



Report on ENSAR2 FCG meeting

DATE:	2016/10/6	OBJECT:	FCG meeting
N/REF:	ENSAR2/FCG/2016.01	LOCATION:	Vienna, Austria
PREPARED BY:	K. Turzó	AFFILIATED DOCUMENTS:	

INFRASTRUCTURE	GANIL	LNS-LNL	ISOLDE	JYFL	ALTO	GSI	KVI-CART
PARTICIPANTS	D. Ackermann M.N. Harakeh S. Lecerf-Rossard M. Lewitowicz K. Turzó	M. Cinausero S. Romano C. Sfienti	M. Borge K. Blaum	A. Jokinen	G. Georgiev S. Grévy	K. Langanke	P. Dendooven
NON PARTICIPANTS							
INFRASTRUCTURE	NLC	IFIN-HH / ELI-NP	ECT*	ENSAF			
PARTICIPANTS	K. Rusek	D. Ghita A. Krasznahorkay	J. Wambach	S. Harissopoulos			
NON PARTICIPANTS	A. Maj						

TOPIC	SPEAKER
<u>Introduction</u>	M.N. Harakeh
<u>GANIL</u> See corresponding presentation NFS: first experiment in 2017 S3: commissioning in 2018	D. Ackermann
<u>LNL-LNS</u> See corresponding presentation Shutdowns at LNL in coming years due to SPES installation. LNS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catana facility (medical applications) is using a fixed number of beam hours (30% of total beam time), agreed with medical scientists, therefore the time for Superconducting Cyclotron is reduced although the machine is available. • High intensity beams (10^{12} pps): available today. Further developments to increase the intensity are in discussion. 	C. Sfienti
<u>ISOLDE</u> See corresponding presentation Solutions to important backlog: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific INTC meetings to analyse the backlog (which experiments are still interesting to schedule). • It may be decided that, during a certain period, no high or low energy experiments are accepted in order to decrease the backlog. 	K. Blaum
<u>JYFL</u> See corresponding presentation The proposals are not classified: they are either accepted or rejected. Pelletron: not much proposals going through the PAC at the moment.	A. Jokinen
<u>ALTO</u> See corresponding presentation Schedule of experiments: the main criterion is the feasibility of the experiment. The ranking is not the first considered parameter. ALTO has not yet too much pressure in terms of number of proposals.	S. Grévy
<u>GSI</u> See corresponding presentation Green light from German government: FAIR will be built with the corresponding budget. Restricted beam time in 2016 and more restricted beam time in 2017. Civil construction: detailed plan released in November or December PANDA detectors will be used to prove the feasibility of HADES experiment. Shutdown in 2017 for UNILAC and SIS18+ESR. Nature paper: first atomic transitions in super-heavy elements	K. Langanke
<u>KVI-CART</u> See corresponding presentation Questions from KVI-CART PAC how to handle specific proposals (detector tests for big experiments...)	P. Dendooven

<p>At the moment, there is no fundamental nuclear physics programme within which experiments are performed at KVI-CART. KVI-CART team needs dedicated proposals to start such programme.</p> <p>Proton therapy concerns R&D, no patient treatment. A dedicated proton therapy facility is being built at the University Medical Center Groningen.</p>	
<p><u>NLC</u> See corresponding presentation</p> <p>IFJ PAN:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ^{12}C experiment: precision experiment in order to have a standard for other experiments. • The patient treatment will start soon. The agreement was signed last Saturday. At least 100 patients are expected. 	<p>K. Rusek M.N. Harakeh</p>
<p><u>IFIN-HH / ELI-NP</u> See corresponding presentation</p> <p>Radio-carbon laboratory: certified last year, only one in Romania.</p> <p>Numerous proposals at each PAC: mainly spectroscopy and lifetime measurements</p> <p>ELI-NP: first beam at the end of 2018 or beginning of 2019 (it is mandatory).</p>	<p>D. Ghita</p>
<p><u>ECT*</u> See corresponding presentation</p> <p>The community is encouraged to submit proposals for organising workshops at ECT*.</p>	<p>J. Wambach</p>
<p><u>Impact studies</u> See corresponding presentation</p> <p>Hiring a company: from GANIL experience, it is very probable that the company will just deliver a report presenting what will be prepared by the consortium.</p> <p>The impact study is a request from the European Commission (mentioned in the call), but there are no guidelines provided by EC.</p> <p>Such information is often requested by funding agencies at all levels.</p> <p>Sotirios: questions raised in a meeting with EC: How much money goes back to economy? How much patents? How much jobs are created? How much post-docs are employed?</p>	<p>S. Lecerf-Rossard</p>
<p><u>MoU with non-EU facilities</u></p> <p>ENRI agreement: guidelines for the Facility Coordination Group. A section of this agreement depends on the MoU with non-EU facilities.</p> <p>MoU: part of TNA budget could be proposed to non-EU researchers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget dedicated to subsistence, the non-EU labs will pay the travel costs. • In exchange, the non-EU labs will pay for subsistence of EU researchers. • This funding has to follow EC regulations. • To be signed between ENSAR2 coordinator and non-EU lab directors as bilateral MoU with each non-EU lab. The ENSAR2 infrastructures will give signature right to ENSAR2 coordinator for these MoUs. 	<p>M.N. Harakeh</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The last sentence of the MoU has to be rephrased.• Common agreement from FCG members for the MoU.	
<p><u>General remarks</u></p> <p>It could be nice to have a common way to rank the experiments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Marks are a good way to evaluate precisely the experiments.• Problem of increasing backlog. <p>KB: it could be necessary to have a Super Board to be sure that the PACs use the ranking system properly → scientific council?</p> <p>Important point: the approval of the experiments is done by the lab directors not by the PACs.</p> <p>This issue has to be discussed during the next FCG meeting in 2017.</p>	All