

Meeting of the Executive Committee of the DPF

22 December 1999

Minutes by C. Newman-Holmes (DPF Secretary-Treasurer)

Present: V. Barger, G. Beier, R. Cahn, B. Carithers, J. Conrad, S. Dawson, G. Farrar, H. Georgi, H. Gordon, N. Hadley, K. Kinoshita, P. Meyers, C. Newman-Holmes, C. Quigg, S. Wojcicki

Absent: D. Naples, P. Burchat

Visitors: J. Peoples, S. Raby, I. Ben-Zvi

Agenda:

Open Session

1. [DPF 2000 - Columbus, Ohio \(S. Raby\)](#)
2. [Phase of DPF/DPB Divisional meetings \(J. Peoples, I. Ben-Zvi\)](#)
3. [Report on ICFA \(G. Beier\)](#)
 - a) Access to HEP data
 - b) World laboratory
4. [Report from APS Divisional Councilor \(S. Dawson\)](#)

Closed Session

1. [Authorship in large experiments - Follow-up \(Hadley\)](#)
2. [Suggestion from A. Sessler for a Snowmass 2001 meeting](#)
3. [Letter from Malcolm Derrick](#)
4. [Request from Peter Rosen](#)
5. [Request for "Y2K Candidates"](#)
6. [Report from Secretary-Treasurer](#)
7. [Report on Panofsky Prize fund-raising](#)
8. [Congressional reception](#)
9. [Panofsky and Sakurai prize committee nominees](#)
10. [AOB](#)

DPF 2000 - Columbus, Ohio (S. Raby)

Plans are well underway for DPF 2000 to be held 9 - 12 August 2000 at Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio. A list of speakers and conveners was circulated to the DPF Executive Committee; about 50% had accepted at the time of this meeting. There is now a Web page for the conference (<http://www.dpf2000.org>) that

includes a list of the confirmed speakers. The organizers at OSU were waiting to hear from DOE and NSF about contributing funding to the meeting.

It was noted that the poster for the conference does have APS's name on it.

Phase of DPF/DPB Divisional meetings (J. Peoples, I. Ben-Zvi)

DPF decided recently to maintain a meeting schedule with divisional meetings alternating with a stronger presence at the APS April meeting. When this plan was agreed to last year, we had already made plans for DPF 2000 to be held at OSU and for DPF 2002 to be held at College of William and Mary. We are thus in a pattern that has DPF meetings in even-numbered years and increased presence at APS meetings in odd-numbered years. Unfortunately this makes us out of phase with the Division of Physics of Beams (DPB) schedule which alternates the Particle Accelerator Conference (odd-numbered years) with participation in the April APS meetings. The Particle Accelerator Conference schedule would be very difficult to change so DPB requested that we try to get in phase with them. We plan to do this by 2004. This means that following DPF 2002 our next divisional meeting will be either in 2003 or 2005.

Report on ICFA (G. Beier)

Gene Beier reported on recent news from the International Committee for Future Accelerators. He reminded us that this group has three representatives from the U.S. - one from the DPF chair line plus two lab directors. As Gene said, the group has no budget, but they make statements to help guide the field and convene special panels. Current work can be viewed at: http://www.fnal.gov/directorate/icfa/icfa_home.cfm.

Access to HEP Data

There was a fairly lengthy discussion about the issue of access to data from high-energy physics experiments. This is getting more attention in the political arena. The two key issues are freedom of access to publicly funded data and misappropriation of commercially funded data. The latter issue doesn't affect HEP much.

G. Beier reported that B. Richter (President of IUPAP) is pushing to make HEP data generally available. Richter is worried about data that are never analyzed. It was noted that NASA makes essentially all data publicly available. The quantity and quality of analysis of NASA data by secondary parties is significant. Data from NASA (e.g. images, spectra) are quite different from HEP data though. There was general concern expressed about use of HEP data by people not familiar with systematic effects due to various detector subtleties. This would make it difficult to make HEP data usable by others.

