

Future collaboration at ATF

some ideas and issues for discussion

Philip Bambade
LAL & KEK

Two main questions (beyond 2012)

- 1) Should ATF remain a dedicated R&D facility for linear colliders ILC & CLIC ? Can it evolve to support broader science goals ?
 - 2) Should our international collaboration evolve towards deeper enhanced support and participation, and how ?
- Will depend on definiteness of LC plans
- Choice for (1) influences (2)

ATF / ATF2 beyond 2012

A) Dedicated facility for continued R&D and training in linear collider design and operation

- + Direct connection to major flag-ship project \Rightarrow structured, coherent program
- + Support from HEP motivated physicists able to pursue accelerator work
- Vulnerable whenever LC (and HEP) program comes under pressure

\rightarrow Organizational model of HEP experiments may be considered

B) Multi-purpose facility for beam physics and instrumentation with basic and applied goals

- + Broader community may bring more interest, support and funding
- Availability of excellent beam conditions for many different users may require a larger, more structured, professional support organization
 \Rightarrow could the flexibility and inventiveness of the present operation be kept ?

\rightarrow Organizational model of synchrotron light sources, large telescopes ?

Organizational model of HEP experiments

- 1) Treat ATF / ATF2 research facility as an experiment in which not only the construction, but also operation and maintenance are supported by the entire collaboration ?
- 2) Departure from ICFA guidelines from 1980 and 1993 ?

"operating laboratories should not require experimental groups to contribute to the running costs of the accelerators or colliding beam machines nor to the operating costs of their associated experimental areas".

- 3) As in HEP experiments, participating institutes would not only use the research environment to pursue their research but would contribute person-power and funding to support the operation.

But how ?

- software management and development ?
- electricity and other consumables ?
- hardware maintenance and upgrade ?
- staffing of beam operation, professional operation staff ?

- 4) The management & organizational structure would evolve, also the signed MoU, maybe publication policy, in proportion to contributions

Organizational model of user-oriented facility

- 1) Present ATF / ATF2 has a central support structure within the host organization at KEK, though it also has many features of HEP experiments (mainly because most researchers originate from HEP)
- 2) In case of a broadened science and application program, should a dedicated professional organization become responsible for all operation, maintenance and some of the upgrades ?
- 3) Who would pay for that ? Should a departure from ICFA guidelines also be considered in form of user contributions to costs
- 4) The management & organizational structure would also evolve, as well as the signed Memoranda of Understanding and publication policy

→ there's some experience in synchrotron light sources and other international multi-user research facilities which can be learned from

My preferred scenario: A + some of B

- 1) Keep ATF / ATF2 as facility for continued R&D and training in linear collider design and operation, to support ILC and CLIC projects
- 2) Organize as HEP experiment, with contributing stakeholders sharing responsibilities for programs and operation in the form of tasks and funds for general interest purposes
- 3) Consider more basic beam operation by dedicated staff
- 4) Openness to host other experiments with different science goals and applications, for a fraction of the beam time, in which case the collaboration would serve as provider

→ International workshop in 2011 on the future usage of the ATF / ATF2 low emittance nano-scale beam ?

→ Could be organized with working groups discussions and meetings over an extended period and conclusions at a final meeting at KEK