Snapshot of the OPERA Collaboration

Quick review of due and effective contributions of the groups in in 2010.

Decisions of the CB regarding group compositions in 2011.

Evolution of the composition of the Collaboration since 2009 in terms of groups and physicists.

G. Wilquet OPERA CB chair

OPERA Funding Agencies meeting

Policy for contributions to shifts and common fund adopted by the CB for 2010 and following

• The formal composition of a group is fixed at the beginning of each civil year by the group leader and endorsed by the CB.

• Nominal shares are proportional to the number of scientists in the group, including PhD students.

• A group must contribute to at least 35% of its nominal contribution to the common fund in cash or in-kind for the equivalent amount (and depending on needs).

• The group compensates for the missing contribution to the common fund with shifts in extra to its nominal share.

- Policy for being by default signee of physics papers:
 - be a formal member of a group during the civil year and effectively contributing to the experiment for at least one year or
 - having be a formal member of a group during the preceding civil year and having stopped effectively contributing to the experiment for at most one year.

2/5/2011

	g countries ha (more than) fu				-	ment sinc	e the proposal and
	. ,	per insti			per cou	ntry	
		2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Belgium	Brussels	2	2	2	2	2	2
France	LAPP Annecy	4	6	5	15	17.5	15.5
	IPHC Strasbour	rg 3	3	3			
	IPNL Lyon	8	8.5	7.5			
Germany	Hamburg	11	9	8	14	12	8
	Münster	2	2	0			
	Rostock	1	1	0			
Italy	LNGS Assergi	4	3	3	57	52.5	52.5
-	Bari	6	6	5			
	Bologna	11	11.5	9.5			
	LNF Frascati	8	7	8			
	L'Aquila	3	3	3			
	Napoli	10	6	9			
	Padova	7	9	6			
	Roma	1	2	3			
	Salerno	7	5	6			
Switzerland	Bern	12	11	12	16	16	16
	ETH Zurich	4	5	4			
Total		104	100	96	104	100	96

Scanning of 50% of bricks by Italy and Switzerland.

Scanning of 50% of changeable sheet at the LNGS: shifts loads insured by all non Far-east groups. Steady decrease of the number of members: 9% since 2009 (16% since 2008). Significant impact on the contributions of the countries whose composition is stable.

Germany Münster	2 members so far contributed to common fund until 2010 already no travel money and no shift contribution in 2009 and 2010 other contributions essentially stopped with completion of detector construction quits the Collaboration by lack of funding
Rostock	single member has retired during 2010: de facto quits the Collaboration contributed to common fund until 2010 other contributions essentially stopped with completion of detector construction

	200	-	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
Japan	Toho Funabashi	4	5	6	27	27	28
	Aichi Kariya	1	1	1			
	Kobe	2	3	3			
	Nagoya	18	16	16			
	Utsunomiya	2	2	2			
Korea	Gyeongsang Jinju	5	5	5	5	5	5
Total		32	32	33	32	32	33

common fund in addition the CS scanning at the facility in Japan. Japan contributes to 50% of the scanning, bricks and CS.

Medium contributions to shifts besides the CS scanning shifts in Japan.

Strong contribution to the analysis.

Israel	Technion Haifa	1 in 2009	1 in 2010	1 in 2011	
Single m	nember is a professo	r emeritus (80) nov	<i>i</i> in charge of major W	EB contributions.	
•	ribution to shifts (ob	· · ·	J J		
	n fund contribution p	-	anted in 2011.		
JINR	JINR Dubna	6 in 2009	7 in 2010	7 in 2011	
•					
•••			ector and its maintena	ince, directly or via Strasb	ourg.
•••	involved in the physical	-			
	e 35 % common fund				
	contribution to com	•			
One mic	roscope funded and	nopetully operation	nal soon ?		
Turkey	METU Ankara	4 in 2009	4 in 2010	4 in 2011	
Group a	ctive in physics anal	ysis; competence i	n emulsion scanning	used in Bern and Padova.	
Effective	e 35 % common fund	contributions in 20)10.		
Indirect	contribution to com	non fund through e	extra shifts.		
One mic	roscope funded and	hopefully operation	nal soon?		
•					
Croatia	IRB-Zagreb	4 in 2009	4 in 2010	4 in 2011	
• .• •	• • • • • · · ·				
	h physics and detect				
Effoctive	e 55 % common fund	contributions in 20)10.		
	contribution to com				

