

ATTACHMENTS:



DUC_report_life_sci_
Jun09.ppt



DUC_report_machine
_ Jun '09.ppt



DUC_UO_report_Jun
e 09.doc



SCI-DIV-PRO-0023
(ToRs)_v2.doc



DUC_report_phys_sc
i_Jun09.ppt

Start of Meeting/ Welcome

Apologies had been received from Keith Meek (University of Cardiff) and Gerhard Materlik (Diamond Light Source).

Professor Rayment welcomed those present to the inaugural meeting of the Diamond User Committee (DUC).

1. Review of the Terms of Reference and Appointment of a Chairman

It was explained that the Chair of the DUC should be drawn from amongst the membership but that the first meeting would be chaired by a Science Director.

Terms of Reference:

The Terms of Reference were presented to the DUC. Under this item, Professor Clegg suggested that in future an email should be sent to all users prior to each meeting of the DUC to request topics for discussion and to inform the users of the date of the meeting.

It was agreed that the membership of the DUC, the minutes and presentations of the meetings would be placed on the Diamond external website.

Action 1.1: DUC members to select the chairman of the DUC.

Action 1.2: Diamond to send e-mail to all users prior to DUC meetings to request topics for discussion.

Action 1.3: Diamond to place meeting material on external web site.

2. Review of Operations

2.1 Performance of the source:

Professor Richard Walker, Technical Director, summarised the performance of the machine. He noted the recent problem surrounding the I15 wiggler. An unexpected failure of a cryocooler had delayed a return to normal operations following a modification to reduce the head load on the insertion device.

2.2 Performance of the beamlines:

Professor Trevor Rayment and Professor David Stuart gave presentations on the status of the beamlines.

Comment from DUC

- I18: Dr Joanna Collingwood asked about possibilities for control of focal spot size in future. Fred Mosselmanns stated that, although the new mechanically focussed KB mirrors would be much more straightforward to operate than the original piezoelectric bimorphs, it might not be sensible to give users control of focusing.

3. Village Infrastructure

Sarnjeet Dhesi explained the reasons why Diamond beamlines are organised into Scientific Villages and the role of support staff at Diamond. The objective of the village organisation was defined as “a collection of facilities forming a coordinated infrastructure to support and promote the scientific capabilities of Diamond”.

Sarnjeet explained that the villages met regularly to coordinate activities.

Peter Moody noted that users’ representatives were not present at meetings. It was pointed out that PBSs should represent the interests of their users.

In discussion it was suggested that a web forum could be established for users to discuss offline facilities at Diamond.

Malcolm McMahon asked what difference the existence of a village made to users. It was noted that villages avoided duplication of off-line facilities and thereby improved the range of facilities that could be made available.

4. Diamond User Interface

Sue Judge gave a presentation on the operation of the User office and the Diamond User interface. The presentation explained the reasons for the development of a fully integrated web-based interface that would assist both the users and Diamond staff at all stages, from the submission of proposals through to the presentation of expense claims following an experiment. The new on-line proposal system will be operating before the next call for proposals.

4.1 Specific Issues:

Experimental Risk Assessment forms (ERA):

Sue Judge agreed that the original system had proved to be unworkable. The ERA system is evolving towards a web-based risk assessment; the current Excel file format is an intermediate stage. Problems for Mac users were acknowledged as well for users of legacy versions of Excel.

Excel macros were noted to be essential for the purpose of validation of data. A web-based system would be introduced in August: this system could be used on-line or downloaded to an Excel form.

Comments from DUC:

It was asked whether the ERA and safety forms were driven by the needs of the MX community. Sue Judge stated that the needs of the physical and life sciences were met by use of different forms.

Peter Moody asked if all of the data on the form was actually needed: Gwyndaf Evans offered to talk to the Safety Group to ensure that only essential data is collected.

Joanna Collingwood suggested that an ERA database of standard or frequently-used materials would be useful for the spectroscopy community. This was noted, but it was pointed out that filling out the ERA forms should never be a matter of ticking boxes.

Action 1.4: Gwyndaf Evans to contact the Safety Group to ensure only essential data is collected.

