Deliverables

Deliverable Number	**D5.2**
Deliverable Title	**Foundations of a business plan for the wayforlight portal**
Lead Beneficiary	**HZDR**
Type	**Report**
Dissemination Level	**Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)**
Due date of delivery	**Month 30**
Authors	**C. Blasetti (NA1 leader, Elettra), M. Grobosch (HZDR), C. Modolo (Elettra), V. Piffer (PSI)**

1. Annexes

1.1 Annex I – Vision and Mission

This section presents all the contributions collected, without further editing or filtering.

Table 11 Mission & vision - PSI

Facility	**Paul Scherrer Institut**
MISSION	VISION
• Promote the European Lightsources facilities and their work; • Thrive to provide interaction among users, industries and beam scientists in order to support further collaboration • Thrive to provide specific information or links to dedicated websites for selected user groups; • To provide easy access to publications.	• Wayforlight will become a reliable point of reference for all European lightsources facilities by providing an up-to-date, interactive and informative environment for all internal and external users.

Table 12 Mission & vision – INFN – DAFNE-L

Facility	**INFN DAFNE-L**
MISSION	VISION
• Gives scientists and students the possibility to find	• A website that can become a European catalog of

useful information for their research surely saving time and visiting only one up to date website.	research infrastructures related to the use of light.

Table 13 Mission & vision – HZDR

Facility	**HZDR**
MISSION	VISION
• to provide characteristics of all accelerator-based lightsources including constantly updated beamline data sheet • to equally provide characteristics of big optical laser facilities which constitute LaserLab Europe • to constitute the access platform to teaching materials such as eBooks or videos produced by the HERCULES school team • to provide specific information or links to dedicated websites for selected user groups, e.g. industry users, archeologists, arts historians etc.	• Wayforlight being the central information hub for any information related to lightsources in Europe.

Table 14 Mission & vision – Elettra

Facility	**Elettra**
MISSION	VISION
• Provide a comprehensive overview of all European synchrotrons, free electron lasers and optical lasers • Offer training tools for new or potential users of EU lightsources • Promote the European Synchrotron and FEL User Organisation among the users • Foster knowledge exchange and catalyze future collaborations	• Become the reference portal for lightsources users in Europe • Be ranked first in Google search for "EU lightsources" • Be updated and reliable • Grow with time thanks to a solid collaboration of facility staff and external users

Table 15 Mission & vision – ALBA

Facility	**ALBA**
MISSION	VISION
• Promoting a common point of information for synchrotron and Fel sources in Europe through: • beamline database by techniques • Deadlines and access info for the different light sources • Education workshops/courses for the synchrotron and Fel researchers.	• European platform for all synchrotron and FEL's users providing information on facilities and educational courses/workshops

Table 16 Mission & vision – DESY

Facility	**DESY**
MISSION	VISION
• to inform users about experimental facilities all over Europe • provide all necessary information to users and enable them to find best suitable beamline, and to	• known to the major part of European SR/FEL users • become global portal, central entry point to the "world of lightsources"

apply and use beam time successfully	• become the only data base where data on beamlines etc. have to be updated • include information on European projects such as FELs of Europe, LEAPS

Table 17 Mission & vision – SOLARIS

Facility	**SOLARIS**
MISSION	VISION
• Visibility of the discipline and the light sources infrastructures in the region • Eastern European scientific gate to large scale light source infrastructures for scientist • Cooperation with the national and international scientific community • Open access to research infrastructure for basic and applied research in such areas as catalysis, biomedical engineering, nanomaterials, pharmacology or geology	• First class research infrastructure for first class researches • Light sources science promotion • Building interdyscyplinary community in advanced science • Stimulating cooperation between science and industry in finding new technical solutions with commercial potential

Table 18 Mission & vision – SOLEIL

Facility	**SOLEIL**
MISSION	VISION
• Develop and maintain a state of the art synchrotron radiation source and suite of beamlines, and offer access to these facilities based on scientific excellence • Assure the highest possible standard of support for both academic and industrial user of the facility • Work together with academic and industrial users towards generating innovative solutions to solve current societal problems • Contribute to both scientific and methodological training for future generations of scientists • Work closely with industry to offer solutions well matched to requirements, and ensure that they make the best and most efficient use of the source • Transfer technology and know how • Encourage open science and the sharing of data	• Promote the highest level of collaborative research at the European level. • Support and contribute to the development of new technologies • Push new data handling and data storage capabilities • Contribute to education and training • Stimulate better interaction with industry • Lead to science discovery and innovation

Table 19 Mission & vision – BESSY II

Facility	**BESSY II**
MISSION	VISION

• Provide overview of European Light Sources for users • Central information point for news, deadlines, etc. • Information for future users.	• Starting point for research projects. • Outreach to users e.g. conferences.

