EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHARTER

I. Function

The Experimental Program Advisory Committee (*EPAC*) will advise the Director of the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center (*SLAC*) on the selection of facilities and experiments for the *SLAC* high energy physics program, and on modifications of facilities and basic installations that would substantially influence the experimental program.

II. Membership and Chairman

The members of the *EPAC* will be appointed by the Director of *SLAC* after broad consultation within the high energy physics community, including the *SLAC/LBL* Users Organization (*SLUO*). The *EPAC* will have twelve members of whom at least seven will be high energy physicists not employed by Stanford University (including *SLAC*).

The *EPAC* appointments will be for three-year-terms, with four new members being appointed each year; at least one of the new appointments each year will be selected from a slate of at least three candidates nominated by *SLUO*. In the event that an *EPAC* member cannot complete his term, an interim appointment may be made by the Director.

The *EPAC* will elect its own chairman.

III. Mode of Operation

A. Meetings and Deadlines

The meeting dates of the *EPAC* will set by the Director as frequently as necessary. It is anticipated that meetings will normally occur twice a year, but must occur at least once a year. All new proposals submitted to the Laboratory at least two months prior to a given *EPAC* meeting will be considered at that meeting. However, proposals for upgrades to existing experiments or running extensions to already approved experiments need only a one month prior submission. There will be no specific deadlines for submission of proposals and no fixed target dates set for *EPAC* recommendations unless the *SLAC* Director determines that these are required by the development of the experimental program.

B. Procedures

All definitive proposals will be made available to the *EPAC* and will become public upon receipt. The procedure for handling a given proposal will depend upon the nature and scale of the proposal. The Director will decide upon the appropriate procedure. The following sub-sections are given for guidance in this matter.

1. Small- or Moderate-scale Initiatives

   Proposals for small- or moderate-scale projects will be referred directly to the *EPAC* with a general impact analysis including both cost and resource requirements (see Sec. III C, below). Such proposals must be in writing and be sufficiently detailed to provide a reasonable basis for decision. In particular, the proposals should give a quantitative justification for the requested amount of set-up, testing, checkout, and running time as well as minimum luminosity or intensity, and services required from the Laboratory. Computer hardware, software, and data analysis requirements should also be detailed. Only proposals for specific physics programs will be considered.

   Depending upon the complexity of the proposal, the Director, in consultation with the Chairman of the *EPAC*, may designate *EPAC* subcommittees to meet with the proponents and study the details of the proposal. These subcommittees will report their findings to the *EPAC*. An oral presentation to the *EPAC*, open to the public, will be given by the proponents as part of the *EPAC* consideration of the proposal.

   The *EPAC* will state the conditions under which it recommends approval of an experiment. These conditions might include necessary tests or milestones that would have to take place prior to installation or data taking as well as the number of beam hours for the experiment. Although at the time of approval, recommendations may be sought from the *EPAC* as to the urgency of executing various parts of the experimental program, the detailed scheduling of the program and the administration of the short range schedule will be the responsibility of the Laboratory management.

2. Large-scale Initiatives

   A large-scale initiative is a proposal for a new facility or a very large experiment which would encumber equipment funds for several years. Such initiatives, once developed into full-scale programs, preempt other large-scale proposals for several years and limit the use of equipment funds for the *SLAC* program. Consequently, they strongly shape the scientific and research program of the Laboratory which is the responsibility of the *SLAC* Director. For these reasons, a different procedure will be used for large-scale initiatives.

   For large-scale initiatives it is desirable to have intensive periods of analysis and development and broad exposure to the community prior to formal

recommendations by the *EPAC* to the *SLAC* Director. Therefore, for such initiatives the Laboratory staff, upon receipt of proposals, in consultation with the Chairman of *EPAC*, will develop a suitable program of public presentation and workshops. These will inform the community at an early stage of the existence of the proposal for a new large-scale initiative and permit a broad discussion of the proposal and its potential impact. The *EPAC* will designate members to attend these activities and report to *EPAC* at subsequent meetings. As appropriate, the Laboratory staff will also negotiate elaboration and modification of such initiatives into feasible plans for execution. A thorough analysis of the impact that the approval of the large-scale initiative would have on all Laboratory resources and an analysis of the feasible time scale for completion will be performed by the Laboratory staff.

