

# AIDA

L. Serin LAL/IN2P3 & CERN

- Review of referee comments
- New budget baseline
- Management team + new nomination of WP leaders
- Timeline up project finalisation

# Review of referee comments

- Referee comments received March 1<sup>st</sup> (14.5/15)

1) Scientific and/or technical excellence : 4.5/5

## **Quality and effectiveness of the Networking Activities**

The networking activities aim to coordinate an effort for the development of advanced general-use detector software tools which will improve the use of the detector development facilities. *These software tools will be successors of the presently existing GEANT4 (physics and geometry of detectors) and ROOT (multi-parameter data analysis) software packages* which are quasi-universally used in detector development and have also entered to other fields than particle physics.

*This activity is an excellent example of successful use of the Networking tool offered by the Infrastructure program. A second networking activity deals with microelectronics and interconnection of technologies necessary to all four detector-development activities.*

- Should clarify that referee misunderstood goal of WP2.
  - Networking activities seem well received
- try to apply less than 20 % reduction of these WPs

# Review of referee comments

## **Quality and effectiveness of the Trans-national Access and/or Services**

The Trans-national Access activities are centered on offering access to test beam and irradiation facilities to users from laboratories involved in detector research and development in Europe . They are organized around two main particle-physics labs, CERN and DESY. Access to smaller-scale irradiation facilities in Europe is also proposed. It is estimated that more than a thousand of users in Europe and beyond will benefit from the existing and planned infrastructures for the next generation of particle physics projects.

It has been noted that the fraction of the Consortium effort dedicated to Transnational Access is low. This is in contrast with the large number of projected users of the facilities. The budget dedicated to Transnational access should be increased by increasing at the same time the own contribution of the consortium partners to the overall effort.

- Should clarify that CERN and DESY beams are free. Should their real existing contributions to the beam be included here ? Only 4 months FTE for CERN and 8 for DESY

- Suggest to keep unchanged EC contributions to WP5 and WP6 and apply small reduction to WP7 so that fraction dedicated to will increase significantly

# Review of referee comments

## **-Quality and effectiveness of the Joint Research Activities**

*The two Joint Research Activities and associated work plan are of top quality and make up a major part of the total effort. They crystallize the essence of the project by focusing on requirements common to the whole detector community and improving the quality of these facilities. One activity aims at adapting the test beam and irradiation facilities to the requirements of the development experimental work and will install and commission a low-energy beam for testing of neutrino detectors. A second activity includes the most important tasks of detector development, namely gaseous-detector tracking, precise vertex detection, Si tracking and advanced calorimetry, all at forefront of detector R&D.*

*The budget of Work Packages WP8 and WP9 take up more than half of the requested budget. In order to obtain a more balanced budget, the participants in these Work Packages should assume a higher share of the costs by their own resources.*

→ Try to keep preferentially activities common to many users/groups

→ Large part of budget reduction should occur in WP8 and WP9.

Apply larger reduction on EC contributions than on commitments  
no more 2 to 1

# Review of referee comments

## 2) Quality of efficiency of the implementation of the management

5/5

*A number of committees appropriately include international experts from outside the Consortium. A User Selection Group is proposed; however its mechanism should be described in more detail.*

- Advisory scientific committee has to be created (with international experts)
- User selection group, mainly for access to irradiation facilities (+ test beam)

Could be :

- WP7 leader
- one representative from CERN (SPS coordinator), from DESY (Test beam coordinator), from each of the 3 irradiation facilities
- One representative of big experiments (ATLAS, CMS, ILC,...)

*The allocation of the budget is balanced between the work packages and participants, with a major fraction attributed to the main participants CERN (27%) and DESY (16%).*

*The staff effort is similarly distributed and beyond the dominant part of major participants (CERN 27 % , DESY/GE 16 % , CNRS 7.9 % , INFN 8.6 % , UK 10.5 % ), a good balance between other participants is proposed.*

- Much reduction effort to be asked to the 5 main participants (70 % of project)

# Review of referee comments

## 3) Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results 5/5

*A clear effort has been made to reach out to new partners e.g. from Lithuania, Slovenia, and Czech Republic.*

→ Should make effort to keep these small EC contributions to an acceptable level

*submission of AIDA publications to Open Access journals will be encouraged. The efforts at dissemination of project results are however centered on scientific publications, conference presentations and a public website. These should be enlarged to enhance the visibility of these huge and important scientific programmes and more effort should be made to reach out to the public at large and contact students at all levels.*

→ Will have to define how AIDA will appear in publication

→ Budget dedicated to dissemination of results/outreach should be unchanged

or with little reduction (60 kEuros)

Action towards public/ students : Any ideas ? detectors tutorials ?

# Review of referee comments

## 3) Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results 5/5

*A work package is dedicated to relation with industry: this relation at an early stage of research and development is very welcome and it is suggested that ways to enhance it even more be found. This project is an ideal gateway to deepen the level of exchanges with advanced industrial partners and will result in a significant socio-economic impact.*

→ Any good idea even with reduced budget ? More clear link to technology transfer group at CERN ?

Experts recommend, in the case of this proposal being selected for negotiation, also to look at an overall optimisation of resources, both human and financial, as well as an efficient management of the project at European level, including of course clear governance issues.

→ Relation with ECFA ?

# New baseline budget

AIDA document (kEuros)		New baseline (kEuros)	
WP 1	450	350	-22%
WP 2	1098	950	-13.5 %
WP 3	1096	950	-13.5 %
WP 4	300	250	-16.6 %
WP 5	100	100	
WP 6	150	150	
WP 7	600	550	-8.3 %
WP 8	3139	2350	-25.1 %
WP 9	3066	2350	-23.3 %
Total	9999.5	8000	-20 %

This budget do not take into account any country/labs priorities (only received info from Poland + CERN)



# Management / Nominations

Management Team organisation has been defined to help me during negotiation phase :

Project Coordinator (LS, IN2P3/CERN)

- + Paul Soler (U. Glasgow) and Ties Benhke (DESY) deputy project coordinators
- + Svet Stavrev (CERN) will act as Administrative Manager

Nomination of new WP leaders :

- WP4 : Should replace P. Sharp to have second WP leader with Steinar
- WP6 : Was H. Taureg : Could it be SPS coordinator, to be discussed with PH division
- WP8 : Should replace H. Taureg. Needs at least someone from CERN as most the WP activity is CERN based.
- WP9 : Should replace H. Videau (LLR/IN2P3) → Vincent Boudry (LLR/IN3P3)  
Henri will work jointly with Vincent until AIDA is started

# Timeline (1)

- Should have first iteration on budget reduction in each WP today.
- Meeting with National Contact April 21st where reduction should be agreed.  
( I have asked them to send me any priority if their contribution should be reduced. In absence of answers, I consider this is up to us to decide the best strategy. CERN position today)
- First negotiation meeting with EC scheduled end April/beginning May where we should bring a new budget + answers to referee comments

# Timeline (2)

Steps to follow :

- Finalisation of the new WP content and budget (WP leaders)
- New Master budget file (who's taking care ?)
- Confirmation of commitments from all partners (NCPs + contact persons from each partner)
- Description of Work (Annex 1 / concise version of proposal) - first version a.s.a.p., say 10 days after the NCP meeting
  - deliverables, milestones, Trans-National tables + budget
- Final split between beneficiaries and third parties
- Approval of the third party participation by the EC
- Compilation of the Grant Preparation Forms (NCP)