



Minutes of the 1st Meeting of the SNX Council

The meeting took place at Villigen, 27th and 28th May 2004
PSI, Building WSLA/108

Present :

SNX Council Members : R. Abela (Chairman)
D. Nicholson (Vice-Chairman)
E. Hough, K. Knudsen (Norwegian Members)
G. Chapuis, R. Cerny (Swiss members)
H-P Weber (Beam Lines Director)

Observers N. Maras (NSR)
J-P Ruder (BBW)

Technical Advisors P. Pattison, Hermann Emerich

Advisors J-D. Grunwaldt

Meeting's Secretary C. Heurtebise

May 27th

The Chairman welcomed everyone.

1. ADMINISTRATIVE ASPECTS

In Attendance: SNX Council, SNX Administrative Secretary, Observers

1.1. Approval of the Agenda [R. Abela]

The agenda is approved.

1.2. Composition of the SNX Council

Hans-Peter Weber reminds the committee that in fact this is the second meeting, the first one took place in Lausanne, and that the members are appointed for a period of three years (see the document from Marti) from the date of signature on the 23rd January 2004.

The composition of the Council is agreed.

1.3. Confirmation of the Chair and Vice-Chair

The Chairman, Rafael Abela, and the Vice-Chairman, David Nicholson are both confirmed by the Council Members.

1.4. Decision on the duration of the mandate of the Council members

The duration is of **three years** for each member. **The Chairman** raises the question of when is time zero. It is agreed to keep the previous mandates so as to avoid having all the Members being changed at the same time.

It was decided to produce a table showing when each member started:

	Beginning of the Mandate	No. of times present at the meetings (including 1 st SNX meeting)	End of the Mandate, according to starting date
On the Swiss Side			
Rafael Abela	Chairman as from Nov. 2003	2	June 2006
Gervais Chapuis	Official Start Dec. 2002	4	June 2005
Radovan Cerny	Dec. 2002	4	June 2005
On the Norwegian Side			
David Nicholson	Vice-Chairman from Nov. 2003	2	June 2006
Ed Hough	Dec 2000	8	Nov 2005
Kenneth Knudsen	Dec. 2002	4	June 2005
H-P Weber	Nov 2003	2	June 2006

1.5. Decision on the presence of Advisors with specific competences

The Chairman is of the opinion that it is highly desirable to have advisors with specific competences present at the SNX Meetings. He proposes to have Frode Mo on the Norwegian side and Jan-Dierk Grunwaldt on the Swiss side. There might be more Advisors at future meetings. This was approved.

1.6. Approval of the minutes of the 23rd SOC meeting

Only one comment was made regarding those minutes: **The Chairman** suggested that the final version be officially approved by **the Chairman** once all the members have agreed to the Minutes.

The Minutes are approved.

1.7. Review and results of actions decided at last meeting

23.3.1. Frode Mo has been chosen to represent SNX Council at SLS meetings. Approved by SOC. **This will be effective from next SLS meeting in 2004.**

23.4.1. This document (“Decision BLD/SNBL”) will be sent to staff members by the Chairman, Rafael Abela. **Done**

23.5.1. Rafael Abela and Hans-Peter Weber to write the draft of the mandate for the manpower committee. **Done**

23.6.1. Hermann Emerich is to organise a meeting during spring 2004 in order to coordinate the needs of the users for sample environment reaction cells. **Will take place on 18th June in Trondheim.**

23.6.2. Hermann Emerich is to provide SOC with a cost breakdown of the B station refurbishment and the installation of the B mono in the optics enclosure. **Done Jan 04**

23.6.3. The SNBL staff is to provide SOC the cost breakdown for the improvement of the general infrastructure eg. modern terminals. The SOC members are committed to providing additional funds from their own institutions. **Done Dec 03**

23.7.1. Hans-Peter Weber is to organise a retreat with the SNBL team and invited experts. **Will take place end of September/beginning of October 2004.**

23.7.2. Representatives for the Review of SNBL. Three names have been mentioned on the Swiss side, a minimum of two will have to be suggested from the Norwegian side. To be coordinated by the Director and finalized by Email. **Done**

The Chairman commented on the above action that the ESRF had not yet decided on the names. Two representatives will be from the ESRF Advisory Committee, namely Gerry Lander and U. Pietsch. **Hans-Peter Weber** inquired on how they were selected to which **the Chairman** replied that it was mainly on a voluntary basis. The other representatives should be chosen by the Directors of the ESRF.

23.9.1. Hans-Peter Weber will send an electronic form of the draft of the Activity Report 2002 to SOC participants for comments. Deadline for comments 15/01/2004. **Sent 19/01/04**

23.13.1. SNX Council agreed that the Audit to be carried out for the period of 15 months (October 2002 to December 2003).

23.13.2. "Compte d'exploitation" to be sent to Jean-Pierre Ruder and Nils Maras as soon as possible, (at the latest 15/02/2004). **Will be done during the 1st SNX Meeting.**

23.13.3. Hans-Peter Weber to provide a prioritised list of extra equipment needed urgently. **Done. Given to G. Chapuis at Herbelon.**

23.13.4. Hans-Peter Weber to e-mail to SOC members the graphs (attached to the four-year budget) already sent to the Funding Agencies. **Will be handed out during 1st SNX Meeting.**

23.14.1. SOC members are transferred to the SNX Council. This will have to be recorded as the first decision of the SNX Foundation. To be done by Rafael Abela. **Done, see point 1.2 of these minutes.**

Regarding action 23.7.1. The following action is decided:

1.1.1. Rafael Abela will coordinate a "brainstorming" meeting within the Council Members regarding the future research to be done at the SNBLs.

At this stage it was pointed out that the Minutes should be available to the public unless otherwise decided.

