

CLS Users' Advisory Committee 2010
Minutes of Meeting #114: December 8, 2010
(1:00 pm Saskatoon Time) at the Canadian Light Source
Room 2046, CLS

Attendees:

At CLS: Derek Peak, Andrew Grosvenor, Dennis Tokaryk, Lucia Zuin, Tom Ellis, Lavina Carter

By Phone: Ron Cavell, Michael Murphy, Stewart McIntyre (Past Chair), Adam Leontowich, Kirk Michaelian

Regrets: Jim Hendry, Graham George, Pierre Kennepohl, Serge Desgreniers (Chair), Jillayne Neufeld

1.0 Approval of the Agenda and Previous Meeting Minutes

- Oct. 13/10 minutes will be circulated and available for approval at January's meeting. Derek approved agenda as circulated. Dennis Tokaryk seconded.

2.0 Business Arising from F2F

- Derek Peak asked if the IR beamline reviews will be made available to the UAC since the HXMA's report had been. Tom Ellis responded that the HXMA review was a CLS review decision and therefore, once the report was available, CLS provided it to the UAC. The formal review of beamlines is in conjunction with the SAC reviews; therefore, the IR report will be provided with the SAC report. The SAC plans to provide their report to CLS prior to Christmas, therefore, once CLS receives the report it will be made available for the UAC.
- In response to a comment made at the UAC F2F meeting, Adam Leontowich looked into the issue and wanted to convey to the UAC why some beamlines (SM in particular) may not want top-up mode: When there is an injection (at the ALS) the electron beam is deliberately enlarged to avoid instabilities, and afterwards the emittance is brought back down. When top-up mode was introduced at the ALS, it was found that this caused periodic noise in the acquired STXM images at the frequency of the top-up injection (every 30 seconds or so at ALS), as well as affecting other beamlines, primarily those which are brightness dependent. What has been done at ALS beamline 11.0.2, is that an 'injection on' signal is provided from the control room, data acquisition is inhibited while this occurs, and any lines that were in progress when the injection took place are then rescanned. The SM line wants top up mode, but it's more complex than that and what is really wanted is to have these types of systems in place beforehand so it is a seamless introduction.

Tom Ellis reported that receiving this feedback is really important so that we can work them out prior to implementing top-up. Some additional issues for top-up include:

- Linac cannot be fired at that rate. It needs to be upgraded prior to this being implemented.
- Timing signals will need to be added to beamlines who cannot acquire data during the injection due to signal perturbation.

- An application to our license regulators requires to be submitted identifying the plan for all safety issues relating to top-up.

Lucia commented that a big step forward would be to inject with photon shutter open.

3.0 Report from the CLS Research Director

- Thomas Ellis reported that the month of November had lots of activity which included: Peer Review, Allocation, SAC and CNSC visit.
- The SAC meeting was very positive and offered good suggestions. Rob Lam has also offered to provide assistance as required in between meetings.
- Medical Isotope – CLS has received the grant and the CLS Board of Directors has approved the project.
- CNSC visit – CNSC was at CLS Nov. 29-Dec. 2 performing an audit. They were pleased with activity; however, had several concerns with our processes. CLS requires a license renewal by March, 2012. CLS together with CNSC have identified a one year timeline to identify, document and implement our processes.

4.0 Visit to Ogle Hall

- Ron Cavell reported that on Friday, Nov. 19 Serge, Andrew and Ron visited Ogle Hall. Ron had stayed there in the summer and feels it has a lot of things going for it, however, the building has had less attention to overall maintenance than the seminary. Upgrades would be necessary.

Tom Ellis reported that the University of Saskatchewan and CLS are currently negotiating. CLS has identified several upgrades which would be implemented such as changing several of the single rooms to include bathrooms. Operating costs are estimated to be ~\$100,000/yr. Ideally it would be nice if the accommodation was privately operated and reasonably priced. With CLS obtaining Ogle Hall as a user residence, CLS is looking for the user' support.

