

## Reflections on NUFACT16 and future of the meeting

**0. ATTENDANCE** We have an attendance of 123 participants in 2016 in Vietnam, with no Vietnamese participants fault of a neutrino physics community in Vietnam. This is a similar number (120) to the 2014 and 2015 meetings, which had however significant local participation.

These numbers are all somewhat lower than the records of 197 in 2009 at FNAL/MIT or 191 in 2011 at CERN/UNIGE. 154 in 2004 (Osaka); 187 in 2005 Frascati; 168 Valencia 2008 -- location is probably a more important factor in the participation than the odd/even year. -- large  $\theta_{13}$  and termination recommendations of MAP&MICE by P5 played big role.

**1. SCOPE** In 2016 we adapted further the scope of the meeting

- definite emphasis on 'neutrino oscillation superbeams' CPV, MH.
- created working group 5 on neutrinos beyond PMNS, including the searches for right-handed/sterile neutrinos with beam dump and high energy colliders.

Was this a success? Certainly deepens the vision in a useful way.

**2. NAME & LOGO:** we changed the scope of the meeting significantly to focus on 'superbeams' but it is clear that the name remaining the same has got a number of people confused.

→ May need to change the name to reflect the change of scope better ?

Neutrinos at Future Accelerators (NuFaC) etc.. etc..

→ not using the pi-mu-nu logo anymore. Need to find a new one.

→ alternatively advertise officially the change of scope in international bodies

→ or organize a merger with NNN workshops? (not trivial, overlap only is Long Baseline beam)

**4. Relations with International bodies:** Meeting was initially endorsed by international committees such as ECFA or ICFA

I remember going to ECFA every year to report and getting re-endorsed.

This ceased to be with the NUFAC scoping study in 2006

→ should we re-instate sponsoring by these bodies?

→ can the ICFA neutrino panel be of some help in this?

**5. Advisory committee :** Nufact meetings till 2005 (6,7?) had an Advisory Committee in addition to the program committee

This body was unresponsive and did not serve at giving advice

However it ensured official recognition and once in a while a proposal of a speaker.

→ I would suggest re-instating an advisory committee among the well known physicists, connecting to NEUTRINO international committee etc..  
Involving lab directors and neutrino collaboration leaders, but also \*independent\* high level scientific personalities.

**6. Organize meeting further ahead in time** As Tord Ekelof commented 'you are late!'

## Concerning the frequency of the meeting:

1. different proposals:
  - continue yearly
  - reduce frequency to once every 18 months
  - reduce to once every two years in opposition of phase with Neutrino conference.
  
2. different opinions in the SPC on this subject:
  - some concerned that yearly frequency is too high to be sustainable
  - some concerned that switching to two years repetition will endanger the meeting without answering the reasons for loss of attendance.
  
3. the mission of NUFACT is very different from that of the neutrino conference. It is focused on ***new ideas*** concerning ***neutrino experiments with accelerators***  
The meeting should continue to see ahead in this field.
  
4. Present organization is very efficient, based on 3yr rotating mandate of conveners.  
What would be the impact of changing frequency of nufact?