1.8 Report on the Status of the Foundation

Hans-Peter Weber handed out the Annual Report 2001.

A folder is handed out to each Council Member and to the two Observers, Jean-Pierre Ruder and Nils Maras. It contains a CD and a paper copy of all the legal documents pertaining to the Foundation, namely:

- The Memorandum of Understanding dated 28/11/ 2003 with its Appendices
- SNX Co-operation Agreement Version 4-2 dated 28/11/2003 with its Appendices
- Constitution de Fondation dated 23/01/2004
- Terms of Reference SSC/SNBL dated August 2002
- Articles of Association of NSR AS amended 21 April 2004
- Statuts de l'Association "Ligne-Lumière Suisse-Norvégienne »

All those documents were sent to the Supervisory Board of Foundations in Bern which approved the Foundation.

1.1.2 Jean-Pierre Ruder asked for a copy of the letter from the authority in Bern, approving the Foundation. Copy to be sent to Jean-Pierre Ruder and to Nils Maras.
Done June 2004.

The question on how to proceed with updated legal documents was raised.

1.1.3.Rafael Abela asks for the master copy of the legal documents, concerning the SNX Foundation to be kept in Grenoble.

Hans-Peter Weber asked for copies of letters, written in the name of the SNX Foundation, to be always sent to Grenoble. Only three people are habilitated to represent the SNX Foundation (the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman and the SNX Director).

Hans-Peter Weber reported the following on the SNX Transition Story:

Let me first recall a few fundamental facts re the SNX, in part to give you the opportunity to better appreciate what we have achieved so far, and what still needs to be done.

- 1) *To permit us to run our own accounting operations in Switzerland as we have been doing successfully in France for many years. The reasons for the move away from UNIL accounting, I have made abundantly clear – I believe – over the last four years. When Chantal gives her status report on the audit, you will get what I hope is the final report on the inadequacy of the past arrangement.*
- 2) *To create clear lines of responsibility and authority between myself and the Swiss employed staff, as it has been the case in Grenoble with the French resident staff.*

This was a good occasion to cast on paper, if not in stone, what in the past some of us had considered as self-evident, and others as needing to be spelt out, namely:

- *The explicit tasks and rights of the Steering Committee and of the SNBL Director as well as*
- *certain rules of comportment, ways of interacting amongst ourselves.*

It was a long and arduous effort to establish the Foundation, which Chantal and I carried out besides our regular duties. In this task we, fortunately, enjoyed the strong support of our sponsors, BBW and NSF, for which we are thankful.

The Foundation act took place on 23rd January 2004, in the presence of Gervais Chapuis, myself and the notary public. This was the first meeting of the SNX Council.

Between January and April Chantal and I implemented all the steps which needed to be addressed to get the Foundation going. In retrospect it is pleasing to report that we did not do any mistake, that all the legal information we provided you, in particular in the matter of Phil Pattison, was correct, this point was later on confirmed by Phil's lawyer.

What is less pleasing to report over the last six months is the situation in Grenoble. As I wrote you last week, the facilities have suffered from the lack of proper maintenance, late or not even started upgrades and that the staff is dispirited. The situation in Grenoble is determined by two factors:

a) The manpower

The responsibility for the present dismal state of our staffing rests squarely with this committee. For more than five years, I brought up the need for additional staffing to your attention, without any response from your side. Our post-doc, who suffered from embolism in January, blames us, from what Phil tells me, to a large part for his health problems, too many long hours, too many weekends, little time for research. He, as well, as the former post-doc, has assured me that they cannot, they will not recommend to a post-doc to stay at the SNBL if the manpower does not improve. I agree with that position.

b) The increasing age of our equipment

The SNBL looked promising many years ago and some equipment was then state-of-the-art. We now have reached the stage, in particular for the Exafs and Powder branch line, where highly reputed colleagues turned us down, they do not want to collaborate with us because of the legacy state of our equipment. We are in trouble there unless we move fast, now and not in two years, I recommend that the Exafs option be phased out within two years. Let us not lure ourselves about the number of publications as you will find out later on this afternoon. The equipment mentioned in those papers was in use two or three years ago, even four years ago, it takes that long sometimes to write up the results, or they were not even SNBL property. Also keep in mind when you hear the publication list that almost one third of last year's publications originated from my own research group as post-docs were ready to leave, and suddenly there was a rush of publications. The publications are not a good indicator of the health of our facility. We have to take immediate action in the spirit as far removed as possible from the spirit which reigned last year in Herbelon.

The next item on the agenda is the most crucial one in our meeting. Our finances as I mentioned earlier on this morning to Jean Pierre Ruder are OK, there is no need to worry about them. Accounting is improving, Chantal will make a demonstration of the accounting programme to Jean Pierre and Nils so that they see that it could not be better. However, unless we tackle the manpower issue in a constructive fashion basing ourselves on reality and not on some wishful thinking, the message that it will give my staff will demotivate them even further.

The next six to eight months are also crucial unless we have

- a) a successor for Jon Are Beukes in Grenoble and working at the latest by October*
- b) funding assured for two additional staff members*
- c) a successful retreat to work out imaginative mid-term plans for the period 2006 and 2008*

The impression we will give to the ESRF Review Committee this fall is that we do not know how to run a facility such as the SNBL and do not know where we are going.

I am willing to help even further by closing down my very successful high pressure group and submit your request to the Swiss SNF this fall for additional equipment for the Exafs beamline

This is the end of Hans-Peter Weber's presentation

Ed Hough stressed the importance of having this retreat in the Autumn. "It seems that the beamlines suffer as they have been going on for 10 years and certainly in some of the areas, in particular in my own field, protein crystallography. I do not think it is possible to upgrade SNBL to be a modern protein crystallographic beamline and it will have to remain an instrument pertaining our skills because it is impossible to compete with the specifically designed and completely up to date beamlines at the ESRF. It would be wrong to prioritize any major developments in protein crystallography on the beamline. We cannot possibly collect data of the same quality or even in the same way as the ESRF and no doubt the Swiss Light Source.

