

Toward the M5 Call for Missions

Fabio Favata

General considerations

- Process being defined.
- Community consultation (e.g., today's meeting) will shape the process.
- Interaction with the Member States will shape the process.
- Hence, you will not get the reply to all your questions today.

Schedule toward the M5 Call for Missions

- TBC!
- Further planning will take place following the present consultation with the scientific community.
- Schedule will be presented/discussed with the SPC at the February meeting.
- Will aim at phasing, insofar as possible, with M4 process.

Boundary conditions

- 550 M€ ESA CaC ceiling.
- Any international cooperation scheme allowed.
 - As long as there's a willing partner!
- Beware of availability of funding in member States.
- Baseline as usual is P/L procurement through Member States.
- All possible implementation schemes will be considered.
 - But be realistic!

International cooperation

- All possible schemes will be considered.
- All possible partners will be considered.
- Export control issues may apply.
- Scientists ≠ Agencies.
- Can be divided into “enabling” and “non-enabling”.

“Enabling” international cooperation

- Does your scheme depend (financially, technologically) on contributions from a partner?
- If so, partner needs to state its readiness to play its part at proposal time.
- Study must be conducted jointly.
- More in general, processes must be “in synch”.
- No exceptions possible.
- No statement, no programmatic feasibility.

“Enabling” international cooperation

- Strategic priorities of, e.g., NASA are well known.
 - Decadal reviews.
- Some areas of interest have been announced by international partners.
 - NASA Europa mission,
 - JAXA IR observatory, & CMB polarization mission.
- ESA available to further clarify issues, check interest with international partners, continue ongoing discussions, etc.
 - Bear in mind one cannot cajole partners!

“Non-enabling” international cooperation

- Can your proposed mission be implemented independent of contributions from a partner?
- Perhaps with reduced ambitions?
- If so, statements from partners not necessary at proposal time.
- Study can be ESA-only.
- Can be joint if partner is ready.
- Not critical during study phase.

Process

- Very similar to M4's.
- Technical and programmatic screening upfront.
- No AO for the P/L is foreseen as general rule (may depend on nature of P/L complement for selected missions).
 - Letters of Support required from national funding agencies (and international partners if/as applicable).

Process

- Peer review by dedicated body under the responsibility of the SSAC.
- Selection of a limited number (≤ 3 , TBC) of proposals for a study phase (typically 18 months, TBC), later down-selection to 1.
- We are available for limited support to the community in the pre-Call phase.

Suggestions

- Be realistic!
- Tune your ambitions with available resources.
- Proposal must have level of detail adequate to the proposal stage.
- Don't try to overdo it.

Suggestions

- Most elements of a mission cannot be properly estimated without a somewhat detailed study.
 - Your best bet may be parametric estimates, unless your mission concept is unusual.
- Concentrate on writing a solid science case compatible with the available resources.
- Schedule will be driven by technology and technical developments.
- If your science case depends on a 5-10% difference in available resources you have a problem (“fragile” proposal).

Caveat emptor

- All indications in today's discussion are to be confirmed, pending conclusion of today's consultation and discussions with the SPC in February 2016!