

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Feedback from IFW workshop for Snowmass 2013 preparation.

Dear Colleagues,

Tomorrow we will have the first meeting to start organizing Snowmass 2012. The IF workshop is held up as an example for that and you have asked both of us to say something/pick our brains. To make it a bit easier we thought it would be good to write some items down about the IF workshop organization.

Here they are and we can discuss or not discuss them tomorrow.

They are in somewhat random order.

- We recommend keeping the same working groups for the Intensity Frontier part of your workshop, as we had for IFW. The only suggestion from the “Proton Decay” group is to not have that as a separate working group, but as an activity. The physics case is well established but no experiment will be built unless it is built for another purpose, so it is a matter of “fine tuning” that experiment so it can also do proton decay.
- When we selected conveners we followed two rules: 1) do not use spokes people, managers, project people from experiments and 2) select junior people (as much as possible) who have a stake in the science of the working group.
- The concept for the conveners: an experimentalist, theorist and observer seemed to work very well for us. Typically the observer was either not expert in that field but somebody with a broader view and working in a different field, or someone who was no longer working in that field. We followed this strategy from the “HMO” (High Minded Observer) convener position in Snowmass 2001 due to its success there.
- Regular conveners meetings before the workshop are essential. We started them early around September 2011 and had one every week. Not everybody was able to attend. We had one face-to-face meeting at O’Hare for half a day.
- These meetings were important in my mind, because this is where a lot of discussion and exchange of ideas took place and the final program was determined. Here we also defined the form and what we expected as outcome of the workshop. These meetings provided an opportunity for different conveners to get to know each other, hear each other’s opinion, argue about them and finally come to some consensus on how to proceed.
- This is where we decided to make it very science based and not have a working group on facilities.
- We also had weekly meeting with DOE, which were important. They told us what they wanted and we told them what we wanted. In the end we arrived at something we all felt we owned and wanted to make work together. This does not mean we agreed on everything, but making the workshop successful was the overriding common theme.
- It is important to emphasize the complementary between the frontiers. It is already bad enough that we have the frontiers. There needs to be some mechanism to connect the energy, intensity and cosmic frontier.
- There should be an attempt to erase walls between the frontiers and not build walls.

- Keep the program/activities oriented towards the science. Science should drive. Not facilities. There will be pressure to be facilities oriented, but this pressure should be ignored to the extent possible.
- What is the deliverable for Snowmass 2013? One thing which helped us, was that we had very clear goals.
- Working groups need to be established early, with conveners and meetings should take place well before the “final” meeting (you are doing that it seems)
- Does DOE (NSF) buy into Snowmass? Have they been asked what they would like out of it. That does not mean you should do what they want. You should know.
- Reestablish a way for the community to own the future program and have input into it. The last input was P5 in 2008 and that was already very influenced by funding agencies and facilities. It was a while ago. Things keep happening in our field, but without community input. HEPAP has been pretty useless as a mechanism for input and/or advice. There was an interesting discussion and talks about this at the last DPF meeting. Europe has ECFA which is used for that. In the US we are trying to use DPF for this and it is the only road we have, but it is not ideal (sorry). The EU strategy exercise is a good example on how things should be done and maybe we will do that for Snowmass.
- Covering the whole field of particle physics at Snowmass will be a big task and seems overwhelming.
- Decide whether any prioritization of programs will take place, and if so, develop a clear mechanism for that.
- Last but not least point: will you involve nuclear physics, because a lot of that program overlaps with the particle physics program? Example: neutrinos and neutrinoless double beta decay.

Regards

JoAnne & Harry