

## **CINP Board Meeting Minutes**

**Date of the meeting : May 11, 2015**

### **Members in attendance :**

Jean Barrette, Jens Dilling, Paul Garrett, Gerald Gwinner, Garth Huber, Rituparna Kanungo and Jeff Martin

### **1. Approval of the Agenda**

Jean moved to approve the agenda and Jens seconded. The agenda was unanimously approved.

### **2. Approval of Minutes from April 2015 Board meeting**

Jens moved and Jean seconded to approve the minutes of the last meeting.

### **3. Finance Report**

(a) Paul reported that \$36,000 was spent last year and most of it was towards the summer program supporting undergraduate students. There is one outstanding issue related to conference support for the “Hard Probes” conference. The invoice of \$4000 was sent by the organizers back in January-February period but was not in the proper format that Guelph can accept. They were asked to submit a revised invoice. Meanwhile there was some confusion on invoice payment arising due to some error on the part of accounts payable at McGill. The situation is now sorted out. The revised invoice will now be paid. As a result at the end of the fiscal year there was a positive balance of \$1295 with this outstanding invoice.

- Garth pointed out that four URS travel awards have been granted but Paul has budgeted for five. Paul will correct this before the AGM.

Paul said that the invoice for executive director’s teaching release was received. Dues are now such that it just covers the teaching release. Invoice from the accounting firm has not yet been received.

Garth reminded that the Board approved in principle at its previous meeting that up to \$10,000 of private funds could be used to cover a shortfall of NSERC funds in FY15, and that it would be useful information to the Institutional Members to include this contingency in the financial statements.

In response to a question from Jens, Garth clarified that this amount is meant for travel expenses of the brief writing committee to write the CINP Brief. It also includes Garth’s travel to the LRP committee meetings.

Paul will put this amount in the private account budget and add a footnote explaining the usage of this money.

Jens moved and Ritu seconded to approve the amended finance report.

(b) Garth said that the institutional members will make a motion to waive the audit. The question was raised whether the Board should recommend every year that the audit be waived. Ritu moved and Jean seconded that the audit be waived this year.

#### **4. CINP Treasurer Search**

Jens reported that he asked Sonia for a CV and a brief statement but is still awaiting its receipt. Paul is yet to communicate with her. No further motion could be made at this point to approve Sonia as the CINP Treasurer.

#### **5. CINP Executive Director's Report**

(a) NSERC funding :

Garth opening discussion on whether we accept the five-year NSERC funding or ask for a three year term. Garth clarified that since we did not understand about the five year MRS before, Sarah Overington said that they can make an exception and let us decide now if we want three years instead of the granted five years.

Jean said we do not have any idea on the budget situation in three years. The present funding profile also has an increase over the five years. Gerald also echoed that this funding year went well but there could be risk of doing worse in the coming years. The main part currently missing from our ask is the support for post doctoral fellows. This however does not seem straightforward to get in the next years as well. Jean said that if after 3 years our budget would double that might make a difference but its probability looks very difficult.

Garth mentioned that based on comments from the SAPES the only place a budget increase could be foreseen is if we asked for bridge faculty positions with universities and negotiate with NSERC to make an exemption on these positions. SAPES also wants IPP to move towards such bridge faculty positions. However, getting the exemption from NSERC seems non trivial. Jens said that there could be some discussion with LPRC to make a recommendation along the lines of IPP scientists and bridge positions. He said at this moment it seems a gamble to ask for 3 years and let go of the approved extra 2 years that we have.

Jens moved to accept the five-year grant and Jean seconded it. There was unanimous approval.

(b) Membership

Jens moved that we accept Michael Wieser as a new faculty member. Jean seconded it.

(c) Garth mentioned about receiving the letters of thanks from TRIUMF.

(d) Garth circulated earlier to the Board and the Working Group Chairs the letter from the LPRC Chair.

Iris has a question on how the accelerator physics briefs will be collected.

Garth expressed significant concern on having the town hall meetings only over the internet.

Garth mentioned that it would be good to have one meeting.

Jean said that the main interested people are expected to be present in person at a Town Hall meeting and in addition video/internet link is good to have.

Besides this, the other issue that Garth will write in his response letter is to move the October 1 deadline for the brief since it is close to the NSERC grant submission period.

## **6. TRIUMF matters**

Jens reported that the CAPTURE funding received by TRIUMF will provide solid operational funds. TRIUMF is currently working with the NRC to fulfill the terms of reference. He explained that for every five-year plan there is a written plan to be submitted from TRIUMF to NRC outlining what TRIUMF will do in the next 5 years with the funding.

He said that the funding received was \$10 million less than the full CAPTURE proposal.

Garth enquired whether that part not funded would be the one related to material sciences. Jens said that the detailed balance workout is in progress.

There were funds allotted two years ago for a new cyclotron for nuclear medicine. Now the cost evaluation for the building for it is underway.

Jens pointed out that the budget announcement wording clearly mentioned basic science which is a very good sign showing that fundamental research is supported by the government and not only applied research.

## **7. Other business**

Jean asked about the institutional members meeting time. He also asked if one should propose names for new Board members. Jens is willing to continue his term Paul will step down as Board member. So we need at least one new person to be elected. Garth will ask for nominations for one Board member.

## **8. Next meeting**

Next meeting will be at Edmonton, during the CAP Congress. Most Board members said they will be at Edmonton. Garth will circulate a reminder on brief presentations and attendance at the Town Hall meeting.