

An AAP2015 Conference Summary?

Bruce Vogelaar
Camillo Mariani
Jim Whitmore
Patrick Huber
Karsten Heeger

AAP2015 White Paper/Conference Summary?

- What we heard in yesterday's discussion
 - Many interesting efforts.
 - Will learn more in next few years
 - Need to better understand requirements
 - Not clear if reactor antineutrinos are needed for applied goals
 - US funding agencies are in the midst of technical and scientific review of some projects. Future may become clearer in a few months.
- What does AAP2015 do?
 - shows growing field with many exciting projects
 - addresses a variety of physics questions and applied goals
 - provides good overview of ongoing activities in the field
 - illustrates how science has stimulated R&D with impact on applied goals
- Agency interest
 - briefing material (“conference summary”) for internal discussions
 - overview/summary of what is being done right now and why

A Brief AAP2015 Conference Summary

- **Objectives**

- summary of activities, not evaluation of merits
- provide an overview of status and outlook for field
- convey excitement and growth of field
- timely follow-up to conference (1-2 months not 6 months)
- can easily read by program directors, heads of programs etc
- something to hand to administrators and people interested in the field
- writing accessible to a broad audience (interested lay audience with physics to experts in the field), like a colloquium

A Brief AAP2015 Conference Summary

- **Our Proposal: ~ 20 page conference summary**
 - **cover**
 - visually interesting, maybe antineutrino map?
 - **executive summary** - 1 page
 - **summary of applied goals** - 1 page
 - **summary of science questions** - 1 page
 - **0.5-0.75 page write-up per project/talk** - 15-22 pages
 - why are we doing it and why is it exciting?
 - focus on positive side
 - written by collaborations, little editing
 - not a comparison between projects (this is done by agency funding reviews)
 - **appendix** - 1 page
 - list of participants
 - **references** - X pages

Contributions and Schedule

- Your “elevator pitch”
 - why are we doing it and why is it exciting?
 - written by collaborations, little editing
- Rules for contribution
 - 0.5-0.75 page per project/talk
 - space includes text and maximum of 1 figure
 - identify goals from list of science & applied questions in 1-page summaries
 - not a comparison between projects (this is done by agency funding reviews)
- Proposed Schedule
 - submit contributions by Dec 31, 2015
 - available for review and comments Jan 4, 2016
 - release by Jan 15, 2016