

Minutes of the STFC Cross Community Committee
15 November 2016

Present: P.J. Nolan (Liverpool), J. Simpson (Daresbury), P. Walker (Surrey), T. Davinson (Edinburgh), I. Lazarus (Daresbury), R. Wadsworth (York, Chair), J. Hiscock (STFC), G. Madden (STFC)

Apologies: J. Long (STFC), G. Smith (Manchester)

1. Minutes of meeting 18th July 2016

- 1.1. The Committee commented on and agreed the minutes of 18th July 2016.
- 1.2. The Committee noted that Jim Thornhill has not yet expressed a desire to fully retire. Therefore, it is assumed that Thornhill will remain at 50% till 2021. The additional 10% of Thornhill requested for the ISOL-SRS project had not been allocated and this had been confirmed with the project.
- 1.3. Item 16.07 - It was noted that Edinburgh would be happy to consider cheaper options than currently offered by their own University for large volume data storage. The minutes have been updated to reflect this.
- 1.4. JS pointed out that although PARIS was not mentioned in the grant submissions, requests for design effort had been made via York during the current grant period and that this work was still on-going.

2. Report to NPGP on Cross Community Requests

- 2.1. The Committee noted that the report should comment on requests for CC staff funding from Daresbury/Liverpool/Manchester and how this matches to the requests for the use of their time to support the NP programme, future expertise needed by the community and any other useful information.
- 2.2. The Committee noted the most recent CC Staff request spread sheet circulated on 8 November 2016. It was noted that 0.4FTE on NUSTAR DESPEC (AIDA) for Targets was actually for ASIC work.
- 2.3. The Committee noted that Paul Morrall's time was often not requested by Universities in their consolidated grant proposals. The requests for his time in the spread sheet did not fully reflect his target activities or other requests on his time for mechanical technician support. The Committee noted that the corresponding column should be removed from the spreadsheet to avoid confusion. The Committee noted that an explanation of the Target activities and how Paul Morrall's time is allocated should be provided to the NPGP.
- 2.4. The Committee noted that CC effort had been requested to support existing STFC funded projects, consolidated grant themes and new projects. It was noted that not all new projects identified in the NPAP Roadmap had requested CC effort. The Committee noted that effort has already been ring fenced to projects which STFC is currently funding (ALICE

and ISOL-SRS). Taking into account the requests for two new (A.N. Other) posts in Mechanical and Software engineering, there is sufficient requested staff funding should all CG themes and the specified new projects be funded.

- 2.5. The Committee agreed that the report should indicate the procedure by which the CC effort has been allocated in recent years. It was agreed that following the grants round, the requested effort will be allocated according to which themes were funded by the NPGP and their ranking
- 2.6. The Committee noted that the report should contain information on succession planning. Details of institutes with individuals that are close to retirement and any succession plans could be provided. It was noted that continuity (alongside succession planning) is important in order to pass on knowledge and maintain skills. Furthermore, providing new interesting projects will aid in maintaining effort at Universities and Daresbury and help to develop skillsets. Recruitment of software engineers will be a priority, along with Electronics FPGA experts, which are difficult to recruit. Identifying mechanical expertise was easier as STFC has a pool of mechanical engineers who could work alongside the existing experts if required.
- 2.7. It was noted that the NPGP CC Introducers had been provided with the CC staff request spread sheet and that a revised version would be attached to the NPGP report.
- 2.8. The Committee noted that in the spreadsheet the "Total Requests For Use" were slightly higher than the requested staff funding; however, the requests were within 10% of the staff requested. The committee was not concerned by this and considered that workload could be managed.
- 2.9. The Committee noted that it is difficult to predict future effort requests and acknowledged that additional (currently unknown) calls on effort will arise over the next four years. The Committee noted that the report should inform the Panel on the need to be flexible for future requests; since it is important the CCC is able to absorb these requests in order to deliver world leading research. The current funding request does not allow for any flexibility regarding future requests.
- 2.10. The Committee noted that ALICE ITS effort has been ring fenced for construction. Theme 9 QCD Matter, on the Liverpool/Daresbury proposal contains a new request for effort for the ALICE ITS installation and commissioning phase. The Committee noted that the requested effort needed to be clearer and that this information would be supplied through the CC clarification meeting and the spread sheet updated accordingly. Additional effort for installation for the ISOL-SRS project is clearly defined in the spreadsheet and associated with a physics theme.
- 2.11. It was agreed that the report should comment on the fact that the overall CC post request has included a best guess for effort required on areas related to applied projects (i.e projects related to developments based on pure nuclear physics project).

- 2.12. It was agreed that the report should point out that 0.1 FTE/yr has been included in the CC effort requested for the leaders of the Mechanical, Electronics and Software tasks in order to allow for the co-ordination of the work in these areas. It was also agreed that it was important to note that experts in the CC areas are often called upon to provide initial input to potential future ideas and that this aspect is never accounted for in the effort requested, but does clearly have a time cost.
- 2.13. Bob Wadsworth agreed to draft the report and circulate to the committee for comment. The deadline for the finalised report is 3rd January 2017.

3. Membership Updates and Next Meeting

- 3.1. STFC informed the Committee of planned changes to the Cross-Community Committee. Bob Wadsworth and Phil Walker will be stepping down from the committee and will be replaced by two new members. Shortlisting for new members is currently underway. John Smith will be a new member on the Committee representing the NPGP, and will provide a direct link between the CCC and the NPGP. John Simpson and Paul Nolan will remain on the Committee. A discussion with Manchester regarding their representative is ongoing.
- 3.2. The next meeting will be held in summer 2017 following the NPGP grant awards and will focus on allocating the awarded effort.