

MINUTES OF MEETING

Title/Subject: Diamond User Committee Meeting #4

Venue: Diamond House, G59

Chairman:
Dr Joanna Collingwood

Time/Date: Tuesday 1st February 2011

Secretary:
Kathryn Poulter

PARTICIPANTS

ADDITIONAL DISTRIBUTION

DUC members

Stuart Clarke
Bill Clegg
Joanna Collingwood
(Chair)
Karen Edler
Ian Hamley
Karen Hudson-Edwards
Emyr MacDonald
Keith Meek
Peter Moody
Pagona Papakonstantinou
Johan Turkenburg

Institution

University of Cambridge
University of Newcastle
University of Warwick

University of Bath
University of Reading
Birkbeck College
University of Cardiff
University of Cardiff
University of Leicester
University of Ulster
University of York

**Diamond Light Source
representatives:**

Steve Collins
Andy Dent
Sarnjeet Dhesi

Gwyndaf Evans
Susan Judge
Fred Mosselmans

Kathryn Poulter

Trevor Rayment
Dave Stuart
Chiu Tang

Nick Terrill

Richard Walker
Martin Walsh
Patrick Wilson

Materials Village Coordinator
Physical Sciences Coordinator
Surfaces & Interfaces Village
Coordinator
MX Village Coordinator
User Office Manager
Spectroscopy Village
Coordinator
Science Division Project
Controller
Director, Physical Sciences
Director, Life Sciences
Engineering & Environmental
Science Village Coordinator
Soft Condensed Matter Village
Coordinator
Director, Technical Division
Life Sciences Coordinator
Head of Communications

APOLOGIES

Malcolm McMahon
University of Edinburgh

1. INTRODUCTIONS AND OPENING REMARKS

Joanna Collingwood welcomed everyone to the meeting, including two new representatives Karen Hudson-Edwards (Spectroscopy Village) and Karen Edler (Surfaces and Interfaces Village).

Apologies were received from Malcolm McMahon.

2. MINUTES AND ACTIONS

The Minutes of the meeting held on 8th September 2010 were approved.

Action 3.2 – More detailed guidance for new applicants writing a proposal has been drafted. Sue will update the website for the next call (Feb-11).

Action: Sue Judge

Action 3.9 – An update on the Offline Labs would be addressed in the talk later in the meeting.

Action 3.11 – The automatic reminder to be sent to users to complete an Experimental Report is expected to be available in February.

Action: Sue Judge

All other actions were completed.

3. ESUO

Joanna Collingwood reported that representation on the ESUO was continuing, as chair of the DUC, and as the UK representative.

4. USER REPRESENTATIVES REPORT

There were few issues raised by Users.

i) “Feedback following unsuccessful proposals.”

Keith Meek raised the issue that in situations where the PBS advises users with their proposal, then it would be helpful to inform them of feedback from the PRP if the application is unsuccessful. Following discussion, it was suggested that the PI could forward any feedback to the PBS. However it should be noted that the PBS is not responsible if applications are unsuccessful.

ii) Peter Moody commented how quiet and satisfied the users seemed to be.

iii) Bill Clegg commented that he had received no feedback.

5. MACHINE UPDATE REPORT

Richard Walker gave a presentation to update the DUC on developments and performance with the machine.

6. PHYSICAL SCIENCES REPORT

Trevor Rayment gave a presentation to update progress on the Physical Sciences beamlines.

The issue of whether Phase III beamlines will address the oversubscription of some beamlines was discussed. Trevor commented that in the early APs, I22 and I06 were very oversubscribed. However, as I10 BLADE comes online, and then the I09 soft x-ray end station, the situation should improve for I06. B21 high throughput SAXS (Phase III) will help the situation on I22, however increasing capacity was not necessarily the driving force behind beamline selection for Phase III as opposed to improving capability. New beamlines for Phase III were also pushing the capability of Diamond.

It was requested that a presentation on Phase III be given at the next DUC.

Action: Trevor Rayment

Joanna commented that ESUO was looking at the high/low subscription rates at synchrotrons throughout Europe, and that making this information centrally available to prospective users, will help with both over and under subscription at the Light Sources.

7. LIFE SCIENCES UPDATE

Dave Stuart gave a presentation to update progress on the Life Sciences beamlines.

There was some discussion on Industrial demand and the impact on beamline statistics. It was requested that the statistics presented indicate Industrial usage.

