Minutes of the MICE Collaboration Board held on 8th July 2010 at RAL

Present

CB Chair – A. Bross **Spokesman** – A. Blondel **Deputy** –M. Zisman

Technical Coordinator – A. Nichols

Brunel University – P. Kyberd Chicago – G. Hanson (proxy) DPNC, Geneva – J-S. Graulich Illinois Inst. Tech. – D. Kaplan Imperial College – K. Long INFN Milano – M. Bonesini INFN Napoli – V. Palladino INFN Roma III – L. Tortore

KEK – S. Ishimoto

LBNL – D. Li

Liverpool – R. Gamet Mississippi – D. Summers

Muons Inc. – T. Roberts (by phone) New Hampshire – U. Bravar (by phone)

Oxford – J. Cobb RAL – T. Bradshaw Riverside – G. Hanson Sheffield – C. Booth Sofia – Y. Karadzhov Warwick – D. Adey

1) Approval of Minutes of 25th March 2010

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

2) Spokesman's Remarks (Alain Blondel)

The new MICE Project Board will meet on 23rd September. The schedule to be presented there is not yet finalised but will be prepared and circulated to the collaboration by e-mail or video conference. The problems with access to MICE computers from outside RAL have been resolved. Now that MICE is taking data, the MICO agenda has been modified to emphasise beam-line tuning. We are missing one MOM in November. Thanks to P. Kyberd for preparing the shift schedule – there are lots of young people involved, but seniors will also be around. V. Palladino & D. Kaplan were thanked for their hard work organising speakers and editorial board arrangements, particularly for IPAC. Papers should be "on behalf of the MICE collaboration", with the author list on the most recent MICE Status report, given as a reference.

Shift policy was discussed. All authors should take shifts. It was proposed that quotas be distributed to groups, based on number of authors. There was discussion of whether groups in charge of critical items could request a waiver if MICE shifts would delay construction, and also of whether "service tasks" such as MOM, BLOC etc should count as shifts for this allocation. There was no consensus on this last point, and the Spokesman agreed to draft a proposal for further discussion. It was also pointed out that response to the Common Fund census was not good, and we should avoid sending out two separate requests for lists of names.

The problem of groups not paying their Common Fund contributions (Harbin, Sofia, ...) was raised. The suggestion that extra shifts might be taken in lieu was not liked by the Board. Other in-kind contribution might be possible, such as extra technician support. D. Li agreed to raise this with Harbin.

We have manpower issues, with crucial people leaving the collaboration, who need to be replaced soon. We also need a cryogenics specialist and magnet engineer. However, we were urged to be confident that present difficulties (such as with the spectrometer solenoids) would be overcome as others had been in the past, and we should be confident that the goals of MICE would be achieved!

3) Project Manager's Report (A. Nichols)

We were referred to talks in the main Collaboration Meeting for details of plans for the Spectrometer Solenoids, and a description of the redefinition of the UK project to advance work on the liquid hydrogen and RF infrastructure. M. Zisman asked if reduction in UK funding to other projects might mean RAL personnel could become available to work MICE. This may be a possibility.

4) Common Fund (Ken Long)

Last financial year, the levy was £171K, of which £147K had been received; £149.3K had been spent. The proposal for 2010-11, based on that agreed for the previous year, was presented; this amounts to £169.5K. The collection of the2010-11 contributions – 60 people at £3K = £180K – would now be initiated.

5) NSF Update (Gail Hanson)

Following the Collaborative Proposal submitted to NSF last September, on behalf of IIT, Mississippi (with a sub-award to Iowa), U.C. Riverside (with a sub-award to New Hampshire) and Chicago, funding recommendations were received in March for three years, rising from \$326K in year one to over \$426K in year 3 (a total of over \$1,138K). Grants should start 1st July (back-datable 90 days), and it was hoped funds could start flowing on 1st August. NSF is keen to support students, and Chicago would start with students working on MICE, with support to be increased if this is successful. (The recent problems with U.S. student access to RAL were not helpful!) The University of Mississippi had received a Major Research Instrumentation grant \$1.6M (£1M) for MICE RF work.

6) Speakers' Bureau Report (Vittorio Palladino)

The status of planned talks and submitted abstracts was presented. We were well represented at IPAC and Neutrino 2010. ICHEP10, LINAC10 and NuFact10 are approaching, and applications for talks are in progress. (NuFact10 is very late in calling for contributions.)

7) October and Future Collaboration Meetings

R. Tsenov gave details of CM28, to be held on 3rd-8th October at the Bankya Palace Spa Hotel near Sofia. Further information has been circulated to the collaboration by e-mail. The location is a small resort town, 17 km from the Sofia city centre. Help was requested for organising the scientific agenda for the meeting. In response to questions, we were told that transfers from the airport would be organised, and car rental would not be necessary.

The location of other meetings was discussed. The following meeting might be in February at RAL. A meeting could be arranged in Oxford outside term time. Different accommodation packages in a college were discussed, and J. Cobb agreed to make further enquiries.

8) Any Other Business

ECFA Review Panel (Ken Long)

A proposed review panel for future large infrastructures for neutrino oscillation experiments had been presented to EUROnu, IDS-NF and Neu2012 and the initiative was welcomed by the community. The panel should be international, and composed of recognised leaders in the field. It is important that laboratory and funding-agency directors are adequately involved, and that there is cross membership with ICFA, ACFA etc. Further details have been circulated by e-mail.

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{CNB 16}^{\text{th}} \, \text{July 2010} \\ \text{Amended 31}^{\text{st}} \, \text{August 2010} \end{array}$