SCRFAS MEETING
LAL/Orsay, 19 December 2006

Present: T. Garvey, M. Grecki, P. McIntosh, H. Mais, O. Napoly, C. Pagani, D. Proch, R. Seviour, F. Richard

At PSI: T. Schilcher and V. Shlott

At CERN: O. Brunner, T. Linnecar

At Frascati (part time): S. Guiducci

Excused: V. Palladino

Presentations can be found in http://ilcagenda.cern.ch/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=1300

1/ Report from ESGARD by ON

Questions/comments:

- How will the number of I3 be decided? This should happen during an open meeting between April and summer 2007. Some coordination between the 3 WG to react to various scenarios will be set up.
- What is the dead line for an LoI? After some debate SCRFAS thinks that the dead line should be May 15 2007.
- Don't forget anybody in the process (how to reach universities?).
- Duration of an IA: 3 years seems too short since the money arrives after ½ year. Assume 4 years and allow some modulation between the JRA.
- Are SCRF CW guns eligible? They could be of interest (generation of polarized e+) but they belong also to XFEL. Wait until they have their first meeting (January).
- Recommendations from the GDE R&D board will also help to orient our choices (will appear during the MAC in January).

2/ Report from the Brussels Meeting on ESFRI IS by FR

Comments:

- we will know the outcome of the ILC proposal before the deadline on LoI.
- a key issue seems to combine the Preparatory phase money and the IA money.
- money for hardware will be very limited (< 4 M€).

3/ Discussion on LLRF with MG

Questions/Comments

- Should we group all LLRF activities (DESY group, UK proposals, tuners…) in 1 WP?
- If not, how to make sure that there is good communication. Through a networking package? This seems the preferred solution.

➔ ACTION: work down a scheme for the LLRF organisation.

4/ Thin films

2 LoI almost identical were received by ESGARD. Interest from Saclay, IPNO, Legnaro.

5/ Discussion on the CERN facility for SCRF

Several points need to be clarified:

- When will SPL use it? >2010?
- How will potential users access to this facility?
- Use of the resources (30% of the total) called 'operation and cost'? (He, prototypes?)
- How does it fit into FP7-IA: connection to the proposed R&D programs?
- Could the preparatory work start before the JRA (e.g. using the ILC Preparatory Phase money?)

➔ ACTION: a meeting at CERN with ON, TL, OB and WW

6/ Discussion on R&D for SCRF (inputs from DP and RS)

Inputs: LoI from DESY and DP. Still missing: French and Italian projects with costs.

Comments

- Will be based on several existing facilities (NB: TTF/FLASH which is the only test bed with beam) which can be a basis for TNA.
- Will require fundamental R&D which at present is supported by CARE while labs programs are projected oriented (e.g. arc coating, new SC materials, support of CARE for mono crystal cavities…).
- Will help maintaining the active collaborations within CARE.
- Should refer to a Central Infrastructure (Facility at CERN? Not obvious at present).
- Some of this effort will/should go to XFEL (synergy on CW RF gun, ERL for the e+ source).
- The Daresbury ERL in 2009 could be used in the Rossendorf proposal.
- RS recalls the 200 MHz cavities for neutrinos (no effort in the DS) expresses interest and emphasizes surface characterisation, in situ, to understand reproducibility aspects (resources, 1.9 M£ requested from PPARC, answer in January)

Diverse opinions were expressed on the use of the CERN facility. Should it concentrate on major projects, ILC mainly, or encourage diversity (SPL, SC neutrino R&D)?

7/ Proposed Strategy for the JRAs: see ON presentation

Comments:

- JRA2 does contain Quarter Wave cavities (LoI from M. Pasini) but not Spokes Cavities (LoI from IPNO) which are Nuclear Physics activities (make sure there is communication).
- JRA3: could go to XFEL and ERL at large.
- JRA4: beam physics contains 'intellectual aspects'; FLASH could contain LLRF

Diverging opinions and comments were expressed on JRA5:

- Grenoble activity not naturally integrated
- How to include existing platforms (DESY, Milano, Orsay-Saclay, etc…)?
- Can the couplers be treated as general or should they appear as specific for high gradients (and then in JRA1)?

ACTIONS:

➔ Contact B. Rousset at Grenoble
➔ if the couplers become a specific project, a proposal within JRA1 is needed
➔ redefine JRA5 as 'General Purpose Test Infrastructure and Networking'

8/ Proposal on Networking

Additions suggested:

- WP on LLRF
- WP on Beam Studies

9/ Trans-National Access

Expected to be a large fraction of the IA, ~1/3. Could cover, e.g., Beam Time, Operational Costs and Services. Would count as a large contribution of our labs.

NEXT STEPS:

- Minutes
- Iteration on JRA and NW
- Meeting in ~2 months
- Identify JRA responsible after converging on the structure
- LLRF activities to be discussed between the players
- Take the various actions outlined above
- Coordinate with the Preparatory Phase proposal for ILC