TRANS-NATIONAL ACCESS IN OPTICON FP7-2A

Johannes Andersen

OPTICON Telescope Directors' Forum

Defining the TNA Programme

Top-level definition from the call:

"A project under this topic must provide and facilitate access to the key research infrastructures in Europe for optical and infrared astronomy. It should aim to integrate these facilities and resources with a long term perspective."

This is the basis for our future marching orders

- **Support to existing infrastructures**
- **Night-time telescope only**
- **ESO telescopes p.t. excluded (ESO *is* TNA!)**

Basics of TNA Programme

2009 + 2010 A+B

- *Min' # nights/tel fixed in contract, ⇒
- Nites/tel/semester fixed by OPTICON, based on total budget
- Budget/tel/semester fixed by OPTICON
- Allocations decided by individual NTAC rankings
- No top-down view of overall state of demand vs. supply
- 2010 (A+B) was a trial period

2011 A+B

- # nights offered decided by owner agencies
- Total budget/semester decided by OPTICON (6 semesters)
- CTAC ranking ⇒ Telescopes & projects compete for one pool of €€

Summary of TNA in 2011 A+B:

	min.	Fee	2011A+B Total						2012 A+B UFs	
	FP7-1	$/nite	Nprop	Offer	Reqst	Alloc	PFini	PrsF	Total, €	UF, %
AAT	28.0	9,484	22	20	99	19	4.95	5.21	180,196	30.1
CAHA 3.5m	18.0	8,966	8	15	22	8	1.47	2.75	71,728	12.0
CAHA 2.2m	28.0	3,371	7	19	37	6	1.95	6.17	20,226	3.4
CFHT	8.0	14,610	7	11	13.5	4	1.23	3.38	58,440	9.7
ESO/MPG22	25.0	2,707	7	22	24	4	1.09	6.00	10,828	1.8
WHT	18.0	7,992	6	8	11	3	1.38	3.67	23,976	4.0
INT	7.0	1,629	1	17	5	0	0.29		0	0.0
TNG	25.0	6,933	5	13	15	2	1.15	7.50	13,866	2.3
NOT	32.0	3,867	30	40	123.4	39	3.09	3.16	150,829	25.2
OHP 1.9	50.0	1,756	10	14	56	13	4.00	4.31	22,828	3.8
TBL	32.0	2,563	5	14	29	10	2.07	2.90	25,630	4.3
TCS	23.0	2,113	1	15	0	0	0.00		0	0.0
LT (@ 10 h)	15.1	3,760	10	10	11.81	5.6	1.18	2.11	21,056	3.5
# props	294.0		119	218	446.7	113.6	2.05	3.93	599,603	100.0
Unique			103							
Approved			34.0					33.0		

Management and reporting of TNA rationalised @ PS office ⇒ BIG savings!

TNA Programme in 2012

TNA in 2012 is an emergency measure!

- In reality, cash in hand (from 2009, 2010) could cover cost
- Thus, we keep the TNA programme afloat through 2012
- In FP7-2A, nights must draw 100% User Fees if allocated at all

In FP7-2+, owner agencies can decide:

- How to allocate the 97% of nights the EC does not pay for
- Whether EC constraints are a useful guide to the long-term future
- Whether OPTICON UFs are a useful tool to address the REAL national imbalances in user demand vs. supply for certain telescopes in the short (2013-2016) and long term **(ASTRONET plan!)**

General comments for FP7-2

The 8-10m telescopes are key infrastructures!

No likely contract can cover User Fees, so OPTICON cannot PROVIDE access or **promote integration of 8-10m class,** but could FACILITATE access by supporting travel to projects awarded time through standard procedures

JRAs should also benefit 8-10m & 2-4m telescopes

- Support (pre-)design of new key instruments (notably WFS, cf. ASTRONET recs.)
- Promote synergies between similar N+S projects
- Spcialisation **IS** under way (HARPS, WFS, NOT,…)

General comments (Part 2)

TNA budget in FP7-2A based on 2011 A+B:

- Should provide support for the time the agencies offer,
- Moderated at a 50% cutoff in proposals submitted
- **From a 33% success rate in FP7-1, 400 k€ per semester will be needed to reach max 50% in FP7-2A**

Support for TNA-related activities in FP7-2A:

- Separate Network activities for ground-space synergy (Gaia transients etc.)
- Separate Network activity on hands-on/off training
- Knowledge transfer; cooperate on specific projects

Evolution of CTAC review

- **General agreement on CTAC principle:**
  - "Level playing field" for all (presumably)
  - Facilitates multi-telescope proposals
  - Highlights and quantifies demand for each telescope
  - More data needed on cash flow in 'steady state'
  - Valuable guide to specialising instrumentation
- **Identify needs for future CTAC evolution**
  - As CTAC evolves towards 100% of time, volume will increase
  - Panels will be needed, but which panels?
  - Specialised telescopes: science ≈ telescope-specific panels?
  - Implementation will be driven by specalisation ⇒ evolution