

# Minutes of the MICE Collaboration Board held on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2005 in Berkeley

## Present

<b>CB Chair</b> – D. Kaplan	Louvain – G. Grégoire
<b>Spokesman</b> – A. Blondel	LBNL – D. Li
<b>Deputy</b> – M. Zisman	Liverpool – R. Gamet
BNL – S. Kahn	NIKHEF – F. Filthaut
CERN – H. Haseroth	Northern Illinois – M.A. Cummings
FNAL – A. Bross	Osaka – Y. Kuno
Illinois Inst. Tech. – Y. Torun	RAL ISIS – P. Drumm
Imperial College London – K. Long	Sheffield – C. Booth
INFN Napoli – V. Palladino	UCLA – K. Lee
Jefferson Lab. – R. Rimmer	UC Riverside – G. Hanson
KEK – K. Yoshimura	

## 1) Approval of Minutes of 28<sup>th</sup> October 2004

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

## 2) Spokesman's Remarks (Alain Blondel)

Alain commented that a lot of good work was going on in the collaboration at present, and that we only have 777 days until data taking commences! There are also vacancies, for an analysis convener and DAQ project leader. This is also already a good time to involve students, with opportunities for producing theses.

## 3) Technical Coordinator's Report (Paul Drumm)

We are now homing in on the details, which shows we are making good progress. Examples included the R&D plans for the hydrogen system and management of magnetic forces in the apparatus. There is a need for a detailed study of the layout, including access for moving equipment into the hall. Decisions are needed on the tracker validation and the Design and Safety Review procedures.

## 4) Report on Recent UK MICE Reviews (Ken Long)

Ken explained three recent MICE reviews. On 12<sup>th</sup> November there had been a Cost & Schedule Review, initiated by K. Peach (RAL). This was generally very positive, and various recommended actions had been undertaken. PPARC Science Committee had conducted a review on 17<sup>th</sup> November, which concluded by recommending that Phase 1 be funded at the level of £9.7M. The Gateway 2/3 Review also presented a very positive conclusion, and welcomed the phasing of the overall project. Some areas were rated "amber", including funding and various aspects of project organisation and management, and recommendations were made, but the conclusion was that, subject to UK funding, we were ready to proceed with the implementation of Phase 1, while the completion of the whole project (Phases 1 & 2) remained the ultimate aim.

## 5) Funding Situation by Country

**Belgium (G. Grégoire):** A request for €40K is about to be submitted. (Less than the previous request, as PMs have been obtained free.) A first response on 2006 funding is due early in July, with the official decision in September.

**Italy (V. Palladino):** An LoI was submitted, resulting in an invitation to submit a full proposal. It is now necessary to reassemble the team, obtaining names by May/June to

sign the proposal. There are positive indications from INFN, but nothing can be promised.

**Japan (Y. Kuno):** A proposal for \$500K had been submitted, with a decision due about April. It is also hoped funding will continue through the US-Japan programme, at the level of about \$100K, for liquid hydrogen development. About \$20K over 2 years is available for travel through a UK-Japan programme, and Ken has also obtained £6K through this channel.

**Netherlands (F. Filthaut):** HEP funding generally has had a 10% cut, and it is hard to start new projects. The only possibility is small project-based grants. A request submitted 2 years ago was turned down, but they will try again. One PhD student is working on MICE, and the new director of NIKHEF has promised another.

**Switzerland & CERN (A. Blondel):** A proposal has been submitted to the Research Board, and will be presented on 3<sup>rd</sup> March. A request has been submitted to Steve Myers for refurbishment of r.f. equipment. MICE may have to pay costs of S.Fr.160K, but will request CERN pays this. (It will remain CERN property, and be returned after the experiment.) If not, Geneva may provide funds. A proposal has (again) been submitted to Geneva University for a student, post-doc plus S.Fr.3K/yr, for work on ToF. There is also a plan to make a submission to the EU for an Integrated Infrastructure Initiative in neutrino physics, including part funding for a muon beam at RAL.

**UK (K. Long):** A new initiative was described, with potential benefit for MICE. This is an r.f. power “basic technologies” bid, to a project intended to enhance UK industrial competence. This could potentially provide all or part of the RFCC modules. The bid will be prepared over the next 6 months.

**USA (D. Kaplan):** MICE is now funded by DOE (\$300K/yr) and NSF (\$100K/yr). Other proposals are in the pipeline, including an NSF MRI proposal (submitted) for ~\$2M over 2 years for a spectrometer solenoid, and NSF “Partnerships for International Research and Education”. Money approved for the US Muon Collaboration might also become available for MICE as other projects wind down.

## **6) Issues from Plenary Meeting requiring decisions:**

### **(a) Tracker Technology Choice**

G. Grégoire, as referee, informed us that Malcolm’s work had answered all outstanding questions, and he recommended the Sci.Fi. detector be adopted as the baseline tracker. This was agreed unanimously.

### **(b) Ratification of Design & Safety Working Group Proposal**

P. Drumm proposed a Design & Safety working group (DSWG), based on the group involved in the AFCSWG. This would be expanded to cover all of MICE in a timely manner. It would conduct an internal “audit” process and oversee the review stages, based on documentation linked through the WBS. Its aim would be to ensure success, rather than to increase workload. The DWSG would report to the Technical Board and advise the Executive Board. The proposal was accepted unanimously.

## **7) Policy for Presentations (Dan Kaplan)**

Dan presented a proposal, previously circulated by Alain by e-mail, for the approval of MICE material prior to presentation at conferences. Material should be shown at a collaboration meeting or a video conference at least 2 weeks prior to the conference (to allow time for a second iteration). A lengthy discussion of the details of this policy followed, and it was agreed it would be reviewed at a future meeting.

### **8) Date & Location of Next Collaboration Meeting**

This will be held on 26<sup>th</sup> – 29<sup>th</sup> June, in Frascati.

### **9) Video Conference Arrangements (Yagmur Torun)**

A discussion of the frequency and duration of video conferences was held. It was proposed that longer conferences every 4 weeks (instead of fortnightly) might be more productive. Extra meetings would be held where needed immediately before conferences, specifically on 27<sup>th</sup> April and 4<sup>th</sup> May before PAC05. The choice of technology was also discussed. More participants connect via phone than with a video link. ISDN video will be closing soon; other possibilities include IP, ESNNet (with video-phone bridge) and VRVS. With ESNNet, toll-free numbers might be possible (paid for by the collaboration). Yagmur was asked to look into this possibility.

CNB 27<sup>th</sup> May 2005