Panel discussion: Americas participation in the ILC

Moderated by Paul Grannis

Panelists:

Alain Bellerive, Canada Research Prof., Carleton Univ
Dmitri Denisov, Deputy ALD for HEP, Brookhaven Lab
Stuart Henderson, Director, Jefferson Lab
JoAnne Hewitt, Chief Research Officer, SLAC, HEPAP chair
Andy Lankford, Univ. Calif. Irvine, IDT Americas rep
Nigel Lockyer, Director, Fermilab
Hitoshi Murayama, UC Berkeley, Kavli Inst U. Tokyo, IDT WG3 chair
Jim Siegrist, Assoc. Director of Science for HEP, DOE
Andy White, Univ. Texas Arlington, SiD collaboration co-spokesperson

I will ask a series of questions to specific panelists. I ask that the responses be confined to 1 – 2 minutes as many of the questions have been touched upon elsewhere in this workshop and we want to cover as broad a range as possible. Time permitting, other panelists will give follow-up comments. For the last 10 minutes we will take up questions from the audience.

1. One can imagine that if the US participates, we would like to do so in a rather big way. How would you articulate the level of leadership within the ILC project in Japan that the US should aspire to?

Siegrist, Lockyer, Henderson

2. The current detector concepts ILD and SiD have been in place for over a decade, and may seem frozen, particularly to young physicists now coming into the ILC community. How should one structure the detector side of the house so as to stimulate new ideas and directions? How essential do you see it for two detectors to be operating in the initial ILC runs?

White, Bellerive

3. What do you see as particularly good candidates for contributions to the ILC and the Pre-lab from the US? Are there coherent US themes? (see talk in Tuesday plenary by Oliver Kester on Canadian contributions and Tuesday parallel session talk by Andrei Seryi et al. on US contributions.)

Henderson, Hewett, Lockyer, Denisov

4. What are the most pressing (and most difficult) issues to be resolved by the IDT?

   (See Monday plenary talks by Tatsuya Nakada and Andy Lankford, and Tuesday parallel session talk by Kaoru Yokoya)

Lankford, Murayama

5. Should a US funding participation in ILC be limited to what can be afforded within the DOE HEP budget, or is it possible to seek some extra funding bump (from Office of Science, Congress, NSF …) to recognize a special opportunity?

Siegrist

6. We now have rather extensive experience with supporting LHC experimenters who are working in the US at analysis centers, in particular at Fermilab and Brookhaven. What are the lessons learned and how would one modify these efforts for ILC? What other steps could be taken to make remote participation productive?

Denisov, Lankford

7. What steps can be taken to engage Canada and Latin American communities more fully in developing the ILC and its experiments?
   (See Monday plenary talks by and Alain Bellerive and Marta Losada.)

Bellerive, White

8. Up to now, the US and Canadian engagement in ILC has been dominated by the older generation of physicists. How can one bring in more of the younger generation that will actually work at ILC into the community? (See the panel discussion in the Wednesday plenary.)

Murayama, Hewett

9. How would you approach participation in FCCee/FCChh, or other large-scale projects on foreign soil, if the ILC goes forward with US participation?

Siegrist, Lockyer