

Memo of the AONSA related discussion in Sydney. V2

Here I have just described a brief memorandum for discussions related to AONSA during the informal meeting of AONSA just after the IAEA meeting and the dinner at the Sealevel restaurant at Cronulla, Sydney on 14 August 2009.

Discussion in the informal AONSA meeting right after the IAEA meeting in ANSTO.

Date: 14 August 2009

Place: ANSTO, Sydney

Participants: Mahn Won Kim(KAIST, Korea), Edy Giri Rachaman Putra(BATAN, Indonesia), Abdul Aziz Mohamed(MOSTE, Malaysia), Dong Zhili(Singapore), Danas Ridikas(IAEA), Muslehuddin Sarker(INSC, Bangladesh), Yuntao Liu(CIAE, China), Rob Robinson(AONSTO, Australia), Roland Granada(CNEA, Argentina), Gawie Nothnagel(NECSA, South Africa), Pablo P. Saligan(PNRI, Phillipines), M.Arai(J-PARC),

President Mahn Won Kim explained what is AONSA to the audiences by showing the AONSA home pages. Most of audiences are interested in participation in AONSA. Then, the most of discussion was spent on membership/observer raise from China and other countries.

- 1) China has not had a good internal mechanism to unify communities and good linkage between the reactor sector and the spallation sector. Hence, for the time being they will stay as observers. China will send a proposal of possible observer candidates to AONSA, and the EC will decide approval.
- 2) China sees a problem with Taiwan and the country name should be rid off from the list of membership. We will use the association name instead of the country name. This was also an issue for the IAEA and the New Zealand representative.
- 3) The observer of Indonesia was selected under a political reason, and he will stay there for the time being. However, AONSA found a difficulty of communication with the work force through the present pass.
- 4) At the end of the meeting, the Indonesian delegate Mr Edy Giri Rachman Putra from Batan, described the extent to which he, the Singaporeans (Mr Dong Zhili, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore) and the Malaysians (Mr Abdul Aziz Mohamed

- MINT, Malaysia) had gone towards organising a three-nation (South-East Asian) association. They have an outline program of meetings at Batan, in Singapore and in Malaysia over the next three years. Those present thought this was a very good indication of the way in which strength could be built up in countries which have only a small neutron scattering community at the present.

- 5) Bangladesh can form a community so as to participate in AONSA. It may take one year.
- 6) Philippine does not have users at this moment but is interested in participating in AONSA as an observer. There was also interest in holding a small workshop/school on Manila, to market neutron scattering in the Philippines, if the leading centers can send one person each at their own cost

Discussion about the next EC at Cronulla

Date: 14 August 2009

Place: Sealevel Restaurant, Cronulla, Sydney

Participants; M.W.Kim, J.White, R.Robinson, M.Arai

We discussed agenda for the next EC in Beijing based on the Tentative Agenda made by the AONSA Office.

- 1) We add Report of the AONSA Summer School to be held in ANSTO.
- 2) The Summer School in 2012 should be held in India. We should ask a ranking executive in the Indian government to persuade BARC to hold it. John will do it.
- 3) It was agreed that India should be approached to run the next summer school in India. One approach might be made to Mr Samrath Lal Chaplot, BARC, India. This should be done by Masa Arai and the President. (Mahn Won has already sent a mail.) There was some feeling about a need to get an answer and for processes to start very soon. Need for good contact with India immediately in case a "fall back position" is needed. Any help to our Indian colleagues such as an approach to CNR Rao (JWW or Mahn Won Kim) might be helpful. This needs to be explored by the President with Indian colleagues as part of the invitation.

JWW suggests that the contact- started already -with the Indian colleagues by Mahn Won should be the way to proceed the aim being to get an agreement in principle for

the Beijing meeting.

GENERAL POINT FOR BEIJING DISCUSSION

- 4) Mahn Won Kim offered that Korea could be the default operation in case of any problems but this would have to be settled at the Beijing meeting.
- 5) It was reported that the AONSA school currently in Sydney had 70 applicants for the 40 places. The rule had been kept to of maximum 50% of the students coming from the host country. This was agreed to be a very good rule. It was agreed that this should be a draft regulation for the conduct of schools and a formula should be agreed at the next executive meeting.
- 6) It was agreed that the India meeting should follow the same track if at all possible.
- 7) For the 2012 school, Indonesia had put forward a bid for it to be held in Bandung - this to be discussed and agreed at the executive in Beijing.
- 8) Budget expenditure plan should be made by EC and proposed to the Board. We propose this idea in the EC.
- 9) It was agreed that at the Beijing meeting, the secretary and treasurer should produce a formal statement on the budget indicating the present cash in hand and expenditure and details for any income relating to the cash in hand.
- 10) It was agreed that the secretary should contact members that have not yet paid their subscription - the object being to finalize subscriptions for 2009 at the Beijing meeting.
- 11) Budget expenditure plans should be submitted by the AONSA Board to the EC a half year before the next EC. - agreed but the secretary and president should prepared draft plans of expenditure to be discussed at the Beijing meeting for eventual presentation to the board for further ideas.
- 12) The Board should take an action to make a budget expenditure plan, which should be submitted to the EC. This point was amended to read 'the executive should prepare a draft budget expenditure plan for consideration in good time to present to the board.' In preparing the draft expenditure plan for the EC, the executive should explicitly describe the cash flow situation and project this flow. At the same time, there should be a suggestion from the executive of the amount of the fee for the coming year.
- 13) The board can make a decision on how to spend the money.
- 14) Main propose of the budget is for supporting travel expenses and registration fees etc. for young scientists.

- 15) We may need to have an exemption mechanism for the membership fee for developing countries. For example, allowance of delaying etc.
- 16) Establish AONSA awards every two years. We need to discuss selection mechanism of winners etc. and need to raise budget for the awards from facilities.
- 17) There was discussion about the size and nature of the award. In one view, a medal and citation (total cost \$500) plus AONSA paid travel to the meeting for the award ceremony was one option. Another option was for a \$5,000 prize every two years if regular donations could be obtained from major donors such as major research centres, industries etc. If regular donations could be achieved, then a selection committee would need to be appointed by the Executive Committee on the recommendation of the Executive.
- 18) There was a discussion on where funds to establish a continuing prize might be obtained. It was thought that ANSTO might provide at least \$5000 each two years towards such a prize. JWW offered to draft a letter approaching JPARC asking for the same. The terms of the letter would have to suggest the value to JPARC of contributing to the award in that way on a continuing basis.
- 19) We agreed the next vice-President candidate should be Prof. Fujii. He should be elected to be an AONSA delegate from JSNS. We also discussed necessity of a post-Presidential post.

- End of minutes -