



Science & Technology
Facilities Council

SiD Workshop: Welcome

Norman McCubbin

Acting Director of Particle Physics Department at RAL



Welcome

- **Welcome!**
- **A pleasure to see such a good attendance for this workshop, and I'm sure you will have an interesting and enjoyable meeting in this lovely setting. (Bought for ~£10,000 by a far-sighted Director of RAL over 40 years ago.)**
- **Obviously we meet at a very difficult time for PP in general, both here and in the USA, and for the ILC in particular.**
- **I wanted to make a few comments on the current situation in the UK, speaking as a particle physicist, and not as a representative of the funding agency. (But I am not going to wade into controversial waters!)**
- **The STFC Delivery Plan (December 2007) stated:**
 - “We will cease investment in the International Linear Collider. We do not see a practicable path toward the realisation of this facility as currently conceived on a reasonable timescale.”
- **It is in the PP ‘public domain’ that this statement goes beyond what was advised by the highest-ranking review panel, Science Board, which spoke in terms of a ‘suspension’ of activities.**



Welcome

- **The Delivery Plan statement has been re-affirmed by the CEO in various Town meetings and similar since, and in evidence before the Parliamentary Select Committee:**

- **21 January 2008:**

Q122 Mr Boswell: Is it your judgment that any of these projects (ILC, Gemini) will fail on account of our withdrawal?

Professor Mason: In terms of the International Linear Collider you will be aware that the US has also withdrawn funding for the next year and I think this is a signal that we actually need to re-think the future of particle physics and find a more sustainable way to go onto the next stage. That is my own personal opinion. What happens to the ILC project is perhaps debatable, *but I am pretty sure at some stage there will be a next generation Linear Collider.* In terms of Gemini..... (my italics)



Welcome

– **27 February 2008:**

Q390 Dr Turner: Finally, can you clarify your fairly abrupt decision to withdraw funding from the International Linear Collider, when that had been funded on the basis of peer review but the decision to withdraw was not? How do you justify this? Was it in fact a response to the American withdrawal of funding?

Professor Mason: No, we made our announcement two weeks before the American decision and it was completely independent. It is not true to say that was an abrupt decision. We had been having discussions within the old PPARC science committee about the balance of funding which was required for ILC compared to the second generation of LHC instrumentation - large hadron collider - at CERN. We had started the ILC programme, and even though it was labelled ILC actually it was generic accelerator and detector development, so generic developments. *We were now at a point where the ILC project was wanting to move forward to specific ILC instrumentation and to ramp up those costs* (my italics), and it was clear to us for a long time and to our peer review bodies that under a flat cash regime we could not afford to do both that and to invest in LHC. So the decision was not made overnight, it was not made rapidly, but it was informed by considerable discussion over many months, even years, about the direction of this programme and whether it was sustainable. As you know, one of the issues which concerned us greatly was the fact that the cost of the ILC was rising, the timescale was stretching, we were in danger of threatening the future of particle physics essentially by putting all our eggs into a basket which might deliver chicks.

SiD Welcome; 14 April 2008



Welcome

- I know that several people in this room
 - a) know these (and other) statements pretty much by heart, and
 - b) would dispute some of the stated or implied assumptions.
- As I said, I don't propose to enter into those areas.
- Finally (March 3rd), we got the results of STFC's Programmatic Review, launched before the Delivery Plan was announced and completed after it.
- The feedback on the ILC Detector R&D Projects (LCFI and CALICE) was:
 - The ranking reflects PPAN's assessment of the priority of investing in R&D towards the ILC project. They note that they would have made this recommendation even if the STFC council decision on ILC had not already been taken.
 - Category: **Lower Priority** (the lowest PPAN ranking)
- Note that the ILC Accelerator projects were not part of the Programmatic Review



Welcome

- Unsurprisingly all of this has had a marked effect on those working on ILC projects. Within the Particle Physics Department at RAL several people have already left, or moved, and, probably, more will follow. (And I suspect there are similar trends in the affected university groups.)
- It look bad, it is bad, but – and this is the point I wish to end on and emphasise – I am hopeful that we will be able to salvage some degree of orderly continuity, so that the many years of UK detector R&D is not all wasted.
- This is not just wishful thinking:
 - there has been ‘considerable’ outcry from STFC’s scientific communities (not just about ILC of course) and from other stakeholders. As a result, a ‘consultation process’ has been set up which solicited input from the community (the community responded!) and this input will now be considered by ten specialist panels, which can make recommendations on funding.
 - I detect a strong desire at very senior levels in STFC to find a way forward, with the community’s confidence and trust.
- **HAVE A GREAT MEETING!**