Table 20 Mission & vision – MAXIV

Facility	**MAX IV**
MISSION	VISION
• provide the academic user community worldwide with a unique and unified information portal about EU lightsources	• To support excellent science at EU lightsources • to foster cross country utilization • to make best use of infrastructure resources provided by EU countries

Facility	**ESRF**

Table 21 Mission & vision – ASTRID2

Facility	**ASTRID2**
MISSION	VISION
• To be the website needed for LEAPS	• The information already included on WFL is a great basis for the LEAPS cause, the only place where all information about facilities and beamlines can be found in one place. However this will need to expand significantly and perhaps shift focus to be the face of LEAPS

Table 22 Mission & vision – EuXFEL

Facility	**European XFEL**
MISSION	VISION
• Provide a platform for navigation through the light source research landscape for users and facilities • Support new users in finding their way to the most suitable facilities for their needs • Promote the further development of SR and FEL user community in Europe	• Keep up with the development of the research infrastructure in Europe • Guide European users to find the best options for complementary studies at different facilities

MISSION	VISION
• Provide up-to-date information to the scientific community about all the experimental facilities available throughout Europe • Support users by enabling them to find the best beamline to suit their research needs • Provide latest information about activities within Europe of relevance to the lightsources user community	• Be the single reference point/portal for lightsources in Europe, with reliable and updated information on all European facilities • Be the only data base where data on beamline and source characteristics, etc. have to be updated, with those data then sent automatically to the web pages of individual facilities • Inform the scientific community about relevant European projects such as CALIPSOplus, LEAPS, etc. • Develop and enhance the lightsources community by sharing relevant information such as conferences, training courses, etc.

Table 23 Mission & vision – ESRF

1.2 Annex II – Stakeholder analysis - Full list of stakeholders

Table 1 contains the full list of stakeholders proposed by the NA1 members. They are already split between External and Internal, grouped into the 12 proposed macro-categories and a weight of Interest and Impact has been assigned to each one of them.

Table 1 - Full list of stakeholders resulting from the WFL BP survey

EXTERNAL		INTEREST	IMPACT
Current Users		**4,25**	**3,25**
	Academic experienced laser users	4	3
	Academic experienced SR & FEL User	5	4
	Academic non-experienced SR & FEL	4	4
	Academic unexperienced laser users	4	2
EU Funding		**3**	**5**
	EU project funding	3	5
Facilities Founders		**3**	**5**
	SR & FEL Facilities	3	5
Industry		**1,33333**	**1**
	Industries Business development / lia	2	1
	Industry laser users	1	1
	Industry SR & FEL users	1	1
Linked projects/initiatives		**3**	**4**
	Initiatives on EU/ national level	3	4
	Projects on EU/ national level	4	5
	Science societies on EU/ national lev	2	3
Media		**1**	**3**
	Specialized Media	1	3
National/Regional Founders		**1,5**	**1,5**
	Initiatives/Programs on regional leve	1	1
	National Initiatives/ Programs	2	2
Political & Science Authorities		**2,6**	**3,8**
	Directors of Universities/ Research ce	4	4
	Facility Directors	3	5
	Political authorities on county level	1	2
	Political authorities on EU level	3	5
	Political authorities on national level	2	3
Potential Users		**3**	**2,5**
	Academic potential users in new scie	4	3
	Facility Business development / liaisc	3	2
	Other user communities	2	3
	Students	3	2
Suppliers		**2**	**2**
	Suppliers	2	2
(blank)			
Facility User Consortia			
Internal			
ESUO		**5**	**4,25**
	ESUO Delegates	5	
	ESUO	5	5
	ESUO NUO	5	3,5
Facility Staff		**4**	**4,375**
	Employees		3
	Facility Beamline Scientists & Tec	5	5
	Facility IT staff	4	5
	Facility Management	3	5
	Facility Marketing	3	3
	Facility staff	4	5
	Facility UO	4	4
	Project staff	5	5

1.3 Annex II – Stakeholder analysis – Stakeholder macro-categories

The following tables presents a more detailed analysis of the stakeholders' macro-categories, including definition, interests and future actions.

