

LCLS Users' Executive Committee (UEC) Meeting

October 14, 2009

The LCLS UEC met by conference call and the meeting was called to order at 9:30 am PST by UEC Chair Linda Young.

Attendees: John Arthur, Anton Barty, Uwe Bergmann, Phil Heimann, Dick Lee, Harry Ihee, Cathy Knotts, Art Nelson, Jochen Schneider, Jo Stöhr, Linda Young

LCLS Director's Update: Jo Stöhr discussed recent LCLS management changes including a new consulting role for Jochen Schneider beginning in December 2009. After retirement from DESY in Hamburg Germany, Jochen accepted a temporary appointment at SLAC to help in the formative stage of LCLS to get science underway. Jochen will step down and Uwe Bergmann, who was recently appointed LCLS Deputy Director, will take over these management responsibilities for the X-ray Facilities Division (XFD) beginning this month. Within XFD, John Arthur heads the X-ray Operations and Engineering Department, Jerry Hastings heads the X-ray R&D Department, and Bill White heads the Laser Department (LCLS will provide core competency at SLAC for lasers since lasers are an essential part of our program). LCLS has been receiving assistance with controls from Guenter Holler and his group with the PPA Directorate, and we are recruiting for a permanent head of LCLS XFD Experiment Controls Department.. The Controls person will be responsible for experiment controls, instrument interfacing, PPS, and interfacing with many groups including users as well as scientific staff at LCLS, AD, and PPA. Jo invited the user community to recommend candidates for this vital role.

Cathy Knotts is responsible for user research administration at both SSRL and LCLS. Since the LCLS is in an early development stage, we rely on her knowledge and experience to help develop policies and processes to support user research. In the start up phase, significant scientific input is also needed, and Uwe will take lead responsibility for interfacing with staff, the Proposal Review Panel (PRP), and users regarding scientific proposal review and experiment scheduling.

In the start up phase, the laser has been performing better than expected with beam exceeding parameters given to users. This is great news but may pose potential problems with users wanted to expand the experiments proposed and approved for their scheduled beam time. While we want to encourage scientific progress and innovation, we have to be sensitive to other scheduled experiments. Since the opportunity exists to clarify expectations, policies will be communicated to handle this scenario. Information on planned studies, samples, targets, etc. needs to be clearly communicated and coordinated with the instrument scientist. It may only be possible to accommodate additional samples or slightly modified parameters that are consistent with the approved proposal, but this should be only be done in consultation with the instrument/beam line scientist and LCLS management as appropriate; extended or additional studies would not be approved if they overlap or conflict with future scheduled experiments.

Communication Guidelines: We will try to keep the highest ethical standards possible when in comes to experiments conducted as well as identification of collaboration teams, discussion of results, press and

publicity of LCLS experiments. Co-authorship needs to be established early on for LCLS research, which may be more like the high energy physics community than authorship on traditional synchrotron papers. It will be necessary to decide in advance who is allowed to talk about research results as well as when and in which situations. Positive press is very important for LCLS and its users, and some fields and journals are very sensitive about advance disclosure. Any planned press needs to be coordinated with LCLS and relevant user institutions. LCLS needs to be informed any time any user has a paper accepted so that press releases can must be coordinated with SLAC Communications as well as with users' institutions and adhere to journal embargo requirements. Communications policies will be established to deal with these situations, and group leaders will be reminded in correspondence with the expectation that they will share this information with their collaborators, students, and other proposal team members.

An access policy was drafted last year and is currently being reviewed and revised to address input from the user community. This will be posted to the LCLS website after obtaining feedback from the UEC.

Proposal Review: Jo and Uwe discussed new guidelines for proposal submission and review. Standards for review of LCLS experiment are higher because it is a new facility with limited initial availability. Given the high percentage of excellent science that will not be able to receive beam time, operations will be scrutinized and some users may not be happy that their proposed experiments are not scheduled.

The next opportunity to submit new LCLS proposals is November 3, 2009. The proposal format has been updated (with a shorter and slightly different format) in response to recommendations from the PRP. A user portal, jointly developed for both LCLS and SSRL, requires users to register first before they can submit a proposal. The scientific user community is strongly encouraged to first communicate with instrument scientists before preparing a proposal to understand operating conditions, machine parameters, and what is possible at this time. Proposal workshops have been held and will continue to be held to encourage this type of exchange.

Rotations for the Proposal Review Panel (PRP) are planned but specific terms have not yet been defined. The PRP reviews are evolving from an instrument focus to relevant fields. While we realize that these changes may be confusing to users, we must retain flexibility in the early stages to modify the process to best serve the users and the facility. For example, rather than ask the PRP to provide a numerical rating, there is a desire for a more a more precise relative ranking. Uwe discussed plans to increase the size of PRP to 14 members. Users will be asked to suggest up to three reviewers and to identify individuals with potential conflicts. The PRP will decide to what extent they make use of the suggested external reviews and to what extent they will review proposal within the PRP. The PRP will meet twice a year to review proposals that will be eligible for beam about one year after submission. LCLS will provide a rough estimate of the percentage of proposals that could be scheduled, and the PRP will divide themselves into subpanels by scientific area to rank proposals within that area. The entire PRP will then reconvene to review the top tier proposals and determine the final ranking. LCLS management will not participate in the PRP meetings unless the PRP requests assistance to clarify questions. Once the PRP provides the proposal ranking, LCLS management, instrument scientists and safety staff will review proposals for

feasibility, and a schedule will be drafted. The final results of the proposal review and the schedule will be communicated to proposers by LCLS management.

In addition to doing good science, safety must be at the forefront. LCLS will add more safety and technical staff to support proposed experiments which are more difficult than originally anticipated. For example, the CAMP chamber is a complex set up requiring infrastructure and safety reviews from various SLAC safety committees. A laser accident occurred at SLAC recently, and a major review process is underway. As a result, laser use at present is very restrictive. It is not clear that we can qualify external laser operators, and even international laser experts will be limited in the types of work they can perform while at LCLS. In addition, we will not be able to accommodate one of the experiments originally scheduled later this run. This has been communicated to that proposer. As additional information and requirements are known, this will be disseminated more broadly.

Future Meetings: Representatives of the UEC are scheduled to meet with DOE BES representatives during the users' conference in October. Discussions may involve future FEL facilities, possible LCLS II upgrades to take advantage of current position and implement improvements to allow seeding and running more hutches simultaneously to increase the capability for more user experiments.

The next open meeting for all of the LCLS user community will be October 20, 2009 during the annual users' conference. Uwe Bergmann will discuss the proposal review process in more detail with the users' organization. Contact the UEC chair or vice chair to suggest other topics for discussion.