We may have to consider shutting down the beamline for a year and completely rebuild it; do we start arguing for funding for replacement of equipment? These are serious issues as the alternative is that we will find ourselves in a situation that suddenly the SNBL actually does not offer anything of use to our users. We should concentrate on specific fields or shut down the beamline and completely rebuild it, or accept the alternative that it is no longer viable."

2. Report of the Manpower Committee

The Chairman refers to the paper "Report of the Manpower Committee" which has been distributed to all before this meeting, except to Hans-Peter Weber. Report attached to the minutes, *see appendix No 1*.

The Chairman is of the opinion that the work done by this committee is of good quality. The conclusions, the analysis on the personnel situation, the recommendations for the structure simply confirm what was said before, namely that the beamlines are understaffed. There is a recommendation on how to improve the situation, namely putting on:

beamline A two scientists, two post-docs, and at least one PhD student because of the workload of the different experiments

beamline B two senior scientists, one post-doc and at least one PhD student

The other point to be discussed is the position of the beamline director with a 50% of his/her time devoted to administrative matters.

The Chairman thanked the committee for the work done.

The Swiss members have already had some discussions on this report, and so did some Norwegian members.

2.1. Discussions

First the discussion will be on the manpower situation on the beamlines, then on the 50% position of the beamlines director. *See appendix No 10 containing the full details of the discussion.*

The Manpower situation on the beamlines

Definition of a post-doc and a scientist position, according to the practices at PSI:

- A post-doc has a contract for two years which can be renewed for one year only. 60% of his time is for research and 30% for support.

- A scientist has a three year contract, 70% support and 30% for research. This contract can be extended.

Hans-Peter clarified the way the Manpower Committee functioned, the mandate was:

- an analysis of the present manpower situation
- an evaluation of the manpower requirements to improve the running operation of the SNBL, taking into account the financial mid-term planning of the SNBL
- suggestions of models for the future structure of the SNBL

The committee consisted originally of Helge Larsen and Andre Scheidegger. For symmetry, the addition of Hans-Beat Buergi entailed the addition of a post-doc on the Norwegian side. The chairperson of this committee was Axel Kaprolat who was appointed by Sine Larsen. He sent a questionnaire to the SNBL staff, with the exception of Hans-Peter Weber. He then collected the answers and sent them out to the committee. The committee commented and asked for additional information by contacting Axel Kaprolat. The beamlines' Director was consulted at certain times. There was no direct contact between the committee and the staff, all the information went through the committee chairman. This is why the conclusions did not reflect what the staff suggested, for example the need for a technician. It is not in accordance with the ESRF directives which were mentioned in Herbelon and Tromso, namely 5 persons per beamline. The number of persons in the report is in accordance with the ESRF directive, but not the description of the positions.

The Norwegians have a meeting with the Advisory Board on Monday 7th June 2004.

This committee channels part of the Norwegian Research Council funding into the NSR which then sends it to SNX. The Norwegians have funding for two positions as Jon Are Beukes and Karina Mathiesen are leaving this year. Authorisation will be requested at this meeting to convert Jon Are Beukes' post-doc position into a scientist position. A technician is needed to finish the EXAFS upgrade, which is already late (see below Hans-Peter Weber's comments on the EXAFS upgrade). It is not easy for the Norwegian Research Council to finance technicians.

A week after the meeting with the Advisory Board, Hans-Peter Weber will be informed whether he can hire someone not necessarily Norwegian to replace Jon Are Beukes, or whether the Norwegians will be in charge to fill in that position in which case the Norwegian will have to advertise for the position. As it will take time to recruit someone, it might be possible to employ someone temporarily. In the past, in order to secure funding for the SNBL the Norwegian had to show they were sending their own post-doc. "*But now it is flexible*". To which **Ed Hough** and **David Nicholson** agreed. It was also mentioned that employing a foreigner would be cheaper as no extra money will be paid to live and work abroad.

On the Swiss side, BBW has set the amount for the next 4 years, and substantial amounts cannot be obtained from the Swiss Agency. The Swiss Committee has therefore to look for other solutions. Different people are being approached:

- EPFL can in the future accommodate 1/3 of a position for a scientist
- PSI can come with another 1/3 of a position for a scientist
- We are still looking for the other 1/3 and the ETH Zurich has been approached but we have not had yet a response from them.
- We cannot approach the SNF as they will not support us with an "infrastructure" position.

On the EPFL funding possibility, **Gervais Chapuis** mentions that it is to try to get in the future, after Hans-Peter retirement, one third of a position but in the meantime it is to find a temporary solution for this funding of one third of a position. **The Chairman** mentions that Gervais Chapuis is confident of getting this one third position, and that they are now waiting for an answer from ETHZ.

The SNX committee is going for two new positions, then each side should find 50% of the cost to finance these two new positions. The question is whether to take one new position in 2005 and one new position in 2006, or two new positions in 2005. It is understood that Nils Maras, for budgetary reasons, would prefer to have the request for extra funding spread over two years. In which case, the question is whether a scientist will be hired in 2005 or a post-doc? It is pointed out that stepwise, it could be that this is the only solution, but in parallel extra funding should be secured.

If we consider
 the budget for 2005, the total is CHF 1'587'130.00
 budget for 2004, the total is CHF 1'475'881.00
 Extra amount needed is CHF 111'249.00

If we consider only the "Total cost of Personnel":
 Budget 2005, Cost of Personnel CHF 1'036'944.00
 Budget 2004, Cost of Personnel CHF 913'150.00
 Extra amount needed CHF 124'000.00
50% of this amount is CHF 62'000.00

which should be found by each party, and a similar amount for 2006.
 The question is whether a scientist will be hired in 2005 or a post-doc?

