Community PP science reviews

Philip Burrows

John Adams Institute for Accelerator Science

Oxford University

PPAP Terms of Reference

‘Draft and maintain a roadmap describing current and future research opportunities in their areas, for presentation and approval by PPAN

Consult and interact with the community to ensure its views are canvassed and there is an appropriate and effective route for communication with STFC on strategic programmatic issues

Make an independent presentation to PPAN on the relevant panel area in years in which an STFC Programmatic Review takes place, thereby providing community input to the programmatic review process

Respond to other specific requests from PPAN for advice as the need arises’

The PPAP

Philip Burrows (Oxford) ***chair***

Cinzia Da Via (Manchester)

Tim Gershon (Warwick)

Nigel Glover (Durham)

Claire Shepherd-Themistocleous (RAL) ***deputy chair***

Mark Thomson (Cambridge)

Dan Tovey (Sheffield)

Rachel Boning (STFC)

http://www.hep.phy.cam.ac.uk/~thomson/ppap.html

Possible Workplan I: Future Opportunities *(Walter Gear 6/3/09)*

‘identify the top major scientific challenges to be solved in the future (in 20 – 30 years) in this field world wide;

Possible Workplan I: Future Opportunities *(Walter Gear 6/3/09)*

‘identify the top major scientific challenges to be solved in the future (in 20 – 30 years) in this field world wide;

highlight the UK involvement in research in these areas including what the UK reputation is in these areas and if it is likely that UK researchers will make these achievements;

Possible Workplan I: Future Opportunities *(Walter Gear 6/3/09)*

‘identify the top major scientific challenges to be solved in the future (in 20 – 30 years) in this field world wide;

highlight the UK involvement in research in these areas including what the UK reputation is in these areas and if it is likely that UK researchers will make these achievements;

identify what facilities will be needed in order for the UK make significant contributions to these areas;

Possible Workplan I: Future Opportunities *(Walter Gear 6/3/09)*

‘identify the top major scientific challenges to be solved in the future (in 20 – 30 years) in this field world wide;

highlight the UK involvement in research in these areas including what the UK reputation is in these areas and if it is likely that UK researchers will make these achievements;

identify what facilities will be needed in order for the UK make significant contributions to these areas;

based on b) understand which of a) and / or c) are the top priorities.’

This Meeting

- Review our community's PP expertise + aspirations
- Draw out community's views on possible future directions: 20 - 30 year horizon
- Opportunity to air + debate tricky issues!
- Start roadmap drafting process
- PPAN has asked for first-pass roadmap by late September (2009!)

Programme Committee for today

Nigel Glover (Durham)

Tim Gershon (Warwick)

Christine Davies (Glasgow)

Val Gibson (Cambridge)

Cristina Lazzeroni (Birmingham)

Steve Playfer (Edinburgh)

Chris Sachrajda (Southampton)

Maria Smizanska (Lancaster)

Guy Wilkinson (Oxford)

Programme for today

10.45 Introduction	– Philip Burrows
10.50 PPAN briefing	– Jordan Nash
11.05 Flavour-changing physics beyond SM	– Gino Isidori
11.50 CKM matrix elements and CP violation	– Jonas Rademacker
12.50 lunch	
13.30 Lattice QCD	– Jonathan Flynn
14.15 Rare decays	– Patrick Koppenburg
15.00 Lepton universality and flavour violation	– Fergus Wilson
15.40 tea/coffee	
16.00 LHC upgrades	– Chris Parkes
16.15 e+e- machines	– Adrian Bevan
16.30 NA62 + kaons at JPARC/FNAL	– Cristina Lazzeroni
16.40 COMET + muons at FNAL	– Yoshi Uchida
17.10 General discussion	
18.00 End	

Discussion questions for today

1. How important will measurements of flavour-changing observables be in the post – 2014 landscape?
2. What are the connections between flavour-changing physics and (i) physics at the energy frontier and (ii) neutrino and non-accelerator physics?
3. What developments are needed from theory (including lattice QCD and phenomenology) to support and/or lead the UK experimental effort in this sector?
4. Should the UK focus its effort in flavour-changing physics on a few key observables, or aim for wider coverage?
5. How many experiments, in the flavour-changing physics sector, should the UK aim to participate in?
6. What factors should be used to determine the prioritisation of projects?
7. Are there areas of commonality between experiments (whether in the flavour-changing physics sector or otherwise) that can be exploited?
8. In which areas relating to flavour changing physics is the UK internationally leading?
9. Does the UK have the technological base to contribute to future flavour facilities?

Housekeeping

1. Apologies received

2. Thanks to:

   Birmingham Group

   IoP HEPP Group

   STFC

   IPPP