Executive Committee members expressed the following viewpoints:

G. Farrar - in favor of the general idea; experimentalists should be encouraged to think about it.

G. Beier - would be valuable to get people involved from countries that can't afford to do HEP; there are already outreach ways to access LEP data.

P. Meyers - we shouldn't confuse access by the public with access by other high-energy physicists. Also - for small experiments, getting the data into a format accessible to outside users would be a crushing burden.

V. Barger - a spirit of openness is good for the field.

N. Hadley - would be difficult to come up with a format for the data.

ICFA will continue to discuss this and then will probably make a statement.

World laboratory collaboration

Gene mentioned that Albrecht Wagner had presented an outline of an idea for a "Global Linear Accelerator Lab" at the last ICFA meeting. The idea is to see if accelerators can be built and operated as detectors are. Copies of Wagner's transparencies were distributed to the DPF Executive Committee. Gene said that no action was required at this time but this proposal would be discussed at the next ICFA meeting.

Report from APS Divisional Councilors (S. Dawson)

Divisional Councillor Sally Dawson reminded the Executive Committee that the APS Council is the policy-setting body of APS. It currently has about 70 members and there are plans to shrink it as this size is considered unworkable. The APS Council recently passed a motion to introduce a journal pricing model which includes differential prices between institutions to reflect differences in sizes and on-line usage. This would result in journal prices increasing for national labs and would share the burden of publishing more fairly.

Authorship in large experiments - Follow-up (Hadley)

A new class of publications has been proposed (Phys. Rev G - notes from collaborations). There was no follow-up from N. Hadley and no action is required from the DPF Executive Committee.

Suggestion for a Snowmass 2001 meeting

There was discussion of a proposal to have a Snowmass summer study in 2001. At the time of the meeting, Snowmass was only available for two weeks in the summer of 2001; previous Snowmass meetings have been three weeks. Throughout the discussion the point was made that although we refer to this proposed meeting as "Snowmass" it may in fact be held at another location. It is in fact already quite late to organize a meeting at Snowmass for Summer, 2001.

One of the concerns expressed about having a large-scale summer study in 2001 was the recent restrictions on travel. H. Gordon said that J. O'Fallon was supportive of the idea of a 2001 summer study if the Lab directors were in favor of the idea. H. Gordon talked to

both M. Witherell (FNAL) and J. Dorfan (SLAC) and reported that both thought it was a good idea. The wording of the charge is seen as crucial.

There was some discussion of possible locations for a 2001 summer study. One possibility would be to have it at a college campus with dorm accommodations; this would be less expensive than Snowmass. H. Gordon pointed out that there were 482 people at the last Snowmass - a large number to accommodate. G. Farrar pointed out the advantage of using a place that we know has been suitable in the past.

There was some discussion of the goals of the meeting - what would we like to come out of it? H. Gordon said that the goal would be to get the community to come to a consensus on the future direction. J. Conrad thought it would be difficult to get a consensus out of a Snowmass-type meeting in 2001. She suggested a series of town meetings. She felt that this would increase the opportunities for community input, but it is also important that real work be done. P. Meyers said that if a new facility is going to start in 2003 or 2004, we need to get going. We shouldn't expect a consensus at this Snowmass, we just need to give the community something to "chew on". Then we could have town meetings following the Snowmass meeting to try to build consensus.

Another question that came up was whether or not non-accelerator physics should be part of a 2001 summer study. Opinion was divided here. The majority of the Executive Committee seemed to think it was necessary to focus on new accelerators - the technical choices and scientific cases - and that broadening the scope of the workshop would not be helpful given the time limitations. Others felt that the accelerator vs. non-accelerator discussion was an artificial dichotomy and focusing on interesting physics was most important

Finally, there was some discussion of possible organization for a 2001 summer workshop. The chairs of DPF and DPB were co-chairs of the organizing committee for the last Snowmass meeting. C. Quigg agreed to work on the charge and the organization. DPF Executive Committee members should send their suggestions to Chris.