EXAFS upgrade. **Hans-Peter Weber** commented the following: *"the Exafs upgrade is late because of lack of manpower. I asked the staff working on the Exafs upgrade, to make a total of the number of work hours needed. They foresee to upgrade the beamline within one year, as there is no point in spreading it over a longer period of time as we would loose the little advantage we have in improving the facility. I have a list of man hours, for one person, for more than a year and if I do not have that person, it will mean that the EXAFS upgrade will be ready in 2006-2007. I fully agree that we need more staff, I fully agree that Phil's beamline need an additional post-doc. We also need a technician and this did not come out from the Manpower Committee report and this for obvious reasons. The report does not reflect what is really needed on the beamlines. Because of the upgrade we are facing, which is ambitious, a technician is needed. We need to be ambitious in order to keep the SNBL going"*

Hans-Peter Weber sums up: *two new positions are needed although we do not agree on what they should be. The SNBL staff has been flexible in the past and if they had done everything else except what they were supposed to do, we would no longer exist. In the past, we did convert a post-doc position into a technician position because the Swiss NSF was very flexible. What we should argue, outside SNBL, is not the type of position, but how many positions we need just to get the work done. As I suggested beforehand, the technician position could be for one year and then it could be converted, once the Exafs beamline is done, into a post-doc position, or a scientist position as to the decision of this committee.*

Hans-Peter would not like to abuse a post-doc into a technician position.

The Chairman considers this as being a new element not mentioned in the report.

We need to know whether SNX supports the conclusions that come out of the report from the manpower committee so as to take this back to Norway, and to the Swiss Agency, as a proof for the need for more staff.

The chairman, on behalf of the SNX committee, recognizes the need for more staff with a strong recommendation to the authorities so that a solution can also be found from the Norwegian side. *We would like to have two new positions as soon as possible, the first position being that of a scientist. We want to keep in line with the manpower committee conclusions. It might be difficult to transfer the position of a technician into a scientist position, but this will have to be discussed at a later stage as we will have to be very cautious with this kind of transfer.* **The chairman** recommends that the SNX committee pursues with the search of funding for two new positions. The Swiss side is waiting for the reaction from the ETH Zurich. The Swiss will not come up with only a 50% solution, but a 100% funded position for three years.

Nils Maras agreed to Hans-Peter Weber's suggestion to unblock another position so as to have the total funding needed for the staff increase, including two new positions.

The 50% position of the beamline director.

The administrative side of this position should take only 50% of the time. Should the other 50% be support for the users, as the ESRF does, or is this person attached to another institution and doing research?.

Ed Hough got from Helge Larsen three models:

- 50% Administrative tasks, 50% as a scientist on the beamline
- 50% Administrative tasks, and 50% from an institute of research
- 50% Administrative tasks, and another percentage from another University (as this is the case now for Hans-Peter)

As mentioned by **Kenneth Knudsen**, just a 50% as Director means anyway that the person has to live very closely to the ESRF and this limits the possibilities.

David Nicholson underlines the best chances of recruiting someone would be to offer a 100% position split into 50% for Administrative tasks, and 50% working on the beamlines.

The Chairman asks whether this 50% should be supported by SNX, or by a research institution.

Overall it is decided that a 100% position would have to be financed by SNX, and the budget would therefore have to be increased by this extra amount.

Jean-Pierre Ruder comments that SNX Committee Members have to be prudent with the solution 50% administrative tasks and 50% as a scientist attached to one beamline. **Jean-Pierre Ruder** and **Nils Maras** agree with Gervais Chapuis on the fact that the doors have to be left open.

2.2 Actions to be taken

Budget 2005 should be issued with the two new positions unblocked to as to have the full amount needed.

Decision on whether to hire two new persons as soon as possible, or one person in 2005 and another person in 2006.

Ed Hough is to give the answer from the Advisory Committee to Hans-Peter Weber regarding the recruitment of the staff member replacing Jon Are Beukes.

3. A. Financial matters

3.1 Accounts 2003 (Compte d'exploitation 4th term 2003) [H. P. Weber]

“compte d'exploitation” see *appendix No 2*.

The “Compte d'exploitation” for the period October 2003 to December 2003 was sent to Council Members by e-mail. As it can be seen, the whole amount was not spent, but there are orders placed during this period which have not been paid (amount around CHF 26'000.00) and which are not taken into account in this “compte d'exploitation” as this was done that way in the past. So far, we have kept the same format as from the beginning of the accounting at the SNBL. As can be seen on the first part of the spending sheet, Vladimir Dmitriev has been paid CHF 22'000. Because of lack of manpower, he helped us on the beamlines for those three months, and in fact he is still helping us, but now he is not being paid. As he is unemployed, the French state is subsidizing the operation of the SNBL, but this will not carry on.

All the other wages paid are not shown as it was agreed that they should remain confidential, and this point was then remembered by all.

The question of what is included in Stationary was raised. This item includes all the purchases of paper and other items needed for an office, but it also includes the cartridges for the printers, this is why the amount is slightly high.

The ESRF bill for the last quarter 2003 is not included as we got it on 29th January 2004 and it was too late for the University of Lausanne to pay it.

Hans-Peter mentions the 3-day accounting course taken by himself and Chantal at the Centre Patronal in Paudex

No more questions were asked.

