

Mark Rivers

From: Mark Rivers
Sent: Monday, December 21, 2015 12:14 PM
To: 'Donald Weidner'; Haiyan Chen
Cc: Carl Agee; Andrew Campbell; Bin Chen; Dan Shim; Kanani K. M. Lee; Mark Rivers; Abby Kavner; Jennifer Jackson; Quentin Williams; Steve Jacobsen (steven@earth.northwestern.edu); Wendy Panero (panero.1@osu.edu)
Subject: Questions about beam-time allocation at APS 6-BM
Attachments: Man Plan_6-BM_final2.pdf

Dear Don and Haiyan,

The COMPRES Facilities and Executive Committees discussed your report on 6-BM at our meeting last week, and we had some questions about the beam time allocation.

In the 6-BM management plan (attached) COMPRES users are listed as entitled to the following beamtime: 38% contributing user time, plus 33% of 35% General User time. This comes to a total of 49.55% of the time. We understand that the General User time is not guaranteed, but requires that the COMPRES proposals score well.

In the spreadsheet that you attached for the 6-BMB operations in the 2015-2 cycle you list the following.

Total shifts in cycle: 215
Total COMPRES shifts: 63
COMPRES General User shifts: 18
COMPRES Contributing User shifts: 42

These numbers are not consistent with the Management Plan. The Contributing User time should have been 38% of 215 shifts, or 81.7 shifts. However, the Contributing User time actually allocated was only 42 shifts, or about half of what COMPRES was supposed to receive. The General User shifts were 18, compared to $215 \times .33 \times .35$ of 25 shifts in the Management Plan. The total of General User and Contributing User shifts was 60 (18 + 42) compared to 106 ($215 \times .4955$) specified in the Management Plan, or only 57% of what COMPRES was supposed to receive.

Can you please explain these discrepancies?

Thanks,
Mark

Mark Rivers

From: Donald Weidner <donald.weidner@stonybrook.edu>
Sent: Monday, December 21, 2015 1:01 PM
To: Mark Rivers
Cc: Haiyan Chen; Carl Agee; Andrew Campbell; Bin Chen; Dan Shim; Kanani K. M. Lee; Abby Kavner; Jennifer Jackson; Quentin Williams; Steve Jacobsen (steven@earth.northwestern.edu); Wendy Panero (panero.1@osu.edu)
Subject: Re: Questions about beam-time allocation at APS 6-BM

Mark

Actually you didn't accurately read the Management Plan:

Table 6.1 – Beamtime Allocation

Usage	Beamtime (percentage)	BL Scientist Responsible (percentage)
General Users	35	COMPRES (33%) & XSD (66%)
High-Pressure Earth Science Users, including Transitioned NSLS COMPRES users	38	COMPRES (100%)
Transitioned NSLS Engineering/Battery users	17	BNL-PS (100%)
XSD BL Scientist	10	XSD (100%)

We envision all users will submit general user (GU) proposals and be scored by the APS Proposal Review Panel (PRP). **The General User time will be filled by the APS Beamtime Allocation Committee (BAC) based solely on the Proposal Review Panel (PRP) ratings** while the time for the Earth Science users and Engineering/Battery users will be filled based on the PRP ratings supplemented with input from COMPRES Deputy Director and 6-BM Director, respectively.

(I add the bold face for emphasis). So GU time allocation is driven by score. The last column is beamline scientist effort, not beamtime. We have made an administrative agreement with the 'A' hutch people, that we will split the GU time 50/50 and watch to see that this provides a reasonable description of the scores (55.5% for high pressure). It is easier for planning and we find that the scores are very flat at the point that we need to make a division.

It is just now that this understanding has been obtained. The first year has been plagued with communication/understandings issues as well as commissioning, set up and the like. So I ask Haiyan to check

the numbers to see if you are correct on usage. But in trimester 2, we were open for users, but the A hutch was in commissioning mode.

I am not sure if you are aware, but the APS reassigned a significant part of a program from BM1 to BM6. Our competition is not NSLS battery people, but rather BM1 programs.

I think that we have the understanding in place now and the 2016-1 beamtime is being allocated on the basis of 55.5% high pressure.

Don

On Mon, Dec 21, 2015 at 1:13 PM, Mark Rivers <rivers@cars.uchicago.edu> wrote:

Dear Don and Haiyan,

The COMPRES Facilities and Executive Committees discussed your report on 6-BM at our meeting last week, and we had some questions about the beam time allocation.

In the 6-BM management plan (attached) COMPRES users are listed as entitled to the following beamtime: 38% contributing user time, plus 33% of 35% General User time. This comes to a total of 49.55% of the time. We understand that the General User time is not guaranteed, but requires that the COMPRES proposals score well.

In the spreadsheet that you attached for the 6-BMB operations in the 2015-2 cycle you list the following.

Total shifts in cycle: 215

Total COMPRES shifts: 63

COMPRES General User shifts: 18

COMPRES Contributing User shifts: 42

These numbers are not consistent with the Management Plan. The Contributing User time should have been 38% of 215 shifts, or 81.7 shifts. However, the Contributing User time actually allocated was only 42 shifts, or about half of what COMPRES was supposed to receive. The General User shifts were 18, compared to $215 \times .33 \times .35$ of 25 shifts in the Management Plan. The total of General User and Contributing User shifts was

Mark Rivers

From: Mark Rivers
Sent: Monday, December 21, 2015 1:14 PM
To: 'Donald Weidner'
Cc: Haiyan Chen; Carl Agee; Andrew Campbell; Bin Chen; Dan Shim; Kanani K. M. Lee; Abby Kavner; Jennifer Jackson; Quentin Williams; Steve Jacobsen (steven@earth.northwestern.edu); Wendy Panero (panero.1@osu.edu)
Subject: RE: Questions about beam-time allocation at APS 6-BM

Hi Don,

Sorry, I did misread that last column. But if the COMRES beamline scientist is responsible for 33% of the general users then I think it is reasonable to expect that is for high-pressure users in the 6-BM-B station, since Haiyan is not an expert on the 6-BM-A station. In any event, the main discrepancy is on Partner User time, not General User time, and the table is clear on that 38% allocation. COMPRES only received about 50% of that value as CU time in 2015-2. Is there data available on 2015-3?

