



Report on ENSAR2 FCG meeting

DATE:	2017/10/10	OBJECT:	FCG meeting
N/REF:	ENSAR2/FCG/2017.01	LOCATION:	Caen, France
PREPARED BY:	K. Turzó	AFFILIATED DOCUMENTS:	

INFRASTRUCTURE	GANIL	LNS-LNL	ISOLDE	JYFL	ALTO	GSI	KVI-CART
PARTICIPANTS	M. Freer M.N. Harakeh S. Lecerf- Rossard M. Lewitowicz K. Turzó	D. Napoli	G. Neyens	A. Jokinen	M. Grasso B. Espagnon	S. Galès Y. Leifels	B. Jones J. Äystö
NON PARTICIPANTS							
INFRASTRUCTURE	NLC	IFIN-HH / ELI- NP	ECT*	ENSAF			
PARTICIPANTS	K. Rusek A. Maj	S. Galès A. Krasznahorkay					
NON PARTICIPANTS			J. Wambach	S. Harissopoulos			

WORK PACKAGE PRESENTATIONS

TOPIC	SPEAKER
<u>Introduction</u> See corresponding presentation.	M.N. Harakeh
<u>GANIL</u> See corresponding presentation Total of beam time for 2017: 1888 hours of beam. ENSAR2 support from March 2016 to August 2017: about 1500 hours of beam.	M. Freer
<u>LNL-LNS</u> See corresponding presentation The number of available days was reduced due to technical problems. PIAVE+ALPI will not deliver beams in April and May 2018 because of work on SPES. 2020: starting of the experimental campaign with low energy (1+) SPES beams 2022: starting of the experimental campaign with accelerated SPES beams	D. Ackermann
<u>ISOLDE</u> See corresponding presentation 2018: operation with proton beam until end of October. ENSAR2 support will continue in 2018. Negotiation with the research board to use beams of long-lived activity ions for HIE-ISOLDE experiments at the end of 2018, as well as to allow low-energy physics to use stable beams. 2019: shut down. 2020: negotiating with direction to start with stable beams for development and commissioning new set-ups after summer 2020. No clear news about the LINAC4 driver. The high-intensity upgrade will not be ready by the next running period. Phase 2 of HIE-ISOLDE with beam to 10 MeV/u should be completed this winter and beams available by summer 2018.	G. Neyens
<u>JYFL</u> See corresponding presentation Science festival 2017: 12000 visitors in Jyväskylä JYU Open access repository (free access): JYFL reached 80% in 2016.	A. Jokinen
<u>ALTO</u> See corresponding presentation The application forms (similar to GANIL forms) are very nice and could be an example for all research infrastructures.	M. Grasso
<u>GSI</u> See corresponding presentation G-PAC reviewed more than 64 proposals asking for more than 2000 shifts. Recommended A proposals covered 816 shifts. FAIR partners represent in total 80% of accepted proposals and the remaining 20% is distributed to non-FAIR partner proposals.	S. Galès
<u>KVI-CART</u>	

<p>See corresponding presentation</p> <p>The scientific topics covered by KVI-CART are applications: mainly medicine, therapy, dosimetry, and also applications to other fundamental scientific domains such as radiation effects.</p>	B. Jones
<p><u>NLC</u> See corresponding presentations CCB IAC: selection of experiments through discussions, no vote. The ENSAR2 support is given with priority to younger experimentalists.</p>	K. Rusek A. Maj
<p><u>IFIN-HH / ELI-NP</u> See corresponding presentation</p> <p>During the last period, no one was supported by ENSAR2 because no teams had more than 50% of external users.</p> <p>ELI-NP: the PAC organisation is not decided yet. It could be that it will be a different PAC maybe including members of the ELI scientific advisory committee.</p>	A. Krasznahorka y
<p><u>Impact studies</u> See corresponding presentation</p> <p>These studies are well suited for well-defined infrastructures. For IFJ PAN, it may be not that easy to answer each indicator. Question from Adam: is it necessary to go so much into details?</p> <p>The Research Infrastructures will answer as much as they can. Sabrina, with the help of the specialised company, will analyse the answers.</p> <p>Adam advises to limit the scope of these studies to ENSAR1 and ENSAR2.</p> <p>Muhsin: the impact studies will show the EC that its contribution is very small in comparison to the whole budget of the Research Infrastructures.</p>	S. Lecerf- Rossard
<p><u>MoU with non-EU facilities</u> See introduction presentation</p> <p>Muhsin stresses that the scientists coming from labs that did not sign the MoUs should not be supported by ENSAR2. The scientists from “poor” countries (without infrastructures, as Mexico) should be supported.</p>	M.N. Harakeh
<p><u>Possibility to join ERF-AISBL</u> See corresponding presentation</p> <p>To be part of this independent association brings the possibility to inform the European Commission about what is important for us. The EC sees ERF as a group of experts representing Research Infrastructures.</p> <p>Even if GANIL, GSI and ELI are ERF members, it is not known by the community. If ENSAR2 is member, the information will diffuse more easily between the community and the European institutions. It can be important for ENSAR2 for the final report and for preparing the new framework programme.</p> <p>This decision to be part of ERF has to be approved by the General Assembly.</p>	M. Lewitowicz
<p><u>Harmonisation of practices in ENSAR2 RIs</u></p>	All

<p>Muhsin proposes to decide for a unique application form.</p> <p>PAC procedure: it would be nice to include local technical advisory committees in the procedure for pre-evaluation of proposals in all labs.</p> <p>Selection procedure: Muhsin prefers consensus than giving grades. Marek: secret voting has also advantages. At any rate, the proposals have to be discussed.</p> <p>In JYFL, the scoring is open.</p> <p>Martin Freer proposes a central database of all approved experiments that PACs could consult before selecting new experiments.</p> <p>Muhsin advises to think about this issue. FCG members can contact ENSAR2 Management Group who will collect the answers within a single document.</p> <p>Stable beams: ECOS web site Radioactive ion beams: similar chart of beams to be built within ENSAR2.</p> <p>ENSAR2 PACs are using same selection criteria.</p>	
<u>AOB</u>	All