3.2 Income 2004 (payments by funding agencies, other income) [H. P. Weber]

All the funds have arrived on the bank account, as follows :

- From BBW: **CHF665'000.00** (including the extra CHF40'000.00 for the supplementary items)

- From NSR: CHF749'000.00, plus CHF101'000.00 kept in Norway to pay the salary of the post-doc, which makes a total of **CHF850'000.00**

There are other funds which are “Hors Contrat”, necessary for the Exafs upgrade, for the refurbishment. These amounts are not included in the regular budget as the budget would be going up and down over the years. There will be two tables, one with the regular income, according to the contract, and a table showing the income outside the contract.

1.3.1 A table showing the regular income “Contrat” and a table showing the “Hors Contrat” income will be sent to all Council Members. To be done by C. Heurtebise –
Done see Appendix 9.

3.3 Spending 2004 as of May 2004 [C. Heurtebise]

We had access to our Swiss bank accounts only in mid-April, so payments started from that date onwards.

In order to avoid the difference in exchange rates, the amounts entered in the account software correspond to what has actually been paid by the bank. The transfer charges will appear in "Financial Expenses".

As for the income, the amounts shown are the total amounts agreed for this year. Therefore for Norway, the total amount of CHF850'000.00 has been entered in the account software, but this means the salary paid to Jon Are Beukes is also shown in the "Compte d'Exploitation". The other solution is to show the real amount received (namely CHF749'000.00) and indicate in a footnote that the total contribution is CHF 850'000.00, including the CHF 101'000.00 for the post-doc position).

ESRF users' credit: this corresponds to the amount reimbursed by the ESRF to SNBL regarding the one third of the time given to ESRF users. They use gases, and other equipment for which we pay first and then we get reimbursed according to this one third use by the ESRF users. It has been decided to show this amount separately as it is next to impossible to know the exact amounts reimbursed for the budgeted amount concerned.

The "Compte d'Exploitation" shown during the meeting includes the spending of all the salaries, including those of May, most of the invoices in Swiss Francs, as for the invoices paid in France, they more or less include all the invoices up to mid-April. The invoice from the ESRF concerning the first quarter of this year is shown separately, as a total amount (roughly CHF84'200.00) because payment has been requested just before the meeting, the total amount could not be split into the different budgeted items.

The orders are not included in this compte d'exploitation.

Hans-Peter points out that the Council Members should not worry about overspending, *"we will always be in the black. What the Council Members should worry about is the manpower situation"*.

3.4 Audit 2001/2002 and Audit Oct 2002/Dec 2003 [C. Heurtebise]

The audit is not yet finalized for the period Oct 2001/Sept 2002. See *Appendix No 3*.

Hans-Peter Weber suggests the following solution in order to finish the audit for the period Oct 2001/ Sept 2002. *"Informing Depraz that Chantal and I would like to meet the University of Lausanne accounting staff (Mareine and Maradan) in their office, together with our Swiss accountant (BfB) and the auditor (Audict) to see where we stand and decide when they can get the job finished, that is set milestones which they should keep"*. What Hans-Peter would like to get from Jean-Pierre Ruder is a letter from him saying that Hans-Peter is in charge and that he has a deadline set by Jean-Pierre Ruder and Nils Maras.

Jean-Pierre Ruder understands the situation but he is a bit surprised as BBW has written to the University of Lausanne in February 2004 that they should close now the accounts as of 31st December 2003, they should transfer the remaining funds to the new accounts and that they should assist the auditor for the audit. The same letter could be sent again.

The audit should have been done five months after closing the accounts, as written in the statutes of the SNX foundation.

The audit company has got the contract, and they are responsible for the delivery of the audit in due time.

If support is needed to make things move, BBW can do whatever is necessary. It has to be reasonable and it has to fit into what was said previously.

It was agreed that Hans-Peter Weber would discuss this further with Jean-Pierre Ruder in order to see what action to take to make things move fast, and organize a meeting before the summer.

Jean-Pierre Ruder requested to record the fact that BBW is very worried as a funding agency of not seeing any official documents now for several years. To which Nils Maras agreed.

3.5 Budget 2004, 2nd half [H. P. Weber]

The aim of this item is to see whether there are any problems so that the Council Members can react in due time.

Jean-Pierre Ruder reminded that the Budget 2004, presented in Herbelon in November 2003, had a column indicating eventual items to be included or not. In the meantime, additional funds were provided from BBW. Therefore some of these items, for which extra fund was given, have to be shifted into the budget column, therefore increasing the budget. It would be nice to have a new version of the budget taking into account these changes.

1.3.2 An improved version of the Budget 2004, including the extra items (representing a value of CHF40'000.00), will be provided by **Hans-Peter Weber** by June 15th

3.6 Budget 2005 [H. P. Weber]

See appendix No 4 (see e-mail sent to SNX members)

The numbers for Budget 2005 are the same as for Budget 2004, the total amount is CHF1'450.000.00. The exchange rate used is 1.6

Jean-Pierre Ruder thanked Hans-Peter Weber for this budget. *"It is very useful as it helps BBW to determine by October how much BBW will inject into the system for next year"*, and this in agreement with Nils Maras. Jean-Pierre Ruder put the following question, on the document Explanations to Budget 2005:

- under point "C" Hans-Peter wrote down "this situation has got to stop". Does it have to stop because the ESRF does not allow it anymore to continue or it is just because you think you should not rely all the time on common equipment. Hans-Peter Weber referred to the second explanation.
- General equipment (CHF58'600.00). Going through the list given, towards the end some of those elements do not seem to belong to maintenance and running costs of the beamlines, for example office furniture, books, printing annual reports, these items should perhaps go on the infrastructure costs
- Secretarial services. This is a lump sum which is part of the contract with the ESRF, the word "additional" should be removed.
- Financial expenses. The figure of CHF19'000.00 seems rather large, this figure is based on experience, due to exchange rate fluctuations. At this point **The Chairman** asked whether we could contract a fixed exchange rate with the bank. But the rate is rather high, and it does not seem to be a practical solution for SNX as it would involve a further expense. This point can be raised with the SNX Foundation bank.

