

January 30, 2013

Dear Colleague,

It has come to our attention that there is still some confusion about the roles of DPF, HEPAP/P5, DOE/NSF, and the “Snowmass” process in developing plans for future US HEP efforts over the coming months. This is not entirely surprising given the variety of program planning exercises underway. We are writing to try to clarify the situation. Fundamentally, this is a multi-step process with several important milestones over the coming year, and each step will inform and prepare for the next.

First, DOE Office of Science (SC) Director Bill Brinkman issued a charge in December to the SC advisory committees to get their advice on the scientific impact and technical maturity of planned and proposed SC Facilities, in order to develop a coherent plan for future DOE/SC facilities over the next 10 years. Only facilities with a large projected DOE program contribution (>\$100 million) to fabrication over this time frame will be considered. The HEPAP Chair has been charged with forming a new subpanel to respond to this request, and its report will be presented for HEPAP’s approval at their spring meeting. Given the compressed time frame and the considerable effort that has already been expended on HEP program planning by HEPAP and its subpanels, we expect the new HEPAP Facilities subpanel will summarize the current status of these projects, and will identify possibilities offered by new ideas not considered by previous studies, taking account of recent physics results. We note that the Facilities subpanel will not rank order projects. Moreover, this SC planning process is not intended to preclude additional ideas that may emerge from the Snowmass and P5 activities to follow.

Next, the DPF-led Snowmass process has been established to identify compelling science opportunities over an approximately 20 year time frame. This process necessarily encompasses a wider portfolio of activities than that considered by the HEPAP Facilities subpanel, and can make more detailed studies of new and existing concepts. Many important physics questions that can be addressed via the Snowmass process have already been identified and are being discussed in the various community meetings that are already underway to prepare for Snowmass. We note that the DPF process will not recommend priorities but it can certainly have strong input to the upcoming prioritization process (see below), and can make statements about the sense of the community regarding the importance and impact of these future concepts. We urge participation by the entire US community in

developing a common vision for the future of HEP. We expect the DPF process will produce a report which summarizes the science case and highlights selected areas which need additional research and/or technology R&D. We further note that, from the funding agency perspective, the report would be much more useful if it makes some scientific judgments, for example the extent to which each proposed project would address the most important scientific questions, and whether there are other ways to answer these questions.

Finally, the funding agencies expect to charge HEPAP with establishing a new program prioritization subpanel (a.k.a. P5) around the time of the completion of the Snowmass process. HEPAP/P5 will use the input from Snowmass, along with budgetary and other input from DOE/NSF, to recommend a new strategic plan for US HEP in various scenarios. It is important to remember that HEPAP is the federally sanctioned body that provides advice to the funding agencies on the HEP program. It is one of the few official paths the agencies have for collecting community input. We expect they will consult with DPF and the Snowmass working groups (among others) in their process. The new HEPAP/P5 strategic plan will then form a basis for DOE and NSF planning for the future of the US HEP/EPP program, just as the current U.S. program has been shaped by the previous P5 studies starting in 2006.

Effective communication both within and outside the HEP community is crucial to the ultimate success of these efforts. We look forward to working with the community, and its representatives in DPF, to improve communication within our community and to develop a clear and consistent plan that all of us can convey to the outside world to increase understanding and appreciation of our science. We very much appreciate your input and engagement throughout this process.

Sincerely,

F. Fleming Crim
Assistant Director for Mathematical and Physical Sciences
National Science Foundation

Jim Siegrist
Associate Director for High Energy Physics
DOE Office of Science