



The role of EU projects

Point of view of a [CERN] [EuCARD] coordinator

1. **Specific added value:** at a ~25% level of funding, a legitimate question is: what *might* have NOT happened without EuCARD:

Area	examples	mechanism
communication	Accelerating News, booklets,...	The EC obliges the researchers (not the press offices) to communicate
Networking / brainstorming	LHC upgrades, crab cavities, PWA collaboration, TLEP	EC encourages collaborative exchanges across fields and institutes. This stimulates positive competition world-wide.
Joint research activities	HFM, crab cavities, ... EuCARD partners: 8 accelerator centers 8 institutes 20 universities, 3 companies	EC stimulates R&D upstream of projects, by allowing sharing the risks between several partners and the EC. <i>EC allows participation of smaller institutes to leading-edge applied research.</i>

2. Facts on motivation of partners:

- at preparation time (EuCARD, EuCARD2), almost all the accelerator community wishes to participate, even at a 30% level EC funding; significant number of universities.
- All EuCARD events (annual meetings, SC, topical workshops,...) well attended, in spite of heavy workload of researchers and large number of institutional events (IPAC, advisory committees, international project meetings...).

Conclusion 1: The EU IA projects have a recognized added value and **should evolve** to maximize it (EuCARD2, ESGARD): networking, high risk/high gain joined research, collaboration between “heterogeneous” partners: big labs, universities, specialized institutes and non-European partners.

3. Practical details that make life easy or difficult:

- Time sheets (“accounting of productive working hours”)!!!
- Numbering of deliverables,...changed in middle of project,...
- EC audits going down to tiny details pushes the administrations of institutes to request even more from scientists.

Conclusion 2: The EC could organize **meetings of coordinators and administrative managers** to discuss and sort out these practical aspects that may have a significant impact, including on the perception of EU projects among researchers, and on the dynamism of projects.

4. Proposals for improvements:

1. Flexible customization of the three components of the IA to best fulfill the goals of the project.
2. Longer project duration consistent with the R&D time constants, e.g. possibility of two 4-year phases with conditional mid-term review, allowing the community to make medium term planning.
3. Capability for the coordinator to react to a changing environment: possibility to ask for unplanned small extra funding (%'s) for emerging initiatives (new network, industrial partner wishing to join, stimulation of innovation,...).
4. Project funding: now not really coherent with ambitious technical objectives and EC ambitions on building the ERA.
5. Easier association of international funded partners

Conclusion 3:

The very positive experience of the added value of EC Integrating Activities for accelerator R&D is a motivation to maximize their impact by taking advantage of the experience of CARE, EuCARD and now the EuCARD2 preparation.

- **For the community:** enriched network scope, increased balanced of high risk/high gain research with respect to project R&D
- **For the EC:** the above-mentioned proposals were transmitted to the Commission, in preparation of H2020 (except meeting on practical issues).