OHEP COV Closeout – red, University group sections?

Executive Summary

- **OHEP office is carrying out its program management of HEP in a responsible and credible manner.**

- **The integrity and efficacy of the processes have been validated!**

- **Recommendations:**

    - **Office is very short of personnel – needs both to staff both unfilled position and there are needed new positions**

    - **Recommend developing program-planning function in OHEP to help optimize the use of program resources, develop future plans, etc.**

    - **Recommend that priorities and program planning toward success of the HEP program goals be the primary basis for OHEP actions, avoiding, where possible, "peanut butter" solution.**
    - **Others?**

1. **Introduction**

Brief introduction to University Program?

2. **Integrity and Efficacy of the Processes for Treating Proposals;**

- **Proposal and Review Processes   (Validated! almost; the University grants still need more review by that subcommittee)**

Our procedure, what we did – details of interviews, files read, numerical stuff

Conclusions regarding correspondence of reviews to awards

Role of History

Business of 'administrative review' and NSF supported proposers

Thinness of theory reviews

- **Documentation (Lots of paper, could be better organized in order to backup actions, provide data, etc)**

Suggestions for summaries within folders, regular database of numbers…what numbers, etc

3. **Integrity and Efficacy of the Program Management of the National Laboratories and for Large Facilities**

- **Monitoring the Programs of the National Laboratories** (Good; endorse review of laboratory operations; suggest research programs be reviewed)

- **Establishing and Monitoring Equipment Fabrication Projects** (Procedures validated; should develop resource loaded implementation plan for each project)

- **Monitoring Large Facility Operations** (OK. Life cycle costs need to be integrated into the planning. Total DoE/HEP and other investment in a facility should be brought together to understand total resources required and how to evaluate the trade-offs and the balance of resources allocated).

4. **Outcome of the Program's Proposal Processes and Program Management Functions.**

- **Overall Quality and Significance of the Results of the Office's Program-Wide Investments (YES. Reflected in the successes of the HEP program)**

Here goes the advertisement for what experimental university groups actually do?

Should we wonder ("worry" may not be correct) about the labs' research programs? There may be no worry…the labs' research budgets may be entirely justified and all from the theory groups. But, theorist for theorist, this is an expensive way to sponsor theoretical physics, relative to the university program. Anyhow, we don't have to draw a conclusion, just wonder about a review, right?

- **Relationship between Award Decisions, Program Goals, and Office of Science-wide Programs and Strategic Goals   (Awards generally reflect the program and strategic goals, but implementation planning tools and data bases would help to optimize the investments and develop future plans)**

To the extent that the Top quark and CP violation are goals, here is where we should worry about the support and planning necessary to get us through the perfect storm of LHC coming and SLAC and Tevatron running/analyzing.

- **Research Investment, Balance, and Priorities; (global strategic planning and collaborative implementation a key developmental feature of HEP)**

- **Organization, Effectiveness, and Adaptability of the OHEP Operation to the Evolving Research Environment. (Investigate possible ways to reduce the inertia in the Laboratory Operations, University Program, etc.)**

Here is where we could suggest that there is 5% worth of churn available in this program? This should be done with evident pain, but it needs to be said in order to support whatever remedial efforts will come to be required by way of a post doc bump or something.

More about needed datakeeping

Here for lack of travel? Where?

- **Opportunities for Proposal Process and Program Management Improvement. (Develop more standardization in proposals, actions, data summaries on grant awards, etc)**

5. Further Observations and Recommendations

Do we have any?

Appendix A – Panel Members

Appendix B -- Agenda

Appendix C – Charge