The Chairman has the following questions:

- Connection to NICE network. The figure for 2005 is CHF8'150.00, for 2004, it was CHF16'000.00 in the budget 2002/2003. *Remarks: this is correct, but on the Budget 2004, the amount is of CHF7'882.00. I seem to remember that two amounts were added up for this item. To be checked*

- LS-Gre shuttle, meetings, training courses. Amount CHF46'000.00, while in 2002/2003, the amount spent was of CHF66'000.00. The larger amount in 2002/2003 is because of the Tromso Meeting in June 2003 which had not been budgeted for. **The Chairman** would like to see the breakdown cost of this one line.
- Beamlines instrumentation. This was very clear in the budget 2002/2003. **Hans-Peter Weber** underlines the complexity of having a budget describing the beamlines instrumentation as it varies enormously from one year to the next. What has been done is to give an amount for general equipment, namely CHF58'600.00 for 2005, and then the items are listed separately. It was decided to keep the budget as it is, and to have the spending on each item on the "compte d'exploitation" (which gives a detailed list of the spending)

The budget 2005 will be approved at the next SNX meeting, according to the money we will be sure of getting for 2005. The budget as is now is a forecast, actions have to be taken.

3. **B. Renewal of the contract of the Beamline Director** **[R. Abela]**

(without the presence of the BL Director , see By Law 1.4.) and of the Administrative Secretary.

Text from the Chairman, see *Appendix No.13.*

May 27

4. **RESEARCH ASPECTS**

In Attendance: SNX Council, SNBL Administrative Secretary, Observers, BL Scientists
(for the following items)

4.1 **Status of the SNBL**

4.1.A. **Beamline A [P. Pattison]**

See presentation of P. Pattison *in Appendix No.5.*

4.1.B. **Beamline B [H. Emerich]**

See presentation of H. Emerich *in Appendix No.6*

A summary of the progress is given as follow:

- The solid state detector was delivered and is functioning
- The solid state detector was integrated in the new EXAFS software
- We have a liquid nitrogen line for cooling the solid state detector installed.

Gervais Chapuis suggested that Phil Pattison should go and have a look at the vacuum pump they have in Lausanne for possible use at the SNBL.

After discussing the mid-term planning, the following points were raised.

The Chairman commented on Hermann Emerich's presentation, and particularly on the commissioning time, planned in October 2004, which he finds extremely short. "*Normally, we keep at SLS 10% to 15% of the time for commissioning and improvement. We give SLS only 70% of the user available time to the users, 25%*

is devoted to improvements and in-house research and 5% are the so-called for Directors' reserve. In the case of Hermann, it was 120% for users".

Hermann Emerich's answer to this is that after the upgrade more commissioning time will be requested.

It was agreed that more time for commissioning should be granted in the future and this point will be discussed again when reviewing the proposals.

4.2 Refurbishment programme [H. Emerich]

See presentation of H. Emerich *in Appendix No.7.*

Plus table showing the different sources of income for the refurbishment, see Appendix No.8

Total amount to be contributed for the refurbishment, around EUR 52'000

Comments regarding the new EXAFS control software – *We had a test run last week. It worked, but we want to make a further run essentially testing the robustness of this software. The control program is written in "Spec". The decision for this software package was based on the fact that some of the SNBL staff know the basis of this programming language, and that computing help can be obtained from the ESRF.*

4.3 Review of the SNBL through ESRF: Preparation work [H. P. Weber]

Hans-Peter Weber commented that the last review took place in one afternoon, *"we visited the beamlines, presented our achievements, what we are doing, what we planned to do and then we had discussions. The report we got out of the review committee was not very useful as far as suggestions were concerned, they just put in what we reported. What we would like to have this time is a constructive feed back, which might be difficult as the specialities of the members do not coincide with those of the SNBL".*

The Chairman mentions that people suggested by the SNX are competent in the domain concerned by the SNBL. The SAC members are a liaison with the ESRF. We have to contact the ESRF director so as to make our suggestions regarding the name of the Chairman.

Hans-Peter has contacted Sine Larsen telling her that he was disappointed with the choices made, the people chosen are very good researchers but their experience is outside the SNBL domain. Hans-Peter read that letter (see *Appendix No 11*) in which he underlines the fact that the experts have to be chosen by the SAC and not by the Research Directors. **The Chairman** points out that the SNX Council has already suggested experts and the Research Directors will select two members from this list. SAC then usually selects two members from the SAC members. The members of SAC cannot be Chairman of that review panel.

1.4.1 Hans-Peter is to e-mail Sine Larsen, with a copy to **Rafael Abela**, to clarify the composition of the review panel, namely two members are chosen by SAC from amongst the SAC members and two members are selected by the Research Directors from the list provided by SNX.

The Chairman commented that Gerry Lander was already in two other review panels, and therefore he knows how to review the beamlines and it is certainly a good idea to have someone outside SNBL domain of research to contribute to the review of the SNBLs. His past experience in reviewing beamlines should be very helpful for the review to come. The other members will have knowledge on the SNBL domain of research.

The Chairman points out that the ESRF review is much tougher than in the past because of the high quality expected from the beamlines. We therefore have to work on

a good presentation of the beamlines, namely with precise explanations on the technical part of the beamlines, the scientific output/s, and the main developments to take place. This is why the retreat is essential so that the SNBL team and invited users can give their own view on how they see the future of SNBL.

The review will take place over two days. On the first day, presentations on SNBL will take place (from the staff and from scientists who came on the beamlines to perform experiments). The second day is devoted to discussions within the review committee, they might have questions to put to the beamline staff on that second day. The report from the review panel is printed out at the end of that second day.