Table 1 Stakeholder SH1 - Academic experienced SR & FEL Users

Code	SH1	Classification	External	Type of Stakeholder	Beneficiary	Macro category	Current Users
Interest	5	Impact	4	Stakeholder name	Academic experienced SR & FEL Users		
Short description	Scientists in different career stages performing experiments at SR & FEL facilities			Stakeholder needs	User friendly tools to select best beamline for experiment; direct contacts of beamline scientists		
Stakeholder Interests	Maximize the number of experiments and possibly synchronize them across the various facilities; increase the number of publications and collaborations; widen career perspective			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Portal is now known enough to have the impact needed to reach all users		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Save time by having all EU light sources at a glance			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Massive dissemination (including gadgets distribution); continuous feedback to be collected from users and beamline scientists		

Table 2 Stakeholder SH2 - Academic non-experienced SR & FEL Users

Code	SH2	Classification	External	Type of Stakeholder	Beneficiary	Macro category	Current Users
Interest	4	Impact	4	Stakeholder name	Academic non-experienced SR & FEL Users		
Short description	Scientists in different career stages indicating interest in using SR & FEL facilities for their research, but don't have any experience in using this methods			Stakeholder needs	Roadshow and other actions to inform about possibilities offered by EU light sources; examples of research topics addressed at the various facilities; user friendly tools to find the most suitable instrument for their research; direct contact / helpdesk for basic information e.g. on how to submit a proposal; contacts to apply for test beamtimes e.g. via twinning teams		
Stakeholder Interests	Learn how to use SR & FEL equipment; get in contact with new teams; learn about new techniques; increase the number of publications and collaboration; widen career perspective			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Portal is now known enough to have the impact needed to reach all users		

What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Save time by having all EU light sources at a glance	Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Massive dissemination (including gadgets distribution) but also tailored tutorials; continuous feedback to be collected from users and beamline scientists

Table 3 Stakeholder SH3 - Academic potential users in new scientific fields

Code	SH3	Classification	External	Type of Stakeholder	Beneficiary	Macro category	Potential Users
Interest	4	Impact	3	Stakeholder name	Academic potential users in new scientific fields		
Short description	Scientists in different career stages of scientific fields who do not currently use SR & FEL facilities in framework of their research			Stakeholder needs	Roadshow and other actions to inform about possibilities offered by EU light sources; examples of research topics addressed at the various facilities; user friendly tools to find the most suitable instrument for their research; direct contact / helpdesk for basic information e.g. on how to submit a proposal; contacts to apply for test beamtimes e.g. via twinning teams		
Stakeholder Interests	Learn how to use SR & FEL equipment; get in contact with new teams; learn about new techniques; increase the number of publications and collaboration; widen career perspective			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Portal is now known enough to have the impact needed to reach all users		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Learn in the same place about the possibilities offered by EU lightsources			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Tailored dissemination and interaction with other communities e.g. neutrons but also Medical Doctors, Geologists etc		

Table 4 Stakeholder SH4 - Academic experienced laser users

Code	SH4	Classification	External	Type of Stakeholder	Beneficiary	Macro category	Current Users
Interest	4	Impact	3	Stakeholder name	Academic experienced laser users		
Short description	Scientists in different career stages performing experiments at laser facilities			Stakeholder needs	User friendly tools to select best beamline for experiment; direct contacts of beamline scientists		
Stakeholder Interests	Maximize the number of experiments and possibly synchronize them across the various facilities; increase the number of publications and collaborations; widen career perspective			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Portal is now known enough to have the impact needed to reach all users. In addition, only a few laser facilities are described on wayforlight. More need to be added.		

