

**Office of High Energy Physics (OHEP) Response to the Report of the High Energy Physics Advisory Committee of Visitors (COV) Review of OHEP June 18-19, 2007**

	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Status</b>
1	An urgent effort be directed to <u>filling all the vacant staff positions in the Office</u> , and consider adding additional IPA positions.	<b>In process.</b> A staffing plan was developed that identified our office immediate staffing priorities. Recruitment efforts are at various stages to meet our needs. We are using both IPA's and detailees to help with the program workload; we currently utilize the expertise of seven IPA's and two detailees.
2	Documentation and access to program data continue to be improved and data be conveyed in electronic format where this is not yet the case.	<b>In process.</b> Data from grantees containing demographic information is being collected on physicist faculty, senior research scientists, postdocs, and graduate students.
3	The Office continue to work with P5 and HEPAP in evolving the medium term program.	<b>On-going.</b> P5 produced a report on the priorities for an optimal HEP program over the next ten years (2009-2018), under four funding profile scenarios which articulates the scientific opportunities which can and cannot be pursued; the overall level of support needed in the core research & advanced technology R&D programs; and the impacts.
4	OHEP decisions and the rationale behind them be effectively communicated to the community.	<b>On-going.</b> We have taken a more proactive posture regarding communicating with the community decisions made and the rationale behind them. The recent OHEP reorganization was presented to HEPAP and the new structure posted on the HEP website along with the rationale behind the decision.
5	The Office develop a process to globally optimize and comparatively review the balance of support for HEP research at Fermilab, the universities and the other laboratories in light of the evolving program.	<b>Complete.</b>
6	The office understand and communicate appropriate best practices for reviews and ensure they are followed.	<b>In progress.</b> We are working to streamline processes and make them as meaningful as possible.
7	The number of Outstanding Junior Investigator awards be increased by devoting more funds to this program.	<b>Complete.</b> In FY 2007, HEP granted six OJI awards; in FY 2008, HEP granted ten OJI awards.

8	New and renewal proposals be limited to a maximum of 10 pages per senior investigator.	<b>Complete.</b> Ten-page proposal limits have been put into effect. Proposal limits are included on the OHEP website as part of guidelines for applying for a grant.
9	Outside visiting consultants continue to be used for 3-year renewals of large grants and eliminate site visits in continuation years unless some unusual circumstance warrants such a visit.	<b>On-going.</b> We continue to use consultants for renewals of large grants, and we have reduced the number of site visits in continuation years unless some unusual circumstance warrants such a visit.
10	OHEP consider providing a template to reviewers to provide guidance and greater uniformity of reviews.	<b>In-process.</b> We have not yet converged on a template for reviewers.
11	Each proposal jacket contain as the first page a brief summary sheet which shows a history of funding levels by task, current funding, and personnel supported by category.	<b>In-process.</b> Data exists which shows funding levels by task, current funding, and personnel supported by category, but the data is not organized in summary format.
12	The Office establish a formal advisory mechanism to best optimize the split between ILC accelerator and ILC detector R&D funds.	<b>Complete.</b> The OHEP reorganization clearly defines the split between ILC accelerator and ILC detector R&D.
13	OHEP work with the community and the laboratories to formulate a plan for stewardship of accelerator science in the US during the coming transition to a period without an energy frontier machine.	<b>In-process.</b> The accelerator science review scheduled for Fall 2008 will be used as a vehicle to formulate a plan for stewardship of accelerator science in the US.
14	The peer-review process in accelerator research be expanded to cover mid-term accelerator research to provide comparative evaluation of the merit of different research efforts.	<b>Complete.</b> The new OHEP organization provides for general accelerator development and allows for peer-reviews and comparative evaluations.
15	The project initiation and management process continue to be closely aligned with the HEPAP/P5 prioritization process for HEP and the strategic goals of the Office of Science.	<b>On-going.</b> We are closely aligned with HEPAP/P5, and the recommendations of P5 are factored into our long-range planning.
16	Major projects for which the physics goals are well matched to the priorities in the field, and whose overall scope, cost estimate and funding	<b>Complete.</b>

	requirements are consistent with each other be advanced to construction status.	
17	The Office continue to pursue opportunities to support projects in collaboration with other agencies, both domestic and international.	<b>On-going.</b> To the greatest extent possible, we encourage that the projects that are promoted are consistent with priorities of the field and are consistent with our funding profile.
18	The Office add staff to the Facilities Division to provide sufficient project management oversight for upcoming major projects.	<b>In process.</b> A referral certificate has been issued for an Instrumentation program manager.