

# **PAC34 Draft Charge**

# Three Major Review Elements

## I. Proposals and Letters of Intent for Experiments that Will Use the Base Equipment (and modest scale ancillary equipment)

Is the science, based on what we know today, highly likely to be of sufficient scientific merit that it will be included *in the top half of* the priority list to be established for the first 5 years of 12 GeV Operations?

## II. Proposals and Letters of Intent for Experiments that Will Use Major New Experimental Apparatus Not Included in the 12 GeV Upgrade Complement of “Base Equipment”

Is the science *comparable in merit to that of the research that will be supported by the “base equipment” under construction for the 12 GeV Upgrade? Does it represent an effective use of resources comparable to that of the base equipment? Does it belong in the priority list to be established for the first decade of 12 GeV Operations?* Does it merit detailed pursuit of resources and funding for the major new apparatus required?

## III. The Plan that has been Assembled for Running the Remainder of the “6 GeV Program”

# I. Proposals and LOI for Experiments that Will Use the Base Equipment (and modest scale ancillary equipment)

## Jefferson Lab requests that PAC 34:

- Review both proposals\* and letters of intent† for experiments that will use the base equipment currently planned for the 12 GeV Upgrade and provide advice on their scientific merit, technical feasibility and resource requirements.
- Identify proposals with high-quality physics that, based on what we know today, is of sufficient scientific merit that it will be included in *the top half of* the priority list to be established for the first 5 years of 12 GeV Operations
- Identify other proposals with physics that has the potential for falling into this category pending clarification of scientific and/or technical issues
- Provide comments on technical and scientific issues that should be addressed by the proponents prior to a second review and the assignment of scientific priority at a future PAC.

\* Proposals and letters of intent will be considered ONLY if the proponents clearly state their intent to participate in and contribute to the construction of the base equipment.

† Letters of intent for 12 GeV at PAC34 will be given the same “rights” to their scientific ideas as are currently afforded to deferred experiments

# PAC 12 GeV Review Grading

## Categorize Proposals:

- **APPROVAL:** This proposal, based on what we know today, is highly likely to be of sufficient scientific merit that it will be included in *the top half of* the priority list to be established for the first 5 years of 12 GeV Operations
  - Provide comments on technical and scientific issues that should be addressed by the proponents prior to a second review and the assignment of scientific priority at a future PAC
- **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL:** This proposal has the potential for falling into the APPROVED category but serious work is needed to clarify scientific and/or technical issues
  - Provide comments on technical and scientific issues that should be addressed by the proponents prior to its presentation to a future PAC
- **DEFER:** This proposal does not appear to have the potential for falling into the APPROVED category, and a major effort will be needed to justify its inclusion based on identified fundamental problems
  - Provide comments on technical and scientific issues that must be addressed by the proponents prior to its presentation to a future PAC

## II. Proposals and LOI for Experiments that Will Require Major New Experimental Apparatus Not Included in the 12 GeV Upgrade Complement of “Base Equipment”

### Jefferson Lab requests that PAC 34:

- Review both proposals\* and letters of intent† for experiments that will require major new experimental apparatus not included in the base equipment currently planned for the 12 GeV Upgrade and provide advice on their scientific merit, technical feasibility and resource requirements.
- Identify proposals with high-quality physics that: is of scientific merit comparable to that of the research that will be supported by the “base equipment” under construction for the 12 GeV Upgrade; represents an effective use of resources comparable to that of the base equipment; belongs in the priority list to be established for the first decade of 12 GeV Operations; and merits detailed pursuit of resources and funding
- Provide comments on technical and scientific issues that should be addressed by the proponents prior to subsequent technical reviews and a second review and the assignment of scientific priority at a future PAC.

\* Proposals and letters of intent will be considered ONLY if the proponents clearly state their intent to participate in and contribute to the construction of the proposed equipment.

† Letters of intent for 12 GeV at PAC34 will be given the same “rights” to their scientific ideas as are currently afforded to deferred experiments

# PAC 12 GeV Review Grading

## Categorize Proposals:

- **APPROVAL:** This proposal, based on what we know today, is of scientific merit comparable to that of the research that will be supported by the “base equipment” under construction for the 12 GeV Upgrade. It represents an effective use of resources comparable to that of the base equipment, and it belongs in the priority list to be established for the first decade of 12 GeV. You urge the laboratory to investigate the technical details completely and start the process of identifying the resources necessary to construct the equipment required
  - Provide comments on technical and scientific issues that should be addressed by the proponents prior to a further reviews that will be held and prior to the assignment of scientific priority at a future PAC
- **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL:** This proposal has the potential for falling into the APPROVED category but serious work is needed to clarify scientific and/or technical issues
  - Provide comments on technical and scientific issues that should be addressed by the proponents prior to its presentation to a future PAC
- **DEFER:** This proposal does not appear to have the potential for falling into the APPROVED category, and a major effort will be needed to justify its inclusion based on identified fundamental problems
  - Provide comments on technical and scientific issues that must be addressed by the proponents prior to its presentation to a future PAC

### III. The Plan that has been Assembled for Running the Remainder of the “6 GeV Program”

#### **Please address the following:**

- Do the underlying scientific priorities that drove the overall plan, setting beam conditions and narrowing choices for experiments in other halls provide a firm conceptual foundation for our effort to optimize the remaining 6 GeV science program?
- A number of experiments have been identified as “at risk”:
  - Those needing major equipment construction with resources not yet fully identified
  - Those falling in portions of the schedule that are likely to be eliminated in reduced budget scenarios

We welcome your suggestions for additional considerations in the decision process as budgets become known, and your comments on the merits of experiments in the “at risk” group that might be addressed if incremental funding is found