Ian Hamley noted that data in the ERA was entered during the proposal submission up to nine months before the start of an experiment. Sue Judge pointed out that there was an option to revise the submitted ERA before an experiment took place.

DUC members noted that ERA systems were in use at all SR facilities and suggested that Diamond would profit by considering those in use elsewhere (e.g. NLSL) in order to simplify procedures. This was noted.

Johan Turkenburg noted the problems encountered by BAG members using the ERA. At present only the PI/team leader has access. Diamond are looking into this problem.

4.2 Administration of Experiments:

Safety test: an on-line version is being trialled. Terminals may be made available at Ridgeway House for users to undertake the safety test.

Registration and Guest House bookings

Diamond accepted the view that too many forms are emailed to users at present and stated that on-line registration and guest house booking would be available in October 2009, with testing with users in September 2009.

Reports and publications:

Declaration forms Completed by team leaders - Compulsory. On-line version to be available. A revised version was presented to the DUC for comment and met with general approval.

Satisfaction form: all team members, optional.

Experimental report: PI to submit 2 months after completion of the experiment. Compulsory.

Annual report: contributions are requested for publication as a highlight in the Diamond Annual Report.

Expense claims: the problems encountered by members of BAGs were noted. An on-line claim system is under development to shorten the time taken to present and process claims.

Other user interface issues:

Ridgeway House: Joanna Collingwood raised the need for a late check-out time for users who worked the final night of an experiment. It was noted that Ridgeway House is now fully booked most time of the time. A timetable for building an extension for Ridgeway house was

requested. Members of the DUC asked if evening meals would continue to be served at Ridgeway House when refurbishment of the RAL kitchen had been completed. Diamond responded to say this has not yet been decided.

Vending machines: the DUC made comments about the poor state of the vending machines in the Experimental Hall. The cashless vending system did not appear to work well. Vending machines were not being stocked.

Action 1.5: Sue Judge to obtain a timetable of the extension plans for Ridgeway House.

Action 1.6: Sue Judge to contact Avenance a) to request late check-out for users on last shifts, b) to report poor state of vending machines.

5. User Meeting 2010

Isabelle Boscaro-Clarke introduced this item: the DUC was invited to make suggestion for the 2010 User Meeting and to comment upon the most attractive format.

Purpose of User Meeting:

- to inform users of developments at Diamond and in SR
- to facilitate communication between users
- to showcase science carried out at Diamond
- to introduce new users to SR
- to look forward.

Challenges:

it was hard to persuade PIs to attend

Opportunities:

- for new comers to discuss their projects
- for applicants who failed to get beamtime to talk to PBSs
- better use of video-conferencing

Practicalities:

- the RAL site is less than ideal (poor lecture room facilities for a site of this importance)
- accommodation (Ridgeway House is too small). Would regional meetings be feasible?
- Costs: £25K in 2007 (£15K from sponsors).

Conclusion: no recommendations were made by the DUC; discussions would continue.

6. AOB

Communication: the DUC was asked to consider if the modes of communicating with users should be rethought

- Is there value in building social networks for SR users?
- The DUC requested that there should be regular but not too frequent news bulletins; perhaps disseminated on a village basis/ the limitations of “advertising” via websites was acknowledged.

Action 1.7: Diamond to look into a regular news bulletin based on the village structure.

Date of next meeting: proposed date 7th January 2010, to be confirmed.

Annex A: New Actions

Action Number	Action	Actionee	Target Completion Date
1.1	DUC members to select the chairman of the DUC	DUC members	September 2009
1.2	Diamond to send e-mail to all users prior to DUC meetings to request topics for discussion.	Sue Judge	December 2009
1.3	Diamond to place meeting material on external web site	Sue Judge	September 2009
1.4	To contact the Safety Group to ensure only essential data is collected.	Gwyndaf Evans	September 2009
1.5	To obtain a timetable of the extension plans for Ridgeway House.	Sue Judge	December 2009
1.6	To contact Avenance a) late check-out for users on last shifts, b) to report poor state of vending machines.	Sue Judge	October 2009
1.7	Diamond to look into a regular news bulletin based on the village structure.	Trevor Rayment / Sue Judge	November 2009