Program for April meeting

C. Quigg showed a list of speakers for the Spring, 2000 APS meeting. The program for the meeting is now on the Web at <http://www.aps.org/meet/APR00/baps/>.

Letter from Malcolm Derrick

In late October, 1999, M. Derrick (High Energy Physics Division, Argonne National Laboratory) sent a letter to the chairs of DPF and the Division of Nuclear Physics (DNP) about the overlap between particle and nuclear physics with the suggestion that DPF and DNP consider scheduling a joint meeting. DPF Executive Committee members made the following points:

There are already conferences for particle and nuclear physics, including the Conference on the Intersections between Particle and Nuclear Physics ("CIPANP") and the International Conference on Particles and Nuclei ("PANIC"). Both are held every three years, staggered. CIPANP will be held this year and PANIC was last held in 1999.

DPF and DNP are quite different communities although there is some overlap in physics interests.

We could increase interaction with DNP at the APS meetings at which DPF plans increased presence (with DPB beginning in 2004).

Request from Peter Rosen

P. Rosen sent a request for help in putting together a brief publication on the DOE's high-energy and nuclear physics program. H. Gordon mentioned that M. Witherell and J. Dorfan had also gotten this request and he wasn't sure how they were responding. One problem was that Rosen was requesting input by 27 December 1999, only five days after this meeting was taking place. H. Gordon agreed to consult P. Rosen to see if we could have more time to put something together on CP violation.

The publication has since been completed.

Request for "Y2K Candidates"

H. Gordon passed on a request from APS to submit nominations for candidates for APS offices.

Report on Panofsky Prize fund-raising

People who previously agreed to work on this are no longer on the DPF Executive Committee. Although there were no new volunteers for this at the meeting, Gene Beier subsequently agreed to work on it.

Congressional reception

The DPF/DNP Congressional reception is scheduled for 16 May 2000. DNP is taking the lead to organize it. The reception last year had many physicists and not too many other people. There is a suggestion to improve the meeting by having each physicist attendee assigned to a congress member or staff person. The physicists would make appointments to speak with these contact people in their offices and would then take them to the reception. Information about the reception will be sent out via e-mail.

Panofsky and Sakurai Prize Committees

People to serve on the Panofsky and Sakurai prize committees were subsequently selected through e-mail.

AOB

H. Gordon suggested that the DPF Executive Committee send a letter to outgoing DOE Office of Science head Martha Krebs expressing our appreciation for her efforts for particle physics. Howard subsequently wrote and sent such a letter.

G. Farrar mentioned the recent Cosmic Genesis conference sponsored by NASA, DOE and NSF. She felt that the NASA presentation at the conference about interactions with the public was much better than those of NSF and DOE. She suggested that the DPF Executive Committee make a statement encouraging cooperation between DOE, NSF and NASA. Glennys agreed to draft such a statement and send it to me.

Next meeting

The next meeting will be in Long Beach in April, 2000.

Secretary-Treasurer's Report (CNH)

Here is the DPF financial status as presented at the meeting:

Balance at last meeting (as of 2/28/99)	\$99,492.76
Income	\$31,302.66
Expenses	\$18,813.35

Balance as of 11/30/99	\$111,982.07
Income	
Dues	\$15,605.00
Interest	\$5,082.65
April Meeting	\$10,403.01
Other	\$212.00

Total Income	\$31,302.66

Expenses

Newsletter printing	\$1,830.81
Postage and mailing	\$3,896.27
Fee waivers	\$562.50
Centennial	\$12,523.77
Total Expenses	\$18,813.35

Prize Funds	2/28/99	11/30/99	Change
Panofsky Prize	\$59,667.83	\$60,785.32	\$1,117.49
Sakurai Prize	\$190,646.08	\$209,618.09	\$18,972.01
Wilson Prize	\$126,294.42	\$131,983.63	\$5,689.21