturday, June 21, during the morning at Amsterdam. The meeting will be organized by P. de Witt-Huberts (NIKHEF) who will provide detailed information on the meeting.

Darmstadt, October 1988

P. Kienle
(Acting Chairman)

W. Henning
(Local Secretary)