

## NOTES FROM THE MEETING WITH DG/RTD/RI ON INNOVATION PILOTS

BRUSSELS 5 March 2019

Participants: P. Postigo and M. Koleva for EC, M. Vretenar and J.M. Perez for ARIES, P. Tello and T. Lagrange for ATTRACT, F. Selkow and P. Giacomelli for AIDA, B. Schramm for CALYPSO

P. Froissard had to cancel at the last moment its participation to the meeting because of other engagements.

Innovation pilot:

1. **Content:**

to separate between ATTRACT and AIDA, the EC people has defined ATTRACT for co-developments with a market outside the RI's, and the Innovation Pilots for developments for the RIs themselves. It is clear that because of this definition our applications of accelerators cannot be part of the innovation pilot, as well as our medical activities. The EC officers present have realized this (looks as if they did not see it before) and will discuss with Froissard (who could not attend the meeting) if there is any way to keep this important part of our accelerator programs. The fact that INFRAINNOV4 (innovation pilot) is exclusively for innovation for the RIs themselves, in the delivery of services and upgrade of infrastructure, might pose two problems for accelerator technology: a) that our societal applications are left out (things like the ship exhaust cleaning or other environmental applications are not for the RIs), and b) that most of our cutting-edge developments are for the long term (example: HTS), not for an immediate improvement in services or upgrade. It was said clearly that societal applications are for ATTRACT-like projects, and we don't have ATTRACT for accelerators.

2. **Structure:** we have to forget our traditional structure of NAs and JRAs to propose something new. Components of the new innovation pilot must correspond to the 3 categories defined in the work program (roadmaps, developments, prototypes).

3. **Innovation:** definition is not clear, it is ok if our innovation will not go directly to users (long term developments in the accelerator field).

4. **Industry involvement:** there should be a reasonable evolution from what we have now (= a few industries more).

5. **Two-stage actions:** the 2-stage action that we have in mind, with a second series of projects that is selected internally after the start of the project, is fine with them. The allocation of budget to the new projects will require an amendment, for a budget redistribution and/or the inclusion of new partners.

6. **Collaboration agreement** to be signed by the 3 communities to show that there is coordination in the content of the projects and no overlaps or double funding.

7. **Enlargement** of the community is always a plus, but should not be artificial.

8. In the last version of the work programme entered a reference to the results of AMICI that have to be incorporated in the innovation pilot.