

**NSSA Executive Committee**

**Minutes of the conference phone call 12:30am ET, 10/18/05**

**Present on the conference call:**

Dave Belanger (DB)  
Simon Billinge (SJB)  
Rob Briber (RB)  
Jim Jorgensen (JJ)  
Susan Krueger (SK)  
Greg Smith (GS)  
Franz Trouw (FT)

**Missing:**

Shenda Baker (SB)

**Agenda**

- 1.) Accept minutes from 9/14/05 conference call distributed by Susan (attached)**
- 2.) Report on “user activism” meeting at SSRL/SLC (Jim) notes from previous 08/12/05 meeting at O’Hare -attached. Possibilities for DOE Advocacy (attached) Response letter from Orbach to previous letter from User Groups - attached**
- 2.) Update on ACNS 2006 (Rob)**
- 3.) NSSA elections (Rob) candidate statements document attached**
- 3b.) By-laws update to include NSSA fellows (Dave)**
- 4.) Prize Committees (Rob)**
- 5.) Other business**

=====  
**Discussions:**

- 1.) Accept minutes from 9/14/05 conference call distributed by Susan (attached) accepted without dissent.**

**2.) Report on “user activism” meeting at SSRL/SLC (Jim)**  
**notes from previous 08/12/05 meeting at O’Hare -attached.**  
**Possibilities for DOE Advocacy (attached)**  
**Response letter from Orbach to previous letter from User Groups -**  
**attached**

JJ’s comments: Everyone felt the letter from Orbach in response to the letter to Bodman was rather positive. The recent meeting at SSRL was very important since Pedro Montano and Pat Dehmer, plus an American Physical Society advocacy person (Steve Pierson) were in attendance. Pierson drafted a document to guide advocacy and make it more effective. It is a very useful document. The meeting drifted a bit. Some people feel they didn’t have time for advocacy but Steve Pierson said that scientists better find time for it! An advocacy steering committee was mooted to give leadership in this area with representation from the different users group. JJ suggested that committee representation from NSSA should be by the vice president [tentative]. No objections were raised to this, though it is not set in stone at this point. Question: how would such a committee be funded? JJ suggested: can we model it on the US national committee for crystallography? This is funded by the National Research Council which was asked to do so by IUCr. Can a standing committee for the facilities be funded by the National Academy or NRC? JJ will pursue this with Murray Gibson. Another big issue is an X-ray equivalent of NSSA, but noone is taking leadership on that. RB: what should NSSA do at this point? RB will communicate with Steve Pierson about the most effective NSSA response: we want to do it right, how does he recommend we do it? We already use the APS system for writing letters to congressmen and we can continue to do that. It is excellent and really lowers the activation energy for people to respond to our letter-writing calls. JJ noted that as few as 10 letters from individuals triggers a response in congressman/senators’ offices, and letters from organizations like NSSA are also taken seriously. JJ: noted that nobody knows details about the FY07 budget yet so any letters should be suitably vague, pointing out the positive aspects of user-facilities but not assuming that they are facing budgetary shortfalls until this is known.

**2.) Update on ACNS 2006 (Rob)**

Not much to say. DB and RB participating in calls. Web forms are being worked up, registration forms being finalized etc.. Everything proceeding appropriately.

**3.) NSSA elections (Rob)**

**candidate statements document attached**

Slate complete. Statements are all in and just about ready to post. FT: LANSCE user-office will create a web-site for voting. IP addresses are logged and could be checked in the case of a close race. RB: We would like to do it ASAP – next two weeks if possible. Put the statements on the NSSA web-site and then have a “ready to vote” button that links to the LANSCE page. Rob Kramer is the contact at LANSCE user office. FT will put RB in contact with LANSCE-UO to get things moving. If beta-testers are needed the Committee agreed to do it. In fact great enthusiasm was shown for facilitating the election process.

**3b.) By-laws update to include NSSA fellows (Dave)**

This will be voted on in the same election. Will should be changed to Shall in DB’s statement, also a missing the was pointed out. DB: Issue: sub-committees have to have an Excom member on them as an ex-officio member according to our bylaws. Our prize

committees are in violation of this. Proposal: add “, except prize committees” to the bylaws and have it voted on in the election. Universal agreement since we have the notion that the prize committees should be independent.

#### **4.) Prize Committees (Rob)**

Not much movement here. RB: please everyone send a list of names to RB in the next week or so. SJB: can we use the original spreadsheet for the excom candidates as a starting point? After we augment it, can we keep it for future use?

#### **5.) Other business**

ICNS run by NSSA in 2009? Proposal would have to be made in Australia ICNS. Positive responses from most people. RB proposal is to respond in the affirmative and email to the current slate of candidates so they are aware.

**Call ended 1:05 pm**

**Respectfully submitted, Simon Billinge, 10/18/05**