

**Minutes of the Partner User Council Meeting  
Argonne National Laboratory  
May 3, 2010**

**Partner User Council members/alternates in attendance:** P. Abbmonte, B. Adams, A. Allen, K. Blazen, K. Brister, R. Fischetti, B. Furtz, R. Gordon, T. Irving, D. Keane, L. Keefe, B. Lin, J. Maser, M. Meron, M. Rivers, G. Rosenbaum, C. Segre, G. Shen, S. Stepanov, D. Tiede, S. Wassermann

**APS Attendees:** M. Beno, L. Gades, R. Gerig, W. Lowe, D. Mills, J. Quintana, G. Srajer, S. Strasser, L. Young

**Welcome**—D. Mills

**Approval of the Minutes**—T. Irving  
The minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

**Update from Life Sciences Council**—B. Fischetti  
Current members of the Life Sciences Council (LSC) include Wayne Anderson, Keith Brister, Malcolm Capel, John Chrzas, Bob Fischetti, Tom Irving, Andrzej Joachimiak, Denis Keane, Lisa Keefe, Keith Moffat, Vukica Srajer, and Steve Wasserman

The LSC is beginning discussions on expanding membership, for example, the addition of a Vice Chair position. Fischetti's chairmanship has been extended for an additional two-year term.

The LSC first met on May 1, 2008 and has met quarterly or more frequently as needed. The Council cites many accomplishments:

- Discussion with J. M. Gibson about APS support of MX beamlines
- APS web pages
- Update from J. Quintana on G. Rosenbaum's white beam BPMs
- APS User Calendar
- Life Sciences Operators
- Started developing a Life Sciences Strategic Plan
- Discussed more efficient procedure for claiming GUP proposals
- Prepared for Cross Cut review in Jan 2010
  - Each CAT presented their current capacities and future plans
  - Identified cross-CAT collaborations
- Collectively presented the high level of achievement and future plans of the CATs
  - Example: Nobel prize for Ribosome structure
- Created a new position: Argonne Distinguished Fellow for Life Sciences; the search committee is currently pursuing candidates
- Presentation by Liz Moog on undulator possibilities for the Upgrade

Fischetti gave an introduction to the new LSC webpage. In addition, he mentioned the LSC's contributions to Chapter 4 of the APS-U CDR.

### **Technical Working Group Update—S. Stepanov**

Technical Working Group (TWG) meetings are held monthly, each featuring 2 30-minute presentations. TWG has been ongoing for 13 years, with reliable archives since 1998. Meetings feature updates from APS, APS sectors, and CATs.

The goals are to inform the community of the progress that each sector is making and to provide an important information-sharing dialogue between resident scientists. Additionally, TWG gives beamline scientists an opportunity to be recognized for their often outstanding technical achievements that are not always publishable.

TWG is chaired by one representative from an APS beamline and one representative from a CAT. Chairs serve for two years, typically inviting speakers within their area of expertise. Current chairs include:

- Sergey Stepanov (GM/CA CAT, Bio division of ANL), an expert in beamline controls, bio crystallography and x-ray scattering theory
- Bernhard Adams (XOR Time Resolved Group), an expert in non-linear optics and ultra-fast scattering and spectroscopy

Stepanov conveyed special thanks to J. Maser, Y. Shvydko, and B. Toby for being particularly helpful in nominating interesting talks. In addition, Stepanov thanked outgoing chairs K. Attenkofer and K. Brister for mentoring during the transition period, and he acknowledged the APS User Office for providing presentation tools, coffee, and cookies without any reminders.

### **Engaging Industry at APS—D. Mills**

Much of the access by industrial Users is currently through CAT beamtime (IMCA, LRL, DND, etc.). However, both proprietary and non-proprietary proposals come through the General User Program (GUP) and are reviewed by Proposal Review Panels (PRPs). Looking at the current PRP criteria, it seemed that changes were needed for industry-related experiments. For example, the criteria to be used for the 2010-3 run include “technological” importance, instead of only “scientific” importance. At present, industrial use accounts for only 4-5% of beamtime awarded at APS.

Industrial use tends to differ from academic use in several important ways:

- Measurement rather than experiment
- Often short term
- Probably proprietary
- Relatively immediate access needed
- May not have expertise to take measurements; assistance required

- Will not compete favorably through current access avenues
- New access type needed

In considering how to increase access of industrial Users, APS management has identified several questions regarding proprietary work:

- Should proprietary proposals be reviewed by the PRP?
  - Usually too vague to be evaluated well
  - If you pay, should you get time without peer review of the work—maybe just APS management review? Up to some percentage of beamtime?
- Often (but not always) quick access is required by industry.
  - Keep a few days per cycle on APS beamlines for rapid access?
  - If no industry requests, reverts to GU/staff time?

This is a work in progress, and your feedback would be appreciated. Comments can be directed to W. Lowe, D. Mills, or S. Strasser.

In the discussion that followed, several points were made:

- A relationship that has not been discussed, but which sometimes exists, is the development of instrumentation being done at beamlines. Perhaps more effort should be directed to finding industrial partners to collaborate to make a product out of such instrumentation.
- Is there really difficulty of access, or just lack of interest?
  - Mills stated that some industrial users have indicated receiving poor scores, etc.
  - Lowe acknowledged that business has changed. To some degree, there are now more smaller companies that are likely to make use of APS facilities.
- Would management make a distinction between fully proprietary vs. proprietary for just a few years? Would different rates be charged, for example?
  - Mills stated that management does not have a lot of flexibility because DOE dictates rules and rates but can look into it.

Irving suggested that members think about whether they need new formal mechanisms for partnering with the APS. Please send suggestions to Irving.