When the *SLAC* Director determines that the proposal has been sufficiently presented to the community and that all questions of impact, collaborative arrangements, R&D milestones, fabrication and activation schedules, and software and data analysis have been adequately explored, he will refer the revised proposal to the *EPAC* for advice on approval or disapproval. The *EPAC* may also be requested to advise on guidelines for the longer term aspects of the initiative. In the event that several proposals for large-scale initiatives are developed on competitive time scales, the *SLAC* Director shall attempt to adjust the timing to permit a comparative evaluation by the *EPAC*.

3. Experimental Facilities

In the case of certain large-scale initiatives, it may be anticipated that the proposed experimental installation will have utility well beyond the reasonable plans of the proponents. In this situation, the proposed installation can be labelled a "facility." While the essence of a facility is the commitment to make the device useful to members of the community who are not initially involved in its construction, its approval process can be appropriately handled as a large-scale initiative, described above. In this case, during the discussion, analysis, and workshop period prior to *EPAC* consideration, requirements for the long range operation of the facility should also be addressed.

4. Ongoing Programs

In order to maintain program flexibility, it is Laboratory policy to refrain from formally making long-term or open-ended commitments of Laboratory resources, even when it appears quite probable that an experimental program will prove interesting for an extended period. Typically, it is expected that approvals for running time will be for a maximum of one year, although longer durations may be appropriate in certain circumstances. Yearly approvals also furnish a useful mechanism for appraisal and review of ongoing experimental programs.

C. Laboratory Resources

The *SLAC* staff will prepare a report on the impact that the approval of a given proposal would have on the resources of the Laboratory, total funding requirements from all sources, and scheduling compatibility. This report will be available to the proponents and to the *EPAC*.

While the *EPAC* will be informed on funding requirements and projected funding availability for proposals before approval, the *EPAC* will not make specific funding recommendations. The actual funding and commitments by *SLAC* will be determined through negotiations between the proponents and the management of *SLAC*. The agreements negotiated between *SLAC* and proponents will be kept on file and open to inspection upon request.

D. Conflict of Interest

A member of the *EPAC* will not take part in deliberations or votes when:

1. his/her name appears on the proposal under consideration,
2. another proposal is being considered in direct competition with one in which the member is a collaborator, or
3. he/she decides that his/her participation appears to create a conflict of interest.

E. Deliberations and Decisions

The *EPAC* is advisory to the Director of *SLAC*. The Director of *SLAC* or his Deputy will participate in the *EPAC* deliberations, for it is recognized that the Director benefits from the *EPAC* debate prior to making decisions. The deliberations of the *EPAC* will be confidential to the extent legally possible. All decisions to accept or reject a particular proposal will be made by the Director of *SLAC* or his assigned Deputy after receiving the advice of the *EPAC*. Upon receiving the recommendations of the *EPAC*, the Director of *SLAC* will inform the *EPAC* of his decisions.

For proposals requiring urgent action without time for a formal review by the *EPAC*, the Director will consult with the *EPAC* chairman about a suitable ad hoc review and decision process.

F. Progress and Reviews

The EPAC can be requested by the *SLAC* Director to review the progress of a facility, experiment, or machine development. It will make any recommendations arising from these reviews that it considers would improve the experimental program.

G. EPAC Records and Communication

The Director of *SLAC* will appoint a particle physicist to serve as secretary to the *EPAC*. The secretary will not be a member of *EPAC*. The secretary will keep records of the *EPAC* deliberations, its recommendations, and the Director's decisions. Within 20 days after each meeting, he will transmit the record of the meeting to the Director. The *EPAC* secretary will communicate the decisions of the Director to the proponents.

For proposals accepted, a record will be kept of the assigned time, the tests and milestones to be met, and, as the program develops, the actual number of hours, integrated luminosity, or number of track chamber pictures received.