AIDA Advisory Committee

Present in Vienna:

Alan Bross   FNAL

Geoff Hall   Imperial College

John Harvey   CERN

Peter Jenni   Freiburg & CERN

28 March 2014

Mandate

- Our mandate – a reminder
  - Monitoring scientific and technical activities and advising the AIDA management on deliverables & milestones.
  - Recommendations to AIDA management about scientific or technical choices
    - or actions to be taken with partners and Work Packages
  - On request of AIDA management, participating in AIDA internal review
  - Providing a short document after each SAC meeting
    - reporting at the AIDA plenary meeting
  - Participate in strategy discussion about the continuation of AIDA within the European framework Horizon 2020.

Some observations

- The project is approaching its end so it is natural to try to give some feedback on its success
  - maximise the chance of approval of a follow-up

- As well as observing progress, we have also compared with what we have said in previous years
  - NB we have had limited time to assess and discuss!

- Participants are in a good position to judge too
  - and **probably should** in view of next phase
  - but perhaps do not meet more often than us?

Some feedback from AC in 2013

- The project has been well managed   - well done!
  - not just the top level, but throughout
- Generally on schedule but many deliverables in final year
  - be careful to anticipate them
- Record progress - especially *deliverables*
  - documentation is really important   (some excellent online material)
    - for EU, and to ensure progress beneficial to wider community
    - suggest **short** reports with standard template
  - Try to aim for generic software development to maximise benefits
- Some activities affected by outside actions
  - CERN test beams and 65 nm NDA
  - reformulate some final objectives internally
- Make clear the added value from AIDA

The response from AIDA?

- Generally good, but some room for improvement
  - might be worth considering when planning AIDA-2
  - and preparing final reports, which could be crucial to next phase
- Praised
  - Trans-National Access activities have been a big success
  - Generic software developments seem very useful
  - Examples of work carried out by younger team members
  - Progress with common data base (Imhotep)
- Weaker
  - AIDA is still a non-homogeneous activity
    - are people exchanging, or just presenting their own work?
  - Documentation
  - Will be challenging to meet 65 nm objectives
  - Common DAQ needs focus

Future

- Think about end game
  - this may be crucial for approval of another project
- Try to see EU perspective, not just your own
  - final reports must be completed in time
  - maximise deliverables which are met
    - even those subject to delays should report significant progress
  - maximise documentation and publications citing AIDA
    - don't ignore "unsuccessful" outcomes – valuable for others
  - remember EU objectives are not just scientific or technical
- Strategy for follow-on – which will be competitive
  - Consider what EU may be looking for as well as personal interests
  - TNA activities appear to be very valuable achievements