

# CINP Board Meeting Minutes

January 27, 2025, 14:30 NL/14:00 Atl/13:00 East/12:00 MB&SK/10:00 BC

## **Present:**

Board members: Gwen Grinyer, Garth Huber, Liliana Caballero Suarez, Russ Mammei, Thomas Brunner (secretary)

Working group (WG) chairs: Svetelana Barkanova (Hadronic Physics/QCD), Alexandros Gezerlis (Nuclear Theory), Ruben Sandapen (Nuclear Physics Education and Training), Nicole Vassh (Nuclear Astrophysics), Jeff Martin (Fundamental Symmetries)

The meeting starts 13:02pm ET with introductions of everyone on the call. The goal of having the working group chairs join the board meeting is to have a conversation in preparation to kick off the Long-Range Plan (LRP) process.

Garth informs the group that he and others went over the terms of reference for the LRP process based on input and feedback from NSERC. Terms of reference are largely finalized now in coordination with IPP director Carsten Krauss and the CINP working group chairs. They are discussing the best options to gather input from the community. The last day of CAP congress is earmarked for the CINP townhall.

From a discussions during WG chair meetings it was concluded that at the townhall the WG chairs present a synopsis of their subfields based on briefs they received – likely there will be no presentations by all individual experiments. Only new projects with substantial need for discussion will be invited to present. If an experiment or researcher feels that they absolutely need to present, there could be a possibility to accommodate experiments for a talk even if they are not “new” experiments. However, that process is still being discussed/refined. In the past, there was a process to request a talk. Overall, the goal is to keep the townhall planning process short and precise and not provide a platform for everyone to present their experiment. The summary of the working group chairs will already combine and condense the essential information.

Briefs will be requested prior to the townhall meeting. A LaTeX document is being prepared that asks specific questions to get the required information, while discouraging people from ‘only’ copying their NSERC applications. If briefs are sent to different working groups, the submitter should indicate which working group chairs should review the text. The WG chairs will receive the briefs at least two weeks prior to the townhall to be able to prepare the summary for their group. No final deadline has been set yet. Following the townhall, meeting people will be able to revise their briefs.

Alex asks if there is a policy for groups that do not send in briefs? Garth replies that the LRP is really important for experiments who are competing for resources. If theorists submit briefs, it helps a lot. If experiments do not submit a brief, it is at

their peril, for theorists the situation is not as clear but receiving theory briefs will be helpful. Garth reminds the group that theorists should take the LRP seriously. Mathematicians complain that theorists in physics are better funded through NSERC. Having a LRP with a clear message with respect to theory priorities helps make the case for theory support. There are specific subfields where theory support is currently lacking. The LRP is a good place to point out deficiencies and make a case for them. We need to make sure to advertise the process also to theorists.

In August the WG leads will meet at TRIUMF to compile the CINP brief for the LRP. The period for the LRP has changed to a 7-year plan with an outlook over 15 years.

Carsten and Garth meet regularly to discuss LRP committee membership. NSERC recommended specific people for co-chairs. Carsten and Garth were approaching candidates to co-chairs. Garth reached out to a person that NSERC recommended. The process is still ongoing to find the co-chairs. Carsten and Garth were discussing a committee of 12 people, which is the same size as last time, but larger than in the more distant past. Past LRP committees: Ken Ragan (2005-06) 4/10 were CINP, Malcolm Butler (2010-11) 4/10 were CINP. Dean Karlen (2015-16) 4/11, Adam Ritz and Brigitte Vachon (2020-21) with 4/12 CINP representatives, IPP with 5/12 and 1 accelerator. Garth aims for 5 CINP representatives out of 12 committee members. The goal is to have 8 people of the committee from Canada, 4 from international institutions to have a broader input and perspective. Other aspects are to have 1 theorists either national or international, 1 person from intermediate energy hadronic field, and one expert on low energy symmetry (UCN, alpha, atom traps, ...). Garth and Carsten are chiefly responsible to nominate committee members, respectively for nuclear and particle physics, but they need to coordinate national/international and geographic distributions. At their last meeting they went through a list that was provided by NSERC of past evaluation section members. The goal is to invite international experts to the LRP committee who know the Canadian system through their work on the evaluation section.

