



**CANADA'S NATIONAL LABORATORY FOR
PARTICLE AND NUCLEAR PHYSICS**

**LABORATOIRE NATIONAL CANADIEN
POUR LA RECHERCHE EN PHYSIQUE
NUCLÉAIRE ET EN PHYSIQUE DES PARTICULES**

Owned and operated as a joint venture by a consortium of
Canadian universities via a contribution through the National
Research Council Canada

Propriété d'un consortium d'universités canadiennes, géré en
co-entreprise à partir d'une contribution administrée par le
Conseil national de recherches Canada

12 March 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: Kitchen Cabinet Advisory Committee
FROM: Nigel Lockyer, Director, TRIUMF
RE: Request for Help in TRIUMF Five-Year Planning Process

As you know, we are preparing the next five-year plan (5YP) for TRIUMF. The 5YP Steering Committee is overseeing this process which will use a set of successive reviews and reports to move from a "wish list" to a realistic and robust plan for TRIUMF in the period 2010-2015. A package of written materials has been submitted to the TRIUMF Policy and Planning Advisory Committee (PPAC). After PPAC narrows the field of possible activities, we will develop the full analysis of benefits and resource requirements.

PPAC will publish its written report by Monday, March 17, 2008, the day of the next Kitchen Cabinet meeting. I am asking the Kitchen Cabinet to conduct a review of the PPAC report by addressing the following points:

1. Perform a reality check on the PPAC report. Are there obvious showstoppers? Recognizing that full design reports are not available, are the resources identified in the PPAC 1-pagers approximately adequate? Please comment on the feasibility of building up the needed resource base on the time scale needed to undertake the program in the next 5 year period. Also consider the impact on present activities.
2. Review the Director's Vision, the PPAC report's discussion of it, and the PPAC discussion of top priorities and relative balance.
3. In approximate order of descending importance, what are the greatest strengths of the Director's Vision as modified by PPAC?
4. Likewise, what are the greatest weaknesses of the Director's Vision as modified by PPAC?

I would request that Kitchen Cabinet file its written report to me by Thursday, March 20, 2008. This report will be made publicly available on the website.

Please find enclosed the Terms of Reference for PPAC; I would encourage you to refer to their criteria as you prepare your report.



CANADA'S NATIONAL LABORATORY FOR
PARTICLE AND NUCLEAR PHYSICS

LABORATOIRE NATIONAL CANADIEN
POUR LA RECHERCHE EN PHYSIQUE
NUCLÉAIRE ET EN PHYSIQUE DES PARTICULES

Owned and operated as a joint venture by a consortium of
Canadian universities via a contribution through the National
Research Council Canada

Propriété d'un consortium d'universités canadiennes, géré en
co-entreprise à partir d'une contribution administrée par le
Conseil national de recherches Canada

01 February 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: Colin Gay, *Chair, Policy and Planning Advisory Committee (PPAC)*
FROM: Nigel Lockyer, *Director, TRIUMF*
RE: Charge to PPAC for its March 14-15, 2008, meeting

TRIUMF is currently preparing its five-year plan for the years 2010-2015. This is part of the process for obtaining TRIUMF funding for that time period. The plan includes a number of new initiatives and the continuation of many ongoing projects. Not all the projects or programs that have been proposed for inclusion will make it into the final plan. As part of the vetting process PPAC is being asked to review the projects and programs for their suitability to be included.

PPAC will be assessing whether and to what extent TRIUMF should be involved in these projects and programs. The vision, projects, and programs are to be judged considering three criteria:

1. Potential for scientific impact^a;
2. Benefit to the Canadian university research community; and
3. Benefit to broader Canadian society^b.

#1. PPAC will be presented with the Director's vision for the future of TRIUMF. Please comment on this vision, and on the match of the projects and project categories with that vision.

#2. A key section of the five-year plan document will be a discussion of how TRIUMF works with and engages the university community. Please critique this section for style and substance.

#3A. The non-CFI programs have been divided into categories. Within each category, use the above criteria to give the relative importance of each program and comment on the relative and absolute allocation of resources required for each project or program. Similarly, rate the relative importance of the different categories and comment on the relative allocation of resources for each category.

#3B. For the proposed CFI projects, please rank the projects according to the above criteria.

#4. For all programs and projects, please critique the arguments presented to justify them.

^aIncluding feasibility, strength of investigator group, and resource requirements

^bIncluding training highly qualified personal, technology transfer, and medical advances