Action: Sue Judge

Currently of the beamtime available on MX, ~80% is used by Academic users, and 20% is Industrial users not via the PRP. The DLS guidelines are that a maximum of 30% beamtime on an individual beamline can be used for Industry and overall at Diamond a max of 10%. Additionally Industrial users are not allowed on a beamline until 1 year after 1st user. There is considerable demand from Industrial users and this is increasing as new opportunities are explored e.g. for remote access.

The question was raised as to what Diamond does with the income from Industry. At present it is used for improving the capacity on the beamlines that take Industrial users e.g. faster detectors, additional manpower.

8. USER OFFICE REPORT

Sue Judge gave a presentation to update progress in the User Office.

It was requested that when you type in your e-mail address, the system then reminds you of your FED ID. Sue replied that the FED-ID system is not under DLS control however the Quest system to remind users of their password is available and works well.

There was some discussion regarding Users watching the safety video in advance of coming to Diamond. This can be done the night before in Ridgeway House, via Users own laptops.

The request was made that the information from the video that has to be remembered, and is different at every facility e.g. key telephone numbers, be distilled into a single sheet and given out / displayed at the beamlines. This is available in the Welcome Packs sent to the PIs, and will be made available on the beamlines.

Action: Sue Judge.

Sue reported that the implementation of a new online claims system was being considered.

The issue of sample size for the Satisfaction Surveys was raised. It was agreed to add the number of forms completed to the statistics.

Action: Sue Judge

It was commented that I12 scored the lowest on software. Trevor responded that the survey was part of the process to raise visibility of issues and take appropriate action to improve the beamlines e.g. by making additional resource available.

Phase 2 build of Ridgeway house has been completed, and a third phase is planned, but an update is required on progress.

Action: Sue Judge

8. FEEDBACK FROM VILLAGE COORDINATOR BREAKOUT SESSIONS

i) Soft Condensed Matter

Ian Hamley reported that I22 is now running smoothly after the issues with the monochromator have been resolved. B22 was running well with no major issues. It was requested that the User office provide more clarity regarding contingency experiments. Given that B23 seems to have fewer shifts requested for AP9 than are available, it seemed strange to have contingency expts. Post meeting note: The statistics show user requested shifts at the time of proposal submission. Following the technical assessment, the number of shifts was increased. However this is not shown in the data presented.

It was commented that solution BIOSAXS on I03 was an interesting development.

ii) Engineering

Stuart Clarke reported on the three operational beamlines in the Engineering and Environmental village. I11 - running reliably, availability of the gas cell was a very helpful development and the DSC was nice to have. I12 has had issues with GDA, which was inevitable given that new detectors were involved. It was discussed as to whether any lessons learnt regarding new electronics and software could be applied in the future. I15 – it was noted that it was having mechanical stability issues with the DCM and focussing mirror, however was moving forward to improve beam stability and also with the purchase of flat-panel and Atlas CCD detectors.

Full proposal in Phase III for a Larger Area Detectors PD beamline has been submitted and it was one of five beamlines going forward to the final round of SAC review.

iii) Surfaces and Interfaces

Karen Edler reported that they had discussed how to prompt more user comments, and that perhaps a more targeted village specific email could be sent. Stuart commented that he called up people he knows if they have had beamtime recently and asked for feedback.

It was requested if the user office could provide recent user's names to village reps. Sue commented that the schedule is available on the website and has the name of the PI and when they have beamtime. It was agreed that the link to the schedule should be circulated, and that the Reps should try to contact users in their village for feedback after beamtime.

Action: Sue Judge

Action: DUC Reps

iv) Spectroscopy.

Karen Hudson-Edwards reported on the status of the 3 beamlines in the village. The He cryostat and polycapillary are now available on I18, and the WDX is now running. There was concern at the low number of applications for I18. More effort should be made to encourage applications from Europe. B18 was working well and the software was improving. I20 would be running later in the year. It was requested that people who have been awarded beamtime on I20, that has not yet been scheduled, should be contacted and given an update.

Action: Sue Judge

v) Macromolecular Crystallography MX

Gwyndaf Evans reported that the question of making flexible scheduling available for users had been discussed and the following steps agreed.

i) Draw up plans and implement onsite dewar storage and tracking facilities to enable users to send in pucks/samples that can be queued on-site ready for available beamtime.

