

## Notes on telephone meeting with John Womersley

Present: Paul Dauncey, Tim Greenshaw, John Womersley

John was first asked to comment on the level of funding available for a “major” bid from the CALICE and LCFI groups. He said that the available funding was of the order of £1M p.a. and that there was increasing recognition of the importance of maintaining a capability in detector development. Preliminary comments from the Consultation Panel were strengthening this perception and the PPRP would be made aware of this strategic goal. He also said that:

- There is no commitment that the above sum will be made available; this will depend on the quality of the project.
- We should not be too constrained by this amount of money; further funding may be obtained if the projects merit it.
- He would prefer to see one coherent bid from the LCFI and CALICE groups, as this would make fitting within the funding envelope easier to handle, but that this should not be a completely artificial union of separate projects. (He mentioned that his preference for a joint proposal was based to some extent on conversations he has had with Marcel and Mike.)

John told us that projects which were aimed specifically at ATLAS/CMS upgrades would be funded from a different pot (SLHC money). This could apply to the DAQ developments (applicable to the ATLAS tracker upgrade) and possibly the studies of novel materials (LHC vertex detectors); alternatively, the latter would be appropriate for PRD funding.

He confirmed that the PRD of Marcel and Mark requesting support for studies of particle flow algorithms was on his desk following approval by the PPRP and he hadn't yet signed it as he wasn't sure that this was the most appropriate use of funding in the current climate. He would be interested to receive a broader proposal, particularly if this could profit from additional external funding. He intended to talk to Marcel and Mark about this.

John recommended that any technology proposal contain suitable phrases about working with the detector gateway centre, one of the centres that that Steve Worm is working to set up, but stressed that there is no additional funding available through this route: any proposal would be judged by the PPRP and funded by STFC, with the exchange of ideas with the gateway centre being seen as a bonus as regards the likelihood of success (“knowledge exchange” being one of the criteria against which proposals are judged). There was no requirement to include effort in any proposal specifically for work with the gateway centre.

It was confirmed that “future colliders”, as referred to in some STFC communications, meant all possibilities, i.e. a future linear collider, SLHC or a muon collider. John was of the opinion that CERN's future programme will be critical as regards determining what “future collider” means in practice and that this will evolve in the short term due to the arrival of Rolf Heuer as CERN director and in the medium term (2010 to 2012) following first LHC results. He said the best approach would be to be flexible to respond to any future direction at this time; “to be ready, nimble and able”.

John emphasised that the main desire from STFC was to maintain the expertise for detector development in the UK. Questioned as to how he would rate the relative merits of generic technology developments and tests of novel concepts, such as that of the digital ECAL, John said he personally would tend to support the former, but any programme would need to be quite focussed to achieve anything with the low level of funding available. He also emphasised that recommendations for funding would be made by the PPRP, not the STFC.

It was suggested that John look at a set of Statements of Interest from the CALICE and LCFI groups and provide feedback on these before they were submitted for consideration by PPAN. He said he would appreciate this as it would allow him to ensure that adequate space was left for these in spread sheets. It was suggested that Sols be submitted to him by about 3<sup>rd</sup> June and then discussed in a further phone meeting on the 10<sup>th</sup> June at 10:00. These Sols could then be submitted to the PPAN meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> July.

John suggested that a major proposal from the CALICE and LCFI groups should aim to cover a period of about three years. PRD bids submitted in parallel should of course cover different periods if this was appropriate for the projects concerned.