

FUAP
(Galaxy and above)

*Sarah Bridle, Chris Conselice, Anthony
Challinor, Rob Fender, Shude Mao, Paul
O'Brien, Bob Nichol (Chair)*

Background I

- Work started in May 2009
 - *Remit remains ill-defined (we were supposed to be long-term planning!)*
- Developed key science themes (First Light, Cosmology, Extreme Astrophysics, Galaxies)
 - *Each had four ranked questions (one A-grade question per theme)*
 - *Both legacy and future potential considered*
- Iterated with community via town meeting and web-forms
 - *hundreds of comments (included as many as possible). Thanks*
 - *Felt we got the community back on-side (but fragile)*
- Urgency from August because of need for facilities prioritization
 - *Rushed! Unstructured and ill-informed*

Background II

- Final report submitted Oct 16th, final consultation Sept 29th
 - *No feedback on how our advice was used (although asked for several times). Reality weight between previous PR, project forms and AP reports*
 - *Never saw prioritization prior to publication even though we asked multiple times*
 - *“Public consultation” used as community acceptance of these cuts*
- Remain unclear of FUAP role going forward and not sure PPAN knows either
 - *Dec 18th meeting with John Womersley was helpful but left questions*
 - *PPAN has £28M reduction by 2014 compared to £24M increase for PALS. Why?*
 - *Encouraged to “fiddle” but what does that mean? Needs to be done quickly but how? PPAN was very uneasy*

FUAP questions I

- Sent to Jordan Nash and STFC on Dec 22nd
 - *Only response from John Womersley (thanks). We can expect some questions (we are ready and willing)*
- Top critical priority was no further cuts to people (fellowships, students, grants)
 - *No concrete explanation why this was cut, just “regrettable”. No statement on how/when this will be rectified.*
 - *Universal dismay from young scientists (only career path is abroad!).*
- LOFAR was a “Crown Jewel” in 2 of our 4 science themes. It’s cheap, happening and well-supported.
 - *What does “managed withdrawal” mean? Chilbolton?*

FUAP questions II

- XMM-Newton was a “Crown Jewel”
 - *Top priority for ESA*
 - *Can astronomers still gain exploitation funding?*
 - *Consequences for the grants!*
- Future of CMB research
 - *After Planck, this hugely successful science area has no hope*
- No northern access after 2012 (see also 8-m User Group letter)
 - *Key requirement in FUAP report*
 - *Unique in Europe (even Iceland has a northern telescope)*
 - *Encouraging noises but how to coordinate the ideas bubbling up*
 - *Are we really out of Gemini? (why not lower involvement?)*
 - *Instrument trades for time?*

Joint AP statements

- On Dec 22nd, AP Chairs wrote to Prof. Sterling expressing their dismay at the outcome for PPAN
 - *Lost of leadership in key facilities*
 - *Bad return of our investment*
 - *No headroom. This is it for many years!*
 - *Negative message for our youth*
 - *Rapid reply sharing our dismay but little guidance*
- On Jan 12th, AP Chairs wrote open letter to Lord Drayson (see THES, Physics World)
 - *Stressed dismal future for fundamental science*
 - *Lost of capacity and quality of our scientific talent (“brain drain”)*
 - *Tried to stress need to governmental help*