

Some questions about ET site selection

Jan Harms and Stefan Hild

ET telecon, 10th of January, 2018

Background

- Several promising sites have been suggested (Sardinia, Region of Limburg, Matra Mountains ...) and momentum has built (e.g. seismic measurements, engagement of local communities), which is obviously excellent.
- Some questions one might ask:
 - How much coordination is required to obtain best outcome?
 - Will there be a point in time when we ask in a more official way for proposals for sites? If yes, at what point?
 - Are there any drawbacks of having too many or too few candidate locations? If yes, which and where are the thresholds for too many/too few?

Background, continued

Also we know already we need to supply some information on site selection for ESFRI roadmap application:

“7.7 [Describe your strategy for site selection and for siting](#). If your RI is single-site, explain how the site was or will be chosen. If your RI is distributed, explain how you have (will) select the headquarters and (national) nodes: (maximum 1000 characters with spacing)

7.8 [Elaborate on the \(prior\) context of the site \(-s\) of your RI](#), e.g. a ‘green-field’, part of a broader plan of site development (including synergetic initiatives, installation in the premises of pre-existing facilities of similar or different scope) and the ‘value’ transferred to your new RI in terms of infrastructure, services and human resources: (maximum 1000 characters with spacing)”

Different categories

Is it possible to formulate a grid?

	Scientific	Socio-economic	Political
Essential				
Optional/ Beneficial				
....				

Idea

Is there a minimal set of requirements any candidate site needs to satisfy? If yes, what are these?

Would it be useful to establish a slightly more formal set/catalog of requirements and pieces of information that would be handy/vital to qualify a site?

Having such a set/catalog/document could be useful to make sure we do not miss any opportunity to collect the required information well in time, but also it allows to guarantee a level playing field and perhaps encourage folk to investigate more potential sites?

Scientific (we control)

- Seismic level
 - Well characterised (some months? One year of data? How many sensors?)
 - Seismic level compatible with ET targets (Good enough to be compatible with ET-D sensitivity? Or do we go for as low as possible? --- Any trade offs re variation over time? If 10% of the time the site is not quiet, but 90% of the time it is really good? etc)
 - Geological homogeneity
 - Expected impact of self-created surface noise (depends on geology)
 - Surface topology
 - ...

Political (we do not control)

- From ESFRI application questionnaire:
 - “Upload the [Expression of political Support \(EoS\) of the lead country](#); [...] Identify at least two MS and AC, which have submitted Expressions of political Support (EoS) signed by the [national ministries responsible for RI](#) [...]”
 - “5.1 If applicable, elaborate on your current and future inclusion in [National/Regional Research and Innovation Strategies](#) for Smart Specialisation (RIS3) and Operational Programme (-s) from the [European Structural and Investment Funds \(ESIF\)](#) and to what degree the inclusion in the ESFRI Roadmap is a condition for applying to the ESIF by the respective authorities: (maximum 2000 characters with spacing)”

Socio-Economic (we do not control)

- From ESFRI application questionnaire:
 - “3.1. Describe the expected direct economic impact of your RI, e.g. the economic impact from direct spending in the site and region hosting the facility or the headquarters and the nodes of a distributed RI: (maximum 3000 characters with spacing)”