

CINP Board Meeting Minutes

June 7, 2024, 13:30 At/12:30 East/11:30 MB/10:30 SK+AB/9:30 BC

Present: Gwen Grinyer, Thomas Brunner, Garth Huber (non-voting), Chris Ruiz, Greg Hackman (non-voting), Olga (Liliana) Caballero Suarez, Russel Mammei
Absent: Rituparna Kanungo

Minutes taken by Thomas Brunner

1. Approval of Agenda

Thomas motions to approve agenda, Chris seconds.

2. Approval of Minutes of May 28/24

Chris moves to approve minutes, Gwen seconds.

3. Discussion about upcoming NSERC renewal

Garth has circulated the two budget scenarios (accept 1-year COVID-19 extension or submit application this year). Accepting the 1-year extension will require cuts to the program this year and next year. The likeliest cuts will be to travel (CINP student fellow travel next year, international travel this and next year). The junior scientist program will also need to go to zero for next year.

Garth investigated if any of the LRP expenses can be deferred to April 2026 but this does not appear to be feasible since most expenses will occur before April 2026. The extension scenario will bring the budget to zero at the end of the grant cycle with no carry forward.

Alternatively, applying for a new grant this fall will maintain the current CINP program with inflation-based increases. We would request on the order of \$140k-\$150k per year. For FY2019 we received \$85k from NSERC to cover LRP expenses, it was \$75k in all of the other years. Garth explains that in the last LRP round CINP was taken by surprise when they learned that NSERC would not pay in full for the LRP preparation work (our \$10k budget was expected to cover Brief writing expenses and ExecDir travel) but was expecting institutes to contribute to cost sharing (ratio: 1/3 CINP and 2/3 IPP). The cost for the coming LRP will need to also come from our NSERC budget. Future expenses to LRP are unknown but the projection is \$9k for people to meet and draft the brief, in addition to \$10k to cover the LRPC expenses.

The big difference in budget this year compared to previous years is the significant increase to CINP undergrad fellowships which was approved by the Board in March 4/24 E-vote to give a fixed acceptance rate.

Garth reports that the question about raising the graduate fellowship was discussed at the CINP AGM during CAP last week and that consensus was to slightly increase

the number of fellowships and their amount to 3 awards at \$15,000 (currently 2 awards/year at \$13,000). The Junior Scientist program would also be increased by \$1,000 in a future grant request.

Chris asks what the benefits are of taking the extension and what the downsides are. Greg states that everyone else is taking the extension and that optically it may be negatively perceived by the community if we do not take the extension while others do. However, by now so much time has passed that it may not have any negative impact not taking the extension.

Garth mentions that this summer would be better for him to prepare the proposal due to the expected high work load next year with the LRP and it is advantageous of having a travel budget to support the LRP without deficits.

Greg states that in the past we were asking for \$130k and received significant less. This year's request is not so far off from the proposed request 5 years ago.

Russ asks to confirm if most of the writing will be on the shoulders of Garth and Greg. Garth states yes and emphasizes that he would prefer to write the grant proposal this year. Russ argues that we should apply this year.

Gwen was following up on the optics on how it would be perceived. Greg argues that applying this year works best in our schedule and that we cannot run our program with \$75k/year.

Liliana wonders if applying next year will actually hurt us because we will apply with a reduced/slimmed budget/program. Liliana states that in future fellowship/award rounds we can ask recipients of awards to self declare if they belong to a federally recognized group for us to keep track for our reporting and grant application. Garth explains that we keep track of gender in the application process as we request their pronouns. Female applicants are receiving about double the percentage of awards compared to their fraction in the community. Thomas suggests that we could ask past recipients to self-identify in a survey in support of our grant application. Thomas is tasked to send a list with questions to the group.

Liliana asks if we should consider requesting more than \$150k/year. The discussion evolves around the deviations between NOI and application that NSERC accepts and the numbers and values of our scholarships. Consensus evolves that we should apply for the cost of a strong program that can be well defended. With respect to targeted scholarships Garth raises concerns that the number of applicants is small.

Thomas motions to vote to apply for NSERC this fall. Russ seconds. All vote in favor.

Greg suggests requesting the budget that Garth has presented in his spreadsheet. It is a well defendable budget. Russ seconds the statement that we should request funding for well defendable expenses and a strong program. Greg reports that interest into the Junior Scientist award is less after covid and we will need to see how we pitch it in the application. Garth notes there has been a recent uptick in interest, but it is too early to know if this will be sustained.

For the NOI and the application, the group is discussing a request of \$165 in year one to account for the LRP cost and \$148k/year for all consecutive years.

Greg leaves at 1:09 pm ET.

4. Update on discussions with IPP on new Canadian Subatomic Physics Long Range

Garth had a long discussion with Carsten Krauss at CAP on how to prepare the coming LRP. There were a lot of issues that were raised in this discussion.

In order to develop a schedule, Garth took the timeline of the last LRP process and moved it by 5 years. Garth then walks through the schedule that has been circulated to the board via email.

Garth explains that ten years ago NSERC was in charge of the LRP process. In the last round this responsibility was shared between the institutes (IPP and CINP) and NSERC. This round the expectation is that CINP and IPP will drive the process, with input from NSERC, CFI and the institutes. Over the summer Garth will develop the draft terms of reference with the IPP director and present a draft to the board. Garth will also circulate the terms of reference of the past two LRP rounds with the board. Garth will discuss the terms of reference and NSERC's role with Kevin Lapointe (NSERC) at the upcoming ACOT meeting.

Gwen asks about the look ahead to 2041. Garth states that the terms of reference will need to define the time frame of the LRP. Since experiments in SAP typically take a long time there is value for strategic planning in looking at time periods beyond the 5 year horizon. Other things for the terms of reference may be a prioritization of experiments. More details will come in the fall.

5. Other Business

The discussion circles back to the question on self identification. Liliana is concerned that people may not feel comfortable answering a survey. Thomas reports that for nEXO-Canada an anonymous survey on EDI is administered through SNOLAB and suggests that we could ask the lab to run a similar survey for us.

Gwen mentions that there is a lot of duplicated effort between the various communities and institutes and questions whether we should use this information that is available already instead. Gwen argues that statistics of small numbers is not necessarily useful for the evaluation of our EDI efforts.

6. Approximate date of next meeting

Garth will send out a doodle for availability in the week of August 26, 2024 for the next board meeting. The discussion evolves if we should have an earlier meeting to collect information for the application but it does not appear to be necessary.

7. Adjourn

Thomas motions to adjourn, Chris seconds. Meeting adjourns at 1:27 pm ET.