

Minutes of the MICE Collaboration Board

31st October 2003 at Cosener's House, Abingdon

Present

G. Barr, Oxford	P. Kyberd, Brunel
A. Blondel, Geneva	G. Giannini, Trieste & INFN
M. Bonesini, Milano	S. Kahn, BNL
C. Booth, Sheffield	Y. Kuno, Osaka
A. Bross, FNAL	K. Long, Imperial College London
P. Dornan, Imperial College London	V. Palladino, Napoli
R. Edgecock, RAL	K. Peach, RAL
D. Errede, UIUC	P. Soler, Glasgow
F. Filthaut, NIKHEF	D. Summers, Mississippi
S. Geer, FNAL	A. Tonazzo, Roma III
G. Grégoire, Louvain	Y. Torun, IIT
H. Haseroth, CERN	K. Yoshimura, KEK
D. Kaplan, IIT/ICL	M. Zisman, LBNL
A. Klier, UCR	

1) Adoption of Agenda; selection of Chair and Secretary

The agenda was adopted. Peter Dornan was accepted as chair of the meeting; Chris Booth was elected as secretary to the Board, for a period of 3 years.

2) Overall Cost of MICE, Proposal for Common Funds (Paul Drumm)

Paul proposed a method of calculating the overall cost of the project, based on the UK model. This included Value Added Tax at 17.5% on materials, a contingency of 30% and inflation at 3% per year. Infrastructure costs not present in the proposal were also included. The total is in excess of that expected from the various funding agencies. However this is known to be an overestimate as contingencies have almost certainly been included more than once on some elements. Paul stressed that it was important to confirm the figures, and asked that people respond promptly to his requests for clarification of the various costings. Further progress on the Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) should also help to reduce contingencies, as will further work in identifying reusable equipment (such as the PSI solenoid, r.f. equipment from CERN, etc.).

Ken Peach and Andrew Taylor reviewed the requirement for Gateway 1. The costs must be presented in a consistent way, but it should be possible to obtain permission to proceed with an "amber light" without promises of funding. A business case with funding lined up will be required for Gateway 2.

Paul compared the running of MICE with the RIKEN facility, which pays for use of ISIS beam, facilities etc. Since MICE will use beam halo, we may not be charged for protons, but could expect to be charged ground rent for the use of the hall, offices etc, transport costs, administrative and secretarial overheads (e.g. procurement), consumables (liquid nitrogen, helium etc), electricity and use of RAL resources such as surveyors, heavy gang, etc. Ken Peach commented that £5k per signing author was historically a typical amount. In discussion, it was agreed that contingencies were not really Common Fund expenses.

3) Funding Status

Belgium (G. Grégoire): The request for 2004 had not been approved. Lobbying will continue, with a request for €100k in 2005 to be introduced. Indications of the result should be obtained in mid 2004. (Because of the reduction in the size of the aerogel Cerenkov, the costs for this detector will be reduced.)

France (J-M. Rey, via A. Blondel): Particle physicist participation in the experiment is being sought, in addition to the current involvement of Saclay engineers, to strengthen the bid.

Italy (V. Palladino): INFN experimental particle physics committee had not approved funding for MICE, but referred it for consideration as accelerator R & D. TPG development has been funded for '03 and '04. A successful outcome of future bids will probably depend on increased participation in MICE by other EU countries.

Japan (Y. Kuno): €200k per year has been secured for the past 3 years for MuCool, and will be available for another year for overlapping MICE items, such as work on liquid hydrogen tests, scintillating fibre prototypes etc. A request has been made to the Ministry of Education for €500k (for items such as the tracker and superconductor for spectrometer solenoids), and people are optimistic of a positive decision next spring. A further request for €1M from the muon science budget will be submitted in November.

Russia (via A. Blondel & H. Haseroth): Discussions are proceeding with Novosibirsk, Protvino & ITEP. "In kind" contributions of engineering work are possible.

Switzerland (A. Blondel): A small grant (S.Fr.40k) has been received for work on the TPG. A request has been submitted for S.Fr.2.3M for equipment and staffing. In addition, it is hoped that, as well as the PSI solenoid, used r.f. and cryogenic equipment may be made available from CERN.

UK – PPARC (K. Long): The project was proposed to the committees earlier this year, and received scientific endorsement. The collaboration was asked to respond to various possible funding scenarios. An outcome is still pending. For the current year, £50k was provided for the tracker and £200-300k for beam, infrastructure and focus pair development.

UK – CCLRC (P. Drumm): £300-400k is currently being spent on beam and infrastructure.

USA (D. Kaplan): \$24M has been requested from the NSF; a decision is expected early next year. NSF reviews have been favourable, and there is an enthusiasm for accelerator R & D. It is hoped the DoE will also contribute.

Other items: K. Peach plans to set up a committee of funding agency representatives about Easter next year. R. Edgecock is exploring ways of bidding for EU money, possibly about €2M.

4) MICE Constitution (Peter Dornan)

A few comments had been received on the draft circulated in June, and have been incorporated. Now the requirement is that either the spokesperson or deputy spokesperson should be close to RAL during data taking. Details of the Technical Board have been adapted to match the WBS.

Voting in the Collaboration Board will be one vote per voting institute, and the quorum is 50% of eligible members. Abstentions are not included when deciding if a sufficient majority has been obtained for a motion to be carried. Proxy votes would be arranged by institutes sending exact voting instructions to the chairman of the Board.

The Spokesperson is to be appointed one month after the approval of MICE – this is interpreted as 1 month after a satisfactory outcome of Gateway 1 (12th December). A Search Committee consisting of one representative from each defined region will consult the members. If a consensus is reached, that name will be proposed at the next Collaboration Board; otherwise, nominations will be put forward for a subsequent vote.

The constitution was approved unanimously.

5) Organisation of Spokesperson Election (Peter Dornan)

In anticipation of a successful outcome of Gateway 1, it was agreed that a Search Committee (as defined above) be formed following the meeting. Peter Dornan was approved as Chair of the Committee. Collaboration Board members will be consulted over the following 2-3 weeks for their views.

6) Future Collaboration Meetings (Vittorio Palladino)

The following dates and locations were proposed for Collaboration Meetings:

29 th March – 1 st April 2004	CERN
2 nd – 4 th August 2004	Osaka (after vFact'04)
21 st – 24 th November 2004??	RAL
Spring 2005	USA
Summer 2005	Frascati (after vFact'05)
Autumn 2005	RAL

7) Choice of Tracker Technology

The recommendations of the referees (D. Summers & Gh. Grégoire) as presented in the Collaboration Meeting, that “the SciFi should remain the baseline choice for design, engineering and construction” was accepted. In discussion of the term “baseline”, it was agreed that if further results showed the SciFi could not meet the requirement, the decision would have to be reviewed, but otherwise construction would proceed assuming the use of that technology. The TPG would remain a consideration for a possible upgrade, but that would be for a later phase of the experiment.

CNB 13/11/'03