

LRP Issues:

(1) Town meetings and the DNP

What information is needed from TM's?

- Generally agreed that we should give guidance to TM writing groups – I will work on a letter to do this and send it around for comment in advance of July meeting

How should NSAC interface with the DNP to carry out the TM's?

- From comments received, most NSAC members believe that Town Meetings are to be handled by DNP – NSAC should be 'in the loop' for information but not for organization

(2) International representation

What level is useful?

- Consensus is that we MUST have representatives from outside the US attend the resolution meeting – this could (should?) include theorists.

Should international representatives be guests or members of writing/resolution committee?

- They would not be 'voting' or writing committee members.

What countries/regions should be included (Japan, Europe, others)?

- Canada, Europe and Japan (in alphabetical order!). No other countries or regions have been suggested.

(3) Non nuclear science representation

Should we have scientists not in our field to be part of the process?

If so, what level of representation is useful?

- Comments here are that we should have someone from NNSA background, also someone with medical applications background. In addition, some of you have suggested someone from HEP (to interface with v and possibly QCD), someone from astrophysics and possibly condensed-matter (for the many-body problem).
- My take on this is that we should expand our horizons a bit for working group membership. Do we want to expand into HEP, Condensed-Matter, Astrophysics and Astronomy? Certainly the next 'decadal' survey done by the NRC will. I would like to hear more about this if you have opinions. If we want to do this, we will need to make sure that DOE and NSF also agree.

(4) Report sections and 'section leaders'

What sections should we have?

- Most of you seem to be okay with the Implementation Report as the starting point. The concerns with this organization centered on having too much under one QCD umbrella. Various suggestions about how to deal with this were put forward. I think that we will need to be a bit flexible and see how the Town Meetings develop. We should revisit this in the fall.

What areas might need long lead time for input?

- Several people pointed out major facility issues that fall into this category so I will address that below.

- Otherwise, I have heard about sections dealing with education and outreach, applications/interdisciplinary activities and demographics. Perhaps it is not too soon to ask for volunteers at the July meeting to look into these and see what might be needed.

Should NSAC members be ‘section leaders?’

- The general consensus is to lean on NSAC members where appropriate for this. It may not be possible for all areas given the makeup of NSAC. In the past, members of the resolution committee have served in this capacity as well as NSAC members.

Two major facility related issues have come up – (1) A replacement for RIA and (2) an electron-ion collider. Both of these have the potential to be contentious in their own communities. This could spill over to the resolution meeting as well. Certainly these issues will come up at the Town Meetings. Hopefully the TM group can come to some consensus on them. As part of this, one NSAC member brought up the point that major equipment items (large detectors, new facilities or facility upgrades) can come to the resolution committee with very different levels of scrutiny for costs. If costs are ‘low-balled,’ it can make a major item look more favorable to the group. The suggestion is to have projects go through some uniform cost analysis. I agree that this would help. We will have to see if there is a practical way to do it.