Garth: We need on the committee expertise for HEP theory, an ATLAS person, a neutrino baseline, one on DM, B-quark program, 0 $\nu$ BB, underground physics, P-ONE (and IceCube)

Alex wonders if it could backfire to ask for 5 CINP representatives on the LRP committee and we only get 4? Garth argues that for a committee of 12 members, we need to aim for 5 representatives from CINP, for a committee of 10 members, 4 from CINP would be expected. If we only get 4/12 representatives, then we need to get the best and strongest 4 people on the committee.

13:33: Gwen thanks the working group chairs and co-chairs for calling in and for doing all the leg-work for the LRP plan by summarizing the briefs. WG chairs leave the CINP Board Meeting, which continues as a regular board meeting.

## 1. Approval of Agenda

**Gwen moves motion to approve the agenda, Thomas seconds.**

## 2. Approval of Minutes of November 24/24 (minutes by Chris Ruiz)

**Gwen moves the motion to approve the minutes, Liliana seconds.**

## 3. Finance Report (Greg is not on the phone, Garth takes over)

### *a) status of NSERC account and projection to March 31, 2025*

There is nothing controversial about the budget, spending happens as planned. Expenses come in as planned. We have a projected surplus at the end of the grant.

Gwen asks about the status of conference support that is coming in. Garth reminds the board that the requests are Fiscal Year (FY) 2025 expenses, same for future ACOT meeting travel, which will also happen in the next FY. There are no unplanned expenses to be added to the current FY budget.

### *b) update on member invoices paid to date*

No update.

## 4. Executive Director Report (Garth)

### *a) Membership*

Associate Member 3-Year Renewals:

179 - Roger Caballero-Foch (TRIUMF)

183 - Mohammed Mubasher (Alberta)

189 - Bryn Knight (Guelph)

Remove (still no response):

140 - Mike Pearson (Montreal)

185 - Jessica Churchill (McGill)

New Applications:

253 - Hemanth Regi (Regina - Associate)

254 - Lukas Opitz (Regina - Associate)

**Gwen motions to approve the above changes to membership, Liliana seconds.**

### *b) Conference Support applications (FY25 expense)*

#### *- Ab-Initio workshop*

WG chairs provided input on the request for support of this an-initio workshop. They all agreed it was a good workshop. They all commented on the proposed budget, one compared the attendance and amount per attendee to those of other CIMP-sponsored events. The WG chairs suggested to support the workshop at a reduced

level. The initial request was for \$4500, Alex recommended \$3,000 tied to early career participants, Paul Garrett suggests support of max. \$1,500, Nicole did not provide a number for support but said it should not be at the requested level.

Liliana mentions that she found the request high considering the narrow scope. Gwen points out that the conference will be in Europe and asks if there is precedence for CINF supporting conferences outside of Canada? Garth confirms that there were some conferences that were organized internationally but with a large footprint of Canadians at the conference. In both cases that Garth brings up CINF provided conference support targeted at junior researchers.

Liliana points out that most of the people that want to go to the ab-initio workshop are senior. Funding should be targeted at postdocs. Students may not benefit that much from this workshop.

Thomas wonders if the junior scientist travel program could be an alternative? Garth explains that we can do either or. The junior scientist program is for conferences that are not directly sponsored by CINF.

Liliana asks at what level CINF supports WNPPC. Garth: We have a travel award competition that students apply to. We fund 2/3 of the applications. In addition, CINF supports student prizes. CINF only directly supports student travel to WNPPC and CUPC.

**Liliana motions to support the ab-initio workshop with \$1,500 with the condition to support Canadian post docs or students in their last year for support. Gwen seconds.**

*- Women+ in Physics Canada*

Garth mentions that this is the first time that this conference request support from CINF.