		200	9	201	0	201	1
Russia	LPI-RAS Mosc	ow	7		5		5
	MSU Moscow	6		5		5	
	total	13		10		10	
Decision	of the CB: reduc	ce the	size	of the	grou	ip to {	5 in 2010
60% of 35	5% contribution	to coi	mmo	n fund	in 20)10	
Large nur	nber of shifts in	extra	a in 2	010			
Some cor	ntribution to phy	vsics	analy	/sis.			

RussiaINR-RAS Moscow886(5)

No contribution to common fund until 2009/2010 with medium contributions to shifts and some contribution to physics analysis.

Decision of the CB in March 2011: reduce the size of the group to 5 in 2011 Counter proposition from INR to be examined by CB in June: reduce the size of the group to 6

Russia ITEP Moscow	4	2	2								
Risk of suspension since beginning of 2010.											
Strong contribution to the construction, installation and running of the spectrometer Precision Tracker											
through collaboration with Hamburg.											
			ta, in particular the alignment.								
Lack funding: No contribution	ution to comm	non fund ar	d very poor contribution to shifts.								
In March 2011: 2 man-mo	nth of shifts e	xecuted at	LNGS.								
Possibility of remote shifts from Hamburg to be considered.											
Decision: keep monitoring the contribution of the group.											
Russia Grand total	29	20	18(17)								

Tunisia CNSTN Tunis

3 in 2010

The group was suspended in September 2008 by lack of contributions to all aspects. It has been reincorporated in the Collaboration with 3 members in March 2010 after the signature of the agreement between CNSTN and IN2P3. This was due to guarantee the mission expenses for scanning shifts at LNGS.

Minimum 35% common fund contribution of 6.6 kEUR in 2010 for a group of 3 members. Contribution of 4.4 kEUR claimed to be paid and contested by INFN: still to be clarified.

Contribution of 38% of shifts obligations in 2010

Change of director in October 2010: end of 10-year contract of Adel Trabelsi. No clear policy in HEP engagements (Agreement with CERN, agreement with IN2P3, CMS, OPERA) by new direction.

In March 2010, decision to quit the Collaboration.

Pending point: one PhD student co-supervised by Universities of Bern and Tunis whose status within the Collaboration still to be defined: corresponding duties shared by the whole Collaboration or exclusively at the charge of Bern?

Groups suspended or dismissed from the Collaboration in 2009 and 2010

Bulgaria Sofia	3 in 2009 dismissed in 2010								
No significant contribution to anything since long. A request for full funding, shifts and common fund, of an enlarged group introduced has failed. Actions taken: The group has been dismissed in September 2009 from the Collaboration.									
Russia Obninsk	4 in 2009 suspended and then dismissed in 2010								
perspective for change.	nything since long ded in September 2009 from the Collaboration and with no clear in December 2010 from the Collaboration.								

Evolution of the OPERA Collaboration with time

	2008	2009	2010	2011
Institutions full members	35	35	33	30
Institutions excluded/suspended			2	
Institutions having quit				3
Countries + JINR		13	12	11
Physicists	190	185	170	163
Founding countries				
Western Europe	114	104	100	96
Far East		32	32	33
Other countries				
Russia + JINR		35	27	25(24)
Other (4→3) small groups		14	12	9

•The size of the Collaboration is steadily decreasing by 14% since 2008 and in particular in the founding and funding countries of Western Europe (-16% since 2008).

•The decrease by 30% in Russia has been imposed by the CB to better adapt the size of the groups to their contributions.

•A total of 5 small groups have left the Collaboration, either on their decision or on decision of the CB but the main reason is always the lack of funding.

2/5/2011

OPERA Funding Agencies meeting