SPECIAL ESGARD MEETING

23 Juillet 2007

Participants: R.Aleksan, R.Aymar, S.Bertolucci, R. Edgecock, S. Guiducci, G.Guignard

(secretary), M.Spiro, L.Rivkin, J.Womersley,

Connected over the phone: F.Richard, J.Zinn-Justin

Excused: D.Trines

Subject: Guidelines for the next FP7 call on the Integrated Activities

ESGARD called for a special ESGARD meeting, with the Directors of the laboratories that mandated the committee, for defining guide-lines and clearly stating the conditions in which the IA-JRA bids have to be prepared for the next FP7 call. This meeting took place at CERN on July 23, 2007. Several questions, listed in the previous ESGARD minutes, were addressed to the Directors before the meeting and the discussion focused on them.

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

R.Aleksan gives an introduction about the organization of ESGARD, the existing accelerator R&D projects co-financed by the EC in FP6, the role of ESGARD in promoting projects instigated in CARE and the FP7 planning of the calls with indicative budgets. A table giving an overview of the accelerator R&D projects proposed in the 1st call of FP7 (dead-line May 2, 2007) was presented with their total costs and EC contributions requested.

There will be 7 FP7 calls. The second call already took place concerning e-infrastructures, policy development and programme implementation with a total EC budget of 64 M€. Call 3 is the one of interest for IA proposals on accelerator R&D (dead-line on February 15, 2008) for a total EC budget of 277 M€. There will be 4 more calls; 2 in 2008 and 2009 for e-infrastructures and policy development essentially, and 2 in 2010 and 2012 that will include IA bids. The 2010 call also covers DS and CNI-PP. The total EC budget for IA in FP7 should be about 580 M€; this means that there will be 300 M€ approximately left after Call 3. For it is foreseen that the IA budget will be very limited in 2012, one can expect in 2010 an EC IA-budget of the same order as the one in 2008 (~280 M€).

Aleksan then summarized the situation about the preparation of the possible IA proposals for FP7. He recalled the fact that ESGARD received in 2006 more than 34 Letters of Intent for a total budget well exceeding 250 M€ and that the committee set up working groups for developing consistent sets of research activities on accelerator R&D, in line with the priorities stated in the Strategy Document of CERN Council. By the time of the meeting and after progress in the preparation, the working groups aim at having all together 6 networks (NA), 6 or 7 Transnational Access (TA) and 17 Joint Research Activities (JRA), for a total cost of a little less than 120 M€. The total cost is still very large and explains among other things the reasons for defining guidelines.

2. DISCUSSION ON THE IA PROPOSAL PREPARATION

In spring 2006, the anticipated EC-budget for Research Infrastructures was much higher than the budget actually allocated by EC, which is now lower that the one in FP6 once the part reserved for targeted proposals (~120 M€) is subtracted. Proposal budget cuts are therefore unavoidable.

Agreement is that the rational for establishing a proposal for FP7 is based on first determining the accelerator R&D program that the potentially participating laboratories have decided to do in any case for they are needed and then to ask for EC contributions in order to facilitate the program implementation and coordination. Hence, an estimate of the acceptable total budget results from integrating the R&D financed by the various laboratories/organizations; the figure retained is of the order of $60 \,\mathrm{M}\odot$.

Once this total budget is estimated, the next question is to define what appears to be a reasonable ratio for the EC contribution. Too low a ratio of 1/5 is not worth and would be prejudicial to small laboratories. In FP6, this ratio is in average not so much different from 1/3, which then appears as a target to be recommended.

Relevant information about EC contribution comes from the FP6 statistics. Some 60% of the I3s are between 3 and 9 M \in and the remaining 40% are between 11 and 27 M \in with an average of 16 M \in . CARE received 15 M \in and only a few projects were above this amount. With too high a budget, the project runs the risk to be rejected rather than reduced.

Project duration of 4 years is the one to adopt since the EC recommends not going beyond this limit. Given the budget size discussed above and the fact that the laboratories don't want that possible cuts in the program be decided by EC (which could for instance reject one complete IA proposed), the consensus is in favor of proposing a single IA on accelerator R&D.

3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On the basis of the discussions briefly reported in Section 2, consensus was reached by the participants over the following points:

- 1. *It is recommended to submit a single IA* (Integrated Activity) project on accelerator R&D, for reasons of budget limitations and priority control.
- 2. *The recommended duration of the project is 4 years*, i.e. the maximum duration advertised by the EC.
- 3. The target budget figures proposed are 60 M€ for the total cost of the project and 20 M€ for the amount to be requested from EC; this is in order to be in agreement with the estimates of the resources planned by the potential partners on such R&D activities. The argument is that the labs have defined their R&D policy and consequently determined what they can finance, the requested contribution from EU being an added value for putting together and coordinating the retained activities.
- 4. It is requested from the three conveners to provide for each preparatory working group the following:
 - a proposal for *a set of core activities*, for a maximum cost *of 15 M*€. The actual commitment of the partners involved has to be **explicitly given** and these core activities have to be in line with the recommendation of the strategy document.

- an optional *selection of additional activities* to be considered if support by commitment of the partners was available, for a cost *not exceeding 8 M* \in .
- 5. As *guide lines for this budget reduction* with respect to the figures presently quoted in each working group, it is recommended to consider the following:
 - the fact that programs fully supported by participants can either be discarded from the proposal or included without requesting any money from EC (it is assumed that a limit in EC funding exists, independently of the partners commitments). This applies in particular to the JRAs on polarized positron source (POSIPOL), high power RF sources and laser-plasma acceleration (LapTech). The development planned in POSIPOL, important but with lower priority in time, can possibly be submitted in the 2010 call and the LapTech activities can be part of the IA proposal LASERLAB-EUROPE discussed within the high-power laser community.
 - the needs to take into account the technical content of the already approved FP7 proposals, the two CNI preparatory phase projects SLHC-PP and ILC-HiGrade, and the DS EUROv, in order to avoid duplication. In this respect, it is felt that the proposed activities on surface treatment and preparation of SC cavities need to be revisited.
 - the necessity to clarify the importance of some budget figures, not always understood by the participants. Among them, there is for instance the 12M€ in the JRA on Accelerator and beam studies for FLASH at DESY.
- 6. *For Transnational Access*, it is recommended to put *small amounts of money* for it is in the tradition of the participating laboratories to provide the beam freely and to use this money only to help people to come and have access to the beam (when they are not partners).
- 7. Another meeting is planned for the end of September, beginning of October, in order to finalize the proposal and its budget, on the basis of the information which will be gathered from the working groups, according to item 4.