

COMMF6 WG 1: Congressional advocacy for HEP Funding

Keti Kaadze (KSU), Kevin Pedro (FNAL)
On behalf of the authors

Part I: DC Trip Origins

- Overview of the US budget process
- PP community has been engaged with public, policy makers, and opinion leaders for decades
- However, only smaller fraction of the community (~30%) was engaged with policy makers until about 10 years ago
- Maintaining and increasing funding support requires much larger fraction engagement and increased effectiveness of the outreach activities
- Assessing this situation during last Snowmass process lead to establish the HEP advocacy in a current form

Part II: DC Trip Present

- Current arguments to motivate funding
 - National security
 - Training workforce
 - Technology advancement; Discoveries
 - Impact on economy
- Trip logistics
 - Who organizes and leads the DC advocacy trip
 - Who goes to the trip (i.e. postdocs, students, etc.)
 - Who contributes and funds the trip (URA)
 - Washington-HEP Integrated Planning System
 - How it works (i.e. connections, assignments, etc.)
 - Resource for accessing data on past trips (connections, successful meetings, etc.)
 - Trip Material
 - Wiki and trainings
- Metric for trip success
 - Plots of requested requested vs. enacted funding
 - Signatures on appropriations Dear Colleague letters (e.g. for last few years, if possible)

Part III: Future Ideas

- DC Trip Logistics Improvements
 - Continuity and succession of the trip leadership
 - Technical tools for HEP advocacy
 - Timeline of efforts
 - Summarizing DC trip each year
- Science communication with public and policy leaders
 - Influential folks
 - Community-wide effort to influence these folks
 - Social media
- Future advocacy material/training/support improvements
 - How well-educated is our community about existing advocacy effort?
 - How we can improve awareness within our community about these efforts?
 - How to improve advocacy training?

Part IV: Bigger Picture

- Motivation for more substantial increases in federal R&D/science spending
- Observations of persistent, systemic issues with competitive grant-based funding: inefficient usage of time and effort, bias in proposal reviews, decreasing novelty, problems w/ targeted funding
 - Includes discussion of recent bills (Endless Frontier, COMPETES, etc.)
- Other issues: DOE science often overlooked in national conversations; appropriations undershoot authorizations; yearly appropriation process hurts big project reliability & international confidence
- Proposals to explore alternative methods of distributing funding, e.g. flat, lotteries, self-organized, bootstrap
- Other issues should also be addressed

Call to Action

- Part I:
 - Some more information about origin/history of the DC trip could help
- Part II:
 - Description of how WHIPS operates (connections, assignments, successful meetings, etc.)
- Part III:
 - This section is least developed and help on this will be greatly appreciated
- Part IV:
 - Cites many references with scientific studies of issues related to grant proposals, etc.
 - But better references may exist! Please add any if you have them
 - Other ideas to improve US federal science funding are also welcome
- WHIPS:
 - Maintain and further develop this great tool for DC trip