LCLS UEC Meeting July 28th 2023

Present: E. Biasin, Y. Cao, N. Hartley, M. Mitrano, B. Mooers, N. Powers-Riggs, D. Rolles, S. Teitelbaum, J. Williams, L. Conradson, M. Dunne, P. Jones, C. Knotts

Director's Updates

LCLS has restarted, with the first users of 2023 currently onsite after the formal restart yesterday with a campaign beamtime at XPP.

LCLS-II is also approaching the final stages. Although the beam is currently not running due to a cryoplant control issue, the beam will shortly be threated through the undulators with the aim of achieving the formal 'first light' measurement which forms one of the KPPs, prior to the CD4 review in the same week as the Users' Meeting. The X-ray commissioning will start sooner, which will cause some disruption to the Run 21 user program over a two-week period, which is yet to be determined.

User's Meeting

Planning: The speakers are mostly confirmed, including a session on updates of ongoing campaign proposals. Registration is open and all members were encouraged to sign up and publicize it to their groups. A planned 'LCLS-II First Light' event will now happen in October, consistent with availability of senior DOE staff.

Awards/UEC Nominations: There are only two nominations for the Young Investigator Award, compared to seven last year. We would like to invite three finalists to present at the Meeting, and so nominations are being held open for an additional week. Although the lack of experiments this year is a problem, analysis and publications have proceeded and nominations can be made on that basis.

There are four nominations for the User Recognition Award. The nominees are mostly from condensed matter work, and so nominations that reflect the diverse pool of staff at LCLS are welcomed.

There are no nominations for some of the UEC positions that are rotating off, including AMO, M&I and MEC. Matteo will remind all members, and particularly ask those members leaving to nominate at least one possible replacement.

DOE Meeting: As part of the Users' Meeting, the UEC meets with DOE representatives. Matteo asked for advice on what to include in the slide deck for this meeting, and what to change from the previous year. Alongside updates on the restart and LCLS-II, what concerns do we have, and what have we focused on over the last year.

Possible topics to highlight:
- PRP changes, including the suggestion to move to a blind PRP. This would be tied to ideas about broadening the user base to groups that haven't used LCLS before
- Actions taken following the user survey, and how we addressed other issues raised last year
- Proposed LCLS newsletter – it was suggested that an example or mock-up could be released, but we want to avoid starting a newsletter that we don't have the bandwidth or support to continue.
- What foreseeable problems can the DOE help us address? This could include how to deal with new data rates, and whether we can look to expand the beamtime capacity of LCLS.

A recent OSTP memo from the White House said that all federally funded data has to be publicly available. The UEC noted the need to emphasize that we want to work together with DOE to find a scalable solution. For instance, they could organize meetings with PIs, facility, and DOE representatives to help determine a common approach.

Inter-Facility Cooperation: This led to a wider discussion on cross-facility cooperation, since all the light sources will face similar data storage issues. SSURF is an organization nominally representing all user facilities; although it advocates for us in Washington, most users are not aware of it.

Previously, the light source UECs have worked together to e.g., write letters to congress in support of funding. However, most collaboration between light sources takes place on the facility side, rather than for users.

Similar work between light sources could happen under the aegis of SSURF in the future, or could be done entirely separately, as in the past. This might be giving up name recognition when advocating, but that mostly comes from the notability of the facilities themselves, so may not matter. How to work together with other user facilities needs to be an ongoing discussion.