Preparation for jeopardy PAC

« Dear Dr. Sabatie, Based upon the 12 GeV era Jeopardy policy established in 2016, (see http://www.jlab.org/exp_prog/PACpage/PAC47/Jeopardy_2016_Final.pdf) your previously approved Run Group A will be considered in Jeopardy at the next PAC meeting, PAC48. While it is not required, you may submit a ***short update (10 pages maximum)*** *that focuses on any* ***new developments*** *since your previous PAC approval that the PAC should consider in their new evaluation of your proposal.*

This optional update document will be due ***8:00 a.m. EDT (Eastern Daylight Time) on Monday, June 1, 2020****, same as for new proposals. At the PAC meeting, you will be scheduled (whether you submit a written update or not) for a* ***20 minute presentation****, followed by 10 minutes of questions/discussion. Your presentation should contain a single slide summarizing the goal and motivation of the experiment followed by up to 19 slides (no slide animation or overlays for any of the 20 slides) focused on* ***new developments since your previous PAC approval****. If the PAC recommends that your experiment remain on the books as an approved experiment, it will continue to be eligible for scheduling for the next 4 years when it would again need to be considered for Jeopardy if it has not been scheduled in that time frame. Please acknowledge receipt of this email to Susan Brown sbrown@jlab.org <mailto:sbrown@jlab.org> at your earliest convenience.*

Bob McKeown Deputy Director for Science »

New developments since PAC approval

- Creation of RGB: list and description of PAC-approved experiments
  - ✓ nDVCS, G_m(n), PDFs with K-SIDIS, TMDs with K-SIDIS
- New RG proposals joining RGB:
  - ✓ Di-hadron SIDIS
  - ✓ J/psi
  - ✓ BAND
  - ✓ photoproduction of dihadrons on deuteron
- Hardware: new detectors (CLAS12! + FT, CND, RICH, BAND) ***do we need to include this?***
- The **running** of the « first half » of RGB:
  - ✓ Overall performances: ABUs, luminosity, number of triggers
  - ✓ Problems encountered: beam, magnets, detector, DAQ ***should we mention this?***
  - ✓ Beam energy differences and impact on data
  - ✓ Conditions (inbending, outbending)
- **Preliminary results** (with a subset of data)
  - ✓ nDVCS BSA
  - ✓ Gm(n)?
  - ✓ SIDIS?
  - ✓ BAND?
  - ✓ Should we include new « unplanned » results (pDVCS, dDVCS)?

Final section to motivate our request for more beamtime

Questions:

- How much beam time will we ask for?
  - ✓ nDVCS was approved for 90 days
  - ✓ Should we use **ABUs** or **charge collected vs expected charge at 10^35**?

    Days left according to ABUs ~ **51.1**
    Days left according to expected charge ~ **61.1**
- Do we include the beam energy differences in this estimate?
- Do we include extra days due to outbending/inbending running?