5.0 Annual CLS Activity Report (Matthew Dalzell)

- Matthew Dalzell reported that CLS is proposing to change the format of the Activity Report. It will follow a similar format to NSLS, APS and Diamond's reports.
- The report will be focusing on the "quality of science".
- The editorial board currently consists of: Serge Desgreniers, Tom Ellis, Rob Blyth and Matthew Dalzell.
- CLS beamline scientists have been requested to provide nominations for the top 3 articles being done on their beamlines this past year. The data needs to be published, in press or already accepted in 2010 and have a doi # assigned.
- ~5 papers per research area are planned to be the core of the report with additional reports from the facility, outreach, user programs, etc.
- In addition to the once a year activity report, CLS needs the users to tell us their science stories so we may highlight them throughout the year in e-news; press releases; highlights on the web, etc. In respect to articles for press

releases, these stories need to be provided to CLS before papers are published so they can be released at the same time or prior to.

Action: Users to contact Matthew Dalzell with their science stories.

6.0 Experiment reports (Tom Ellis)

- Due to time constraints, this item was deferred until the next meeting.

7.0 General user proposal ranking (Andrew Grosvenor)

- Andrew Grosvenor reported that this cycle, there were three scores reported back to the applicants. In the past only one score was provided. This was a surprise and questioned whether applicants were aware of the new scoring process. The hyperlink for details for the evaluation criteria appeared to be incorrect for some of the information as well.

Lavina reported that the new scoring model was introduced with the previous cycle, however, reporting back to the applicants the three scores was an oversight last cycle and was only implemented with the announcement of the results for this call. The evaluation criteria and rating scales are available at http://www.lightsource.ca/uso/peer_reviews.php

Action required: User office to review wording for announcements to ensure applicants are aware of what their proposals will be evaluated on and check and updated hyperlinks as required.

Tom further explained the review process and scoring. The proposals are reviewed and scored for a) quality of science; b) suitability of resources and c) capability of the researcher, with scientific merit having the highest importance to obtain beamtime. When requests for beam time on a beamline exceeded available time, the proposals above the cutoff line in the same scoring range were placed in a “decision band” and were further assessed based on the suitability and quality of the proposed research, as well as the capability of researchers.

Derek and Ron were observers at the Allocation meeting and commented that they thought our process for allocation was very fair. Ron asked the question, what happens if a reviewer provides a review which is not consistent with other reviews.

Tom responded that the scores are averaged for each of the three criteria areas and proposals which have a high standard deviation for scientific merit, technical suitability and/or capability are flagged. Flagged proposals for scientific merit are further reviewed in detail by the primary peer review member and advise CLS if the score in question should be dismissed and not used in the averaging of the merit score. The external's scores cannot be changed, but could be dismissed.

Derek commented that the shutdown period for the next cycle is larger than in the past, therefore fewer shifts were available which had the cut-off score higher than in the past. Tom commented that most synchrotrons are

oversubscribed by factors of three, however, CLS is not yet at that level of being oversubscription.

8.0 Comments and suggestions from beamline scientist group (Lucia Zuin)

- End of Run meeting has been postponed, therefore, no report at this time.

9.0 Call for AUM speakers and workshop topics (Derek Peak)

- Derek commented that the committees for SES, Summer School and AUM are working together to incorporate some of the same speakers. David Shuh of the APS is one name which has been recommended for a talk at the SES as well as Summer School.
- One-half day workshop (facility and beamline reports) will likely overlap between SES and AUM.
- Seeking how to attract more environmental science users to the facility
- Dennis Tokaryk indicated that the International Symposium on Molecular Spectroscopy meeting <http://molspect.chemistry.ohio-state.edu/symposium/index.html> coincides with the AUM; therefore, many IR users from the community may not be attending the AUM.

10.0 Other Business

None.

Meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Next UAC meeting: January, 2011