Gervais Chapuis, who was a member of a review panel, underlines the importance of the report from that committee which is useful for the beamline reviewed. **The Chairman** is of the opinion that the report is constructive

It is suggested to have presentations, for example, from EXAFS groups. Presentations from two or three users groups is recommended.

1.4.2. Rafael Abela is to provide the dates of the ESRF Review.

1.4.3. Rafael Abela and **Hans-Peter Weber** to coordinate the preparations of the Review Committee Meeting and keep the SNX Council Members informed.

4.4 Midterm planning of the SNBL 2005 – 200...[H.P. Weber]

One part of this mid-term planning is the retreat organised by Hans-Peter Weber and planned end of September / beginning of October with selected scientists. This retreat will involve, for the staff, spending time on the preparations. Axel Kaprolat has been invited to give the ESRF view on their mid-term planning. It was mentioned at this point that the ESRF mid-term planning will come out soon, after council has approved it. This retreat is an excellent opportunity for the staff to immerse themselves in science. A report from this retreat will then be issued.

It was again at this stage confirmed that the SNX council members will issue a document showing how they see the mid-term planning for SNBL. This will be done by exchanges of e-mails.

Ed Hough reminded the audience that the reflection on the future of SNBL should also include how we should consider SNBL: a Research Institute, or a Users Facility, or both.

1.4.4. Rafael Abela is to coordinate the collection of ideas regarding mid-term activities.

May 28.

Hans-Peter Weber was excused for his absence to the meeting on Friday 28th May 2004.

A statement from the staff not present at the SNX meeting was read, see *Appendix No 12*.

The Chairman mentioned that this statement would be taken into account in their discussion.

5.5 Activity report 2003 [H. P. Weber]

Annual Report 2001 was handed out by Hans-Peter Weber on the previous day. **The Chairman** commented on the poor quality of some pictures, which should be avoided in next annual reports.

Annual Report 2002 is almost ready to be printed. A draft was sent by Hans-Peter Weber, in January 2004, to SNX Council Members for comments.

Annual Report 2003. Hans-Peter Weber wanted to ask each member of the team to take on one or two topics and make a contribution which he then will put together. As it will be difficult to get an annual report 2003 in due time, after discussion it has been decided to have a bi-annual report 2003/2004.

1.5.1 A draft of a Bi-Annual Report 2003/2004 is to be ready by next SNX Meeting. The final version to be ready by March 2005. This was agreed by all.

6.6 In-house research [H.P. Weber]

Hermann Emerich commented on the test experiment, with an Italian research group, which will take place in July 2004 involving Raman and Powder Diffraction. *The Raman detector is on loan from Bruker and they are coming along to build it up for this combined experiment. The aim is to do combined Raman/ EXAFS and Raman/Powder diffraction experiments in the future. It seems that a lot of people would be interested in this kind of experiment. For example, Sankar, who is working for the Royal Institution in G.B., is very enthusiastic about it. We are going to have a meeting about this subject in two to three weeks.* Wouter Van Beek, who was working in collaboration with this Italian group, triggered this idea. Hermann Emerich immediately supported it.

Phil Pattison stressed that they have to make the instrumentation on SNBL work as well as possible. The best way is to have a close collaboration with external groups who are experts. The group which is highlighted is Helge Larsen who will be coming for three months on a sabbatical to SNBL. The aim is to develop the multi-axis diffraction on our diffractometer not only as an interesting phenomena but also to use it as a tool to investigate the physical behaviour of the samples using multiple beam diffraction.

The other key group, who is really interested in making a major investment of time and effort in the beamline, in collaboration with us, is Marc Schiltz from the EPFL. He wishes to exploit our multiple-axis diffractometer because he is interested in multiple wavelength and polarisation aspects which can only be done on a synchrotron and only on a diffractometer of the type we have.

If we can get those two techniques working well, then we not only have a useful scientific tool, but a monopoly because there are very few facilities in the world which are equipped to do this kind of experiment. What is particularly attractive is that it works very well on a bending magnet at the ESRF. We are not limited in any way by the source characteristics, we can really exploit this source optimally and exploit the investment which has been made in the equipment. The supplier of the diffractometer, Oxford Diffraction, is very interested in putting these developments into the software which put things on a firm basis, and other users can come and exploit the experience that we have built up.

The other technique which I would like us to develop further, which is still in the early stages, is the combination with photo excitation and spectroscopy. With funding from Kristoffer Andersson in Oslo, we have a photo-spectrometer on the beamline. We can do optical photo excitation and we can do photo x-ray excitation and we can characterize the sample using a photo-spectrometer. At the moment it is off-line but it is our intention to get it installed so that it can also work on-line with the KUMA diffractometer.

Obviously the success of these developments also depends on recruiting suitable staff. What is also hoped is that new staff will bring their own expertise, and that may also influence the way in which the beamlines develop.

Ed Hough repeated the importance of having the retreat in the Autumn. Where is the SNBL going in the future? Can SNBL be world leading in a certain number of fields?

7.7 Discussion of proposals [Shepherds]

The following discussion took place on Thursday afternoon 27th May, in order to give time to think about the problematic situation on Beamline A, due to the shortage of manpower.

Beamline A. Available shifts for the run Sept 2004 to Feb 2005.

Total available	217
(after subtracting 5% for maintenance and 10% for in-house)	
Requested by the ESRF for public beamtime	78
Available for scheduling	139
Shifts to be carried over (postponed experiments)	111
Long Term and Bags: requested 75, granted :	60
Shifts requested from new proposals	175
Shifts recommended for new proposals	117

The problems on beamline A are

- lack of manpower
- the number of shifts to be carried over

The recommendations are as follow: we either allocate the 139 shifts this round and none for next round, or we allocate less shifts this round and consider some new proposals next round.