Action: Gwyndaf Evans

ii) In longer term look at implementing a smaller minimum shift period to enable easy scheduling of time periods <8hrs.

Action: Sue Judge / Bill Pulford

iii) Investigate reimbursement of dewar shipping costs if remote access means no travel or subsistence is used.

Action: Gwyndaf Evans

Travel expense limits per day were also discussed. Travelling to and from Diamond on one day might be cheaper than having an overnight stay but is not allowed due to a daily cost ceiling.

Bill Clegg thought that this might be an Inland Revenue issue related to taxable benefits.

Action: Sue Judge

vi) Materials

Steve Collins reported that the following has been discussed:-

- 1) Feedback from PRP. Could more details be provided as to why an application is unsuccessful, e.g. a tick box Science/Technical etc **Action: Sue Judge**
- 2) List of Peer Review Panels is not up to date on the website. **Action Sue Judge**
- 3) There are still problems with the cards not working with the vending machines.
- 4) Prices have increased in the restaurant but the funding provided has not. **Action: Sue Judge.**
- 5) Software – It was felt that the structure of GDA support is good, with individual software engineers assigned to each beamline. However better communication is required between beamlines as to which features are available.
- 6) There appear to be issues with full access to the DLS visitor network facilities from Ridgeway House e.g. accessing data directories in order to read and copy data sets collected during beamtime. **Action: Bill to give Sue the details to follow up.**

9. OFFLINE LABORATORIES

Trevor Rayment gave a presentation to update progress on the offline laboratories.

A draft website is in place, however there is ~1 month further work to add the necessary keywords to the database, and the system should be made available end March. There are 114 pieces of eqpt in the database, and a list can be made available if required.

Peter Moody asked if there was opportunity to suggest additional eqpt. Trevor replied that one can make suggestions; however there was no mechanism of funding other than via the Capital budget in competition with beamline upgrades.

Stuart Clarke raised the issue as to whether there was a technical officer looking after eqpt in the labs, otherwise it can easily get run down if not properly maintained. This is also a concern of Diamond staff; however the offline labs do have technical support, and Diamond will have to see how things go.

This issue of priority was raised. Synchrotron users will have priority, and so the question was raised as to how clashes could be prevented with expts? In some villages, eqpt is already scheduled (e.g. in Surface science), however in the first instance, this is not expected to be an issue, and will be a nice problem to have.

People coming to use the labs will be treated as External visitors, and will be separate from the User Office processes. They will not be part of the Synchrotron Experimental Risk Assessment system, but will need to complete their own RAs.

Process will be trialled for 6 months.

10. INDUSTRIAL UPDATE

Elizabeth Shotton gave an update on the Industrial group's activities.

Currently 32 companies have used Diamond, and 13 beamlines and offline labs have been used. I07 and B22 have been used for the first time this month.

Joanna asked if there was any advantage in Industrials collaborating with Academics, and DLS acting as the bridge. Elizabeth replied that they do suggest Industrials contact Academics where appropriate.

Industrial users have a number of options to access beamtime:-

- Via the PRP as for academic users when there is no guarantee of beamtime and results are published.
- They can pay for beamtime, and consequently do not have to publish or share IP.
- They can pay anyway, in order to guarantee beamtime.

Stuart Clarke requested that the Marketing Sheets be made available on the website, and Elizabeth agreed to e-mail when these were available.

Action: Elizabeth Shotton

Peter Moody asked whether representation for Industrial users was through the Village structure or whether we have users on the DUC. Industrial users have the equivalent DiSCO (Diamond Industrial Science Committee). DUC members should still talk to Industrial users; however the DUC is an academic panel.

Joanna requested that an update be given every other meeting.

11. COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

Laura Holland gave an overview on the current plans for the SRUM 2011.

Six workshops have been proposed by the Village Coordinators. Feedback would be appreciated on the structure and content of SRUM, especially with regard to the balance of the workshops and any suggestions for speakers. Additionally any feedback on the Public engagement pack would be appreciated. An e-mail will be sent out requesting feedback.

Action: Kathryn Poulter

A student afternoon will be held before the SRUM. Dinner would be provided in the RAL restaurant, however it was planned to use the space at Ridgeway House for refreshments and networking opportunities afterwards. Students will be asked to give rapid succinct talks with a strict format e.g. Ignite. It was requested that details were made available on the website as early as possible.