I was not aware that APS assigned a significant part of 1-BM to 6-BM. It is not mentioned in your report. Have they modified the Management Plan in light of this change?

Thanks,
Mark

From: Donald Weidner [<mailto:donald.weidner@stonybrook.edu>]
Sent: Monday, December 21, 2015 1:01 PM
To: Mark Rivers
Cc: Haiyan Chen; Carl Agee; Andrew Campbell; Bin Chen; Dan Shim; Kanani K. M. Lee; Abby Kavner; Jennifer Jackson; Quentin Williams; Steve Jacobsen (steven@earth.northwestern.edu); Wendy Panero (panero.1@osu.edu)
Subject: Re: Questions about beam-time allocation at APS 6-BM

Mark

Actually you didn't accurately read the Management Plan:

Table 6.1 – Beamtime Allocation

Usage	Beamtime (percentage)	BL Scientist Responsible (percentage)
General Users	35	COMPRES (33%) & XSD (66%)
High-Pressure Earth Science Users, including Transitioned NSLS COMPRES users	38	COMPRES (100%)
Transitioned NSLS Engineering/Battery users	17	BNL-PS (100%)

Mark Rivers

From: Donald Weidner <donald.weidner@stonybrook.edu>
Sent: Monday, January 04, 2016 4:09 PM
To: Mark Rivers
Cc: Haiyan Chen; Carl Agee; Andrew Campbell; Bin Chen; Dan Shim; Kanani K. M. Lee; Abby Kavner; Jennifer Jackson; Quentin Williams; Steve Jacobsen (steven@earth.northwestern.edu); Wendy Panero (panero.1@osu.edu)
Subject: Re: Questions about beam-time allocation at APS 6-BM

Mark

I am not sure of the details, but my understanding is that 1BM had a white beam program - mostly engineering related - that was moved to 6 BM A. The APS support people, as identified in the Management Plan, are Jonathan Almer and John Okasinski, both with strong connections to sector 1, so this is a program for which they were operational people. The science program of the 1BM group is the same as that from NSLS. Thus, there is no need to change the Management Plan. From our perspective, they become stronger competition for the total time than would just the X17A program. This is ok, but it would have been nice to know that this was happening.

Here is an overview of the total time usage during session 2 and 3.

Shifts	2015- 2	2015- 3
A Hutch user time	35	71
A Hutch setup time	9	9
A hutch total User time	44	80
A hutch Installation time	45	15
Total A time	89	95
B hutch user time	66	90
B hutch setup time	12	9
B hutch total User	78	99
B hutch Installation time	48	0
Total B Time	126	99
Total time	215	194

During these two sessions we did not officially distinguish PU (partner user time) from GU (general user time). however, it would not have changed the outcome. We see about 90 shifts dedicated to installation - roughly evenly divided between the high pressure hutch (B) and the engineering hutch (A). User time is 78/44 for high pressure/engineering. During 2015-3, user time was 99/80 for high pressure. [--note: setup is defined as time needed by users to setup their particular experiment and is in addition to the experimental time called user time here. Karato's program required a significant amount of setup time. This will become less as we learn how to do it.]

Haiyan will not support any activity in the A hutch, but all activity in the B hutch. We do plan to add support from Stony Brook, especially as the B hutch receives more than 50%. All B hutch activity so far has been

'COMPRES agenda' except for 9 shifts in both the 2 and 3 sessions. That was used by Yusheng Zhao's group from UNLV.

Don

On Mon, Dec 21, 2015 at 2:14 PM, Mark Rivers <rivers@cars.uchicago.edu> wrote:

Hi Don,

Sorry, I did misread that last column. But if the COMRES beamline scientist is responsible for 33% of the general users then I think it is reasonable to expect that is for high-pressure users in the 6-BM-B station, since Haiyan is not an expert on the 6-BM-A station. In any event, the main discrepancy is on Partner User time, not General User time, and the table is clear on that 38% allocation. COMPRES only received about 50% of that value as CU time in 2015-2. Is there data available on 2015-3?

I was not aware that APS assigned a significant part of 1-BM to 6-BM. It is not mentioned in your report. Have they modified the Management Plan in light of this change?

Thanks,

Mark

From: Donald Weidner [mailto:donald.weidner@stonybrook.edu]

Sent: Monday, December 21, 2015 1:01 PM

To: Mark Rivers

Cc: Haiyan Chen; Carl Agee; Andrew Campbell; Bin Chen; Dan Shim; Kanani K. M. Lee; Abby Kavner; Jennifer Jackson; Quentin Williams; Steve Jacobsen (steven@earth.northwestern.edu); Wendy Panero (panero.1@osu.edu)

Subject: Re: Questions about beam-time allocation at APS 6-BM

Mark

Actually you didn't accurately read the Management Plan:

Table 6.1 – Beamtime Allocation