Gwen mentions that the conference has been around for several years. The McDonald Institute is organizing this year's conference. Gwen is invited to give the keynote talk, hence she excuses herself from the discussion.

Garth mentions for comparison that CCUWIP was supported with \$500. Liliana states that the Women+ in Physics in Canadas conference is pretty large, larger than CCUWIP.

**Liliana motions to support the conference with \$500, Thomas seconds.**

*c) Undergraduate Research Scholarships URS (FY25 expense)*

Amounts and number of past and proposed Undergraduate Research Summer awards:

- Requested in this year's NSERC application:  $8 * \$6k = \$48k$  plus \$4.5k in travel supplements
- actual 2023:  $6 * \$5.5k = \$33k$  plus \$2.755k travel (typical year)
- actual 2024:  $10 * \$5.5k = \$55k$  plus \$5.2k travel (exceptional year)

The deadline for summer student award applications are coming up. The submission deadline aims to have the awards announced well before the summer starts. Garth proposes a deadline for application submission of Monday, Feb 24 with a decisions by March 24. This is before we learn about the outcome of the NSERC CINP MRS.

Five years ago we announced an initial slate of the scholarships on the normal time scale and then announced the rest of the awards once the amount of the NSERC MRS renewal was known.

Garth recommends that this year we do it similarly and we announce 5 or 6 on normal time scale, and then if we get sufficient NSERC for additional awards they will be announced in April.

**Thomas motions to announce 6\*\$6k awards in March and then we announce additional awards once we hear back from NSERC. Liliana seconds. Deadline for submission is Feb. 24, award announcement by March 24.**

- need 1 member for selection committee

Liliana, Gwen, Thomas are likely in conflict with selection committee

#### *d) Graduate Fellowship GF (FY25 expense)*

Amounts and number of past and proposed GF:

- NSERC application: 3\*\$15k=\$45k
- actual 2023: 2\*\$12.5k=\$25k
- actual 2024: 2\*\$13k=\$26k

Garth asks whether we want to announce the amount already. We could announce \$15k. Thomas wonders if we need to go to \$15k from previously \$13k? Gwen argues that we should stick to what we put in the NSERC application. Thomas agrees that it makes sense to stick with an amount of \$15k.

Garth suggests having the submission deadline for applications March 24 and aim for a decision on awards by April 24. Once we know the strength of the applicants and the NSERC funding level, we will have a board meeting to decide the number of scholarships.

**Gwen motions to set the scholarship amount at \$15k. Liliana seconds**

- need 1 member for selection committee

Gwen and Thomas will likely be in conflict.

#### *e) Update on WNPPC Student Travel Award competition*

Garth received 12 applications (one was very late) for WNPPC Student Travel Awards, 8 awards were given out. Gwen chaired the selection committee consisting of Russ Mammei, Ruben Sandapen, and herself. The late submission was not considered after discussion among the committee. The selection process went very well.

#### *f) CAP Congress schedule update*

Thursday June 12 morning we have the breakfast board meeting. CINI will provide breakfast. Individual member CINI AGM will be over lunch time on June 12, followed by the joint session of CINI and IPP. IPP is in charge of organizing the joint session this year.

Friday, June 13, full day for the CINI townhall, likely for 6 hours. It is currently scheduled 9 am – 5pm. CINI will provide coffee breaks but members will be asked to book their lunch as part of registration.

Liliana to send a reminder to all DNP members announcing the townhall so people can plan. Liliana will also remind the CAP congress organizers to add the food selection options to the registration form for the various CINI events. Garth to reach out to the organizers to make sure we have coffee breaks set up during townhall.

### 5. News from TRIUMF

No rep from TRIUMF.

### 6. Other Business

No other business.

### 7. Approximate date of next meeting

At the next meeting we will discuss the proposed budget for FY25, and plan for the next 5 years. The meeting should happen as soon as possible after the NSERC results are announced, and before the Grad Fellowship selection committee meets. We need to make decisions on fellowships at that meeting.

### 8. Adjourn

**Gwen motions to adjourn, Liliana seconds.**