The young investigator award was discussed, where a PDRA would be able to win beamtime. Trevor and Dave agreed to discuss the way forward within Diamond. This needs to be agreed by April to give people time to submit proposals.

Action: Trevor Rayment and Dave Stuart

The Usernet is currently being reviewed, to make more information available and change the navigational structure. Mock ups may be tested on the DUC.

Communications group are planning to send an e-zine to users every 3 months with updates to beamlines, events etc on a village basis. It was agreed that some general content would be good as well as village specific material. It should be sent to everyone in the User database unless they opt out.

It was requested that specific case studies would help for public engagement. Laura can provide this on request.

13. MEMBERSHIP / ELECTION OF A NEW CHAIR

There was some discussion around the procedure for election of a new chair, with the handover to be some time during the summer 2011, before DUC #5.

It was agreed that membership of the DUC should be a 3year term, with an absolute max of 4 years. Based on this, approx 1/3 of representatives should “retire” each year, however not both reps from a village. This could be done alphabetically in the first instance.

At the moment one representative for a village is elected by the user community and the other is nominated by DLS. It was agreed that in the future, the default for both representatives should be an election. However if there were no nominees, then Diamond should be able to nominate representatives.

The Term of chair will be for 2 years. An e-mail will be sent out to the existing committee, requesting anyone wishing to stand for Chair, or wishing to nominate candidates, to inform Joanna. Joanna will then confirm candidates and notify Kathryn Poulter who will run an election by e-mail. Handover will be in time for the User meeting (DUC 5).

Action: Kathryn Poulter

The terms of reference of the DUC will be updated.

Action: Kathryn Poulter/Joanna Collingwood.

14. AOB

It was asked whether there were any plans to provide a gym on site e.g. at Ridgeway House. At the moment there are no plans for a gym in the guesthouse, but Users can temporarily sign up to the RecSoc on site, which has a gym but not weights room. Information is in the Welcome packs.

Annex A: New Actions

Number	Action	Actionee	Target Completion Date / Status
3.2	To make a more detailed guidance note on applying for beamtime available on the website.	Sue Judge	End Feb
3.11	To implement an automatic reminder to be sent to users to complete an Experimental Report.	Sue Judge	End Feb
4.1	To give a presentation on Phase III at the next DUC.	Trevor Rayment	Next meeting
4.2	To clarify which statistics include Industrial use.	Sue Judge	Next meeting
4.3	To make Welcome Packs available on the beamlines	Sue Judge	End Feb
4.4	To add the number of forms completed to the statistics.	Sue Judge	Next meeting
4.5	To give an update on the next phase of build of Ridgeway House.	Sue Judge	Next meeting
4.6	To send a link to the schedule to the DUC	Sue Judge	End Feb
4.7	To contact PIs to obtain feedback on recent visits.	DUC Reps	Next meeting
4.8	To contact users on I20	Sue Judge	End Feb
4.9	Draw up plans and implement onsite dewar storage and tracking facilities.	Gwyndaf Evans	Next meeting
4.10	Implement a smaller minimum shift period to enable easy scheduling of time periods <8hrs.	Sue Judge/ Bill Pulford	Next meeting
4.11	Investigate reimbursement of dewar shipping costs if remote access means no travel or subsistence is used	Gwyndaf Evans	Next meeting
4.12	To investigate the reasons for travel expense limits per day and report back	Sue Judge	Next meeting
4.13	To review feedback given to unsuccessful users from the PRP.	Sue Judge	Next meeting
4.14	To update the PRP lists on the website	Sue Judge	End Feb

4.15	To review the allowance for food.	Sue Judge	End March
4.16	Bill to send details regarding accessing the DLS visitor network from Ridgeway House to Sue, who will follow up and report back to the next meeting.	Bill Clegg / Sue Judge	Next meeting
4.17	To inform the DUC when Marketing sheets are available.	Elizabeth Shotton	Next meeting
4.18	To e-mail DUC requesting feedback on the SRUM programme.	Kathryn Poulter	End Feb.
4.19	To agree the process for the Young Investigator Award for the SRUM.	Dave Suart/Trevor Rayment	End March
4.20	To request nominations to stand as Chair of the DUC.	Kathryn Poulter	End May
4.21	To update the Terms of Reference of the DUC.	Kathryn Poulter/ Joanna Collingwood.	End May