The users should also apply directly to the ESRF for beamtime.

It was decided, on Friday, to judge the scientific merit of each proposal, and then decide on the number of shifts. Phil Pattison suggested to give beamtime this round to the proposals which got grade A and B+, which represents 81 shifts, this means there will be 58 shifts to be allocated next round. The users getting the 81 shifts might not get beamtime for the next period, they should be informed that it may take a little longer than usual as we are spreading over one year. Users who had beamtime postponed should also be contacted and informed that their beamtime will be scheduled but not necessarily within next experimental period.

Beamline B. The backlog is much less compared to beamline A. (roughly two weeks of backlog)

The Chairman suggested that the total shifts available should be reduced so as to give more time to commissioning, we could therefore ask the ESRF to reduce their number of shifts on the two beamlines.

1.7.1. A request will be sent to the ESRF to reduce the number of shifts given to the ESRF for 2005. **Hans-Peter Weber**

1.7.2. Information has to be sent to SNBL users explaining that there will be a serious reduction of shifts in 2005. **Hans-Peter Weber**. Deadline end of July 2004.

David Nicholson suggested efforts should be made to ensure that PhD students should not suffer as much from the reduction of beamtime on BM1A.

Radovan Cerny suggested going through the proposals and then decide on the grade obtained whether or not beamtime will be granted.

Phil Pattison suggested reducing the number of shifts requested on beamline A and also that the 139 shifts be for the two periods to come. Extra commissioning time is not needed, just time and effort to schedule and support the experiments.

Beamline B. For the period around 25th October, there will be two weeks taken away from the users for commissioning. This will affect Beamline A too for one week. In-House research will then be scheduled in this period so as to avoid having to turn down users at the last minute.

1.7.3. Policy on long term proposals will be discussed at next SNX Meeting. Suggestions by Council Members to be sent to **Rafael Abela** before next SNX Meeting.

1.7.4. The deadline for submitting proposals will be set on the same dates as the ESRF from next round.

On beamline A, proposals with grade A and B+ will get beamtime,

On beamline B, proposals with grade A will get beamtime.

8.8 Summary of actions to be taken [C. Heurtebise]

2.1.1. **Rafael Abela** will coordinate a “brainstorming” meeting within the Council Members regarding the future research to be done at the SNBLs.

1.1.2 **Jean-Pierre Ruder** asked for a copy of the letter from the authority in Bern, approving the Foundation. Copy to be sent to Jean-Pierre Ruder and to Nils Maras. **Done June 2004.**

1.1.3. **Rafael Abela** asks for the master copy of the legal documents, concerning the SNX Foundation to be kept in Grenoble.

1.3.2 An improved version of the Budget 2004, including the extra items (representing a value of CHF40'000.00), will be provided by **Hans-Peter Weber** by June 15th

1.4.1 Hans-Peter is to e-mail Sine Larsen, with a copy to **Rafael Abela**, to clarify the composition of the review panel, namely two members are chosen by SAC from amongst the SAC members and two members are selected by the Research Directors from the list provided by SNX.

1.4.2. **Rafael Abela** is to provide the dates of the ESRF Review.

1.4.3. **Rafael Abela** and **Hans-Peter Weber** to coordinate the preparations of the Review Committee Meeting and keep the SNX Council Members informed.

1.4.4. Rafael Abela is to coordinate the collection of ideas regarding mid-term activities.

1.5.1 A draft of a Bi-Annual Report 2003/2004 is to be ready by next SNX Meeting. The final version to be ready by March 2005. This was agreed by all.

1.7.1. A request will be sent to the ESRF to reduce the number of shifts given to the ESRF for 2005. **Hans-Peter Weber**

1.7.2. Information has to be sent to SNBL users explaining that there will be a serious reduction of shifts in 2005. **Hans-Peter Weber**. Deadline end of July 2004.

1.7.3. Policy on long term proposals will be discussed at next SNX Meeting. Suggestions by Council Members to be sent to **Rafael Abela** before next SNX Meeting.

1.7.4. The deadline for submitting proposals will be set on the same dates as the ESRF from next round.

9.9 Concluding remarks [R. Abela]

The 2nd SNX Meeting will take place in Grenoble, on the ESRF site on Wednesday 1st and Thursday 2nd December 2004

Guest house to be booked, plus meeting room, plus restaurant on Wednesday night. To be done by Chantal Heurtebise. **Guest House and Meeting room: DONE**

The 3rd SNX Meeting will take place in Norway end of May, beginning of June 2005. Rafael Ablea is to fix the exact dates.

The Chairman thanked everyone for the contributions to the meeting. Point 3B is now discussed by the six Council members.

Appendix No 1: Report of the Manpower Committee – P 6 - ***

Appendix No 2: Compte d'exploitation Oct-Dec 2003 – P 10 -***

Appendix No 3: History of the Audit 2001/2002 – P 11 - ***

Appendix No 4: Budget 2005 – P 12 -***

Appendix No 5: Status of the SNBL – Phil Pattison's presentation – P 14 -

Appendix No 6: Status of the SNBL – Hermann Emerich's presentation – P 14 -

Appendix No 7: Refurbishment programme – Hermann Emerich's presentation – P 14 -

Appendix No 8: Refurbishment programme – Sources of income, and list of items–P14-***

Appendix No 9: Global income for 2004 (within contract and outside contract) – P 10 -***

Appendix No 10: Report of the Manpower Committee – Details of the discussion–P 6 -***

Appendix No 11: Hans-Peter Weber's letter to Sine Larsen – P 15 -***

Appendix No 12: Statement from the staff – P 16 -***

Appendix No. 13 Renewal of the contract of the Beam Lines Director – P 13 -

***** Distributed only to SNX Council Members and Observer**