Friday May 26th
LCLS UEC Meeting Notes

Present: Nicholas Hartley, Uwe Bergmann, Yue Cao, Gilles Doumy, Sebastien Boutet, Margaret Doyle, Leilani Conradson, Elisa Biasin, Blaine Mooers, Marius Schmidt, Natalia Power-Riggs, Paul Jones, Cathy Knott, Jackson Williams, Tais Gorkhover, Agostino Marinelli, Dominik Obertour, Emma McBride, Samuel Teitelbaum, Daniel Rolles

Updates from LCLS Management (Sebastien):

- 177 proposals were submitted for Run 22. This is an increase wrt Run 21 (133 proposal). This is consistent with offering of soft X-rays, but there is also increase in number of hard X-rays proposals. Data Collection proposals are also included in this number.
- Some statistic can be seen in the plots below. Increased request for CSD and HMC.
- The recent PRP has experience some challenges:
  - some panels have large demand with challenges in reviewing all proposals in time
  - some PRP members had to drop out last minute from the PRP meeting
  - PRP experienced difficulties in separating between Regular proposal and Data Collection proposals
- The restart of User operation at LCLS has now been pushed to a target date of mid-July.
  - There is ongoing discussion with PIs of Run 21 accepted proposal for updates and possible change of scope.
  - The summer shutdown (usually August) has been cancelled and there may be a fall or winter shutdown instead. After October, there may be integration in the schedule of Run 22 accepted proposal, with overall scheduling until June 2024.
  - PAMM days happen regularly in the schedule and they include contingency shifts, maintenance, safety days, etc.
- The restart of MeV-UED will follow the restart of LCLC

Discussion on LCLS restart and communication with User Base:

- It could be fruitful to only contact the PIs of Run 21 proposals when plans are a little clearer. Communication with the larger group is encouraged.
• Suggestion to send out an email from User Office/ LCLS Director to User Community at large to summarize the challenges experienced in the last period and ‘comfort’ the community that we are all working towards the same goal of fast and safe restart of operation.
• It could be good at least to add in the LCLS website that LCLS is now on downtime (like SSRL for instance has done)
• Users (especially if coming from abroad) may have issues coming in for a beamtime in August/September due to other commitments (vacation/kid’s school/etc.). LCLS management is aware of this and is keeping an open discussion with Run 21 PIs.

Discussion on PRP challenges:

• Reviewers are usually asked to review 9/10 proposals. Every proposal is reviewed by 3 reviewers. The challenge is that, when a panel has 50 proposals (as for CSD and HMC this time) it is not possible to go through them in an 8-hours review meeting. Even with a big panel, you just can’t discuss each proposal thoroughly. Realistically you get 5-7 minutes per proposal when you include breaks, lunches, introduction, etc.
• It would help to have a cap for the number of proposals reviewed by each PRP member. This will ensure fairness.
• The fact that some PRP members drop out the meeting at the last minute causes several issues. For instance, the other reviewers need to pick up the work, as well as some proposals are reviewed by 1 or 2 people instead of 3.
• It could help to split the different panels in sub-panels. For instance, in CSD, split gas-phase from liquid-phase experiments. Or, split soft and hard X-ray proposals. The latter could be a good suggestion considering that the two kinds of proposals are not competing for the same beam. In the past, different ranking have been used for the two kinds of proposal.
• It would be useful to coordinate feedback from the PRP. Right now, every PRP is encouraged to contact LCLS management, but the creation of a questionnaire could help to standardize the process. The User Office has actually been working on this.
• Another idea is to have only the chairs of the panels to get back together after the larger PRP meeting.
• Would an in-person review meeting help instead of virtual?
  o PROS: people would have to commit in advance to the trip, so you would know who is going to be present.
  o CONS: may be perceived as waste of time and money. Money needs to come out from LCLS budget?
• Having more PRP members would be beneficial. Plenty of younger researcher could be interested/available for this.
• Is the final discussion actually useful, or a score-based ranking would be more objective? There might be some arbitrariness in ‘bumping proposals up or down’ at the last discussion (i.e. highly biased last minute adjustment, eloquences of one PRP reviewer in highlight their topic of interest, etc.). Having enough remote scores could make the process more objective.
• There are pros-and-cons with both approaches. Reviewers meeting often help address inconsistencies between initial reviews (i.e. if some reviewer noticed some critical issues/benefit that other reviewer noticed)

Updates on the User Meeting

• Agenda is coming together. Plenary speakers have been invited and we are waiting to hear back.
- We are going to have a data analysis workshop on the Sunday inviting students to come a little bit earlier, meet other students, etc.
- Panofsky is not available. Can we have some session outside? Issues in the last due to heat/wind.

**Updates on newsletter:**

- So far, we are planning on sending it twice a year, in connection with the release of PRP results, when Users may be more attentive. We can adjust later on the frequency based on a more realistic estimate on the time it takes.
- We should distinguish the newsletter from a regular facility newsletter. Links to research highlights can be provided, but the focus should be given to topics that concern users more directly and broadly, such as UEC discussions, and even news from other facilities.