What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Save time by having all EU light sources at a glance	Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Add more laser facilities to the portal + Massive dissemination (including gadgets distribution)+ continuous feedback to be collected from users and beamline scientists

Table 5 Stakeholder SH5 - Academic unexperienced laser users

Code	SH5	Classification	External	Type of Stakeholder	Beneficiary	Macro category	Current Users
Interest	4	Impact	2	Stakeholder name	Academic unexperienced laser users		
Short description	Scientists in different career stages indicating interest in using laser facilities for their research, but don't have any experience in using this method			Stakeholder needs	Roadshow and other actions to inform about possibilities offered by EU light sources; examples of research topics addressed at the various facilities; user friendly tools to find the most suitable instrument for their research; direct contact / helpdesk for basic information e.g. on how to submit a proposal; contacts to apply for test beamtimes e.g. via twinning teams		
Stakeholder Interests	Learn how to use SR & FEL equipment; get in contact with new teams; learn about new techniques; increase the number of publications and collaboration; widen career perspective			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Portal is now known enough to have the impact needed to reach all users. In addition, only a few laser facilities are described on wayforlight. More need to be added.		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Save time by having all EU light sources at a glance			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Add more laser facilities to the portal + Massive dissemination (including gadgets distribution) + continuous feedback to be collected from users and beamline scientists		

Table 6 Stakeholder SH6 - Students

Code	SH6	Classification	External	Type of Stakeholder	Beneficiary	Macro category	Potential Users
Interest	3	Impact	2	Stakeholder name	Students		
Short description	Master or PhD students			Stakeholder needs	Find quickly an overview about European Light sources		
Stakeholder Interests	Learn about the possibilities offered by the European Light sources			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Portal is not known enough by the facilities and by the scientists; dissemination for students is not among the top priorities.		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Save time by having all EU light sources at a glance			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Massive dissemination (including gadgets distribution)		

Table 7 Stakeholder SH7 - Industry SR & FEL users

Code	SH7	Classification	External	Type of Stakeholder	Beneficiary	Macro category	Industry
Interest	1	Impact	1	Stakeholder name	Industry SR & FEL users		
Short description	Industry SR & FEL users			Stakeholder needs	Easy access procedure Support in development of experimental design, performing the experimental campaign and data evaluation		
Stakeholder Interests	Using SR & FEL techniques to develop new products e.g. for going into new markets, improve existing products e.g. improving one property of the product or looking for the reasons for quality problems with their products			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Industry section in multi-language but not know enough; presently targets mostly SMEs wishing to use SR and FEL sources.		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	In the case of SMEs, receive vouchers under the TamaTA scheme of CALIPSOplus. Medium and large-scale industries can get in contact with us for information about lightsources users through the facilities Industrial Liaison Offices			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Targeted dissemination but also development of new tools e.g. catalogue of patents or case studies list.		

Table 8 Stakeholder SH8 - Industry laser users

Code	SH8	Classification	External	Type of Stakeholder	Beneficiary	Macro category	Industry
Interest	1	Impact	1	Stakeholder name	Industry laser users		
Short description	Industry laser users			Stakeholder needs	Easy access procedure Support in development of experimental design, performing the experimental campaign and data evaluation		
Stakeholder Interests	Using laser techniques to develop new products e.g. for going into new markets, improve existing products e.g. improving one property of the product or looking for the reasons for quality problems with their products			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	The industry section was designed and is developed by the SR and FEL users. Nothing was done until now for laser users.		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	to be defined			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	to be defined		

Table 9 Stakeholder SH9 - Industries Business development / liaison offices

Code	SH9	Classification	External	Type of Stakeholder	Beneficiary	Macro category	Industry
Interest	2	Impact	1	Stakeholder name	Industries Business development / liaison offices		
Short description	Potential light sources users			Stakeholder needs	Find quickly an overview about the possibilities offered by European light sources		
Stakeholder Interests	Using SR, FEL and laser techniques to develop or test new products or methods			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Portal is little know by EU industries		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Save time by having all EU light sources and their Industrial Liaision offices at a glance			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Targeted dissemination but also development of new tools e.g. catalogue of patents or case studies list.		

Table 10 Stakeholder SH10 - EU project funding

Code	SH10	Classification	External	Type of Stakeholder	Funding sources	Macro category	EU Funding
Interest	3	Impact	5	Stakeholder name	EU project funding		
Short description	EC RTD Unit or another EC agency			Stakeholder needs	Ensure that good use is made of public money		
Stakeholder Interests	Showcase a portal which is user friendly, useful and used in Europe and abroad			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Portal is not known enough; however, it has been taken as a model by the SSURF (Society for Science at User Research Facilities) in the U.S.		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Have all the EU light sources at a glance			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Targeted dissemination with EC + presence at international conferences (e.g. ICRI) and maximize interactions and links with other initiatives, in particular MERIL, CatRIS and the EOSC galaxy.		

Table 11 Staleholder SH11 - National Initiatives/ Programs

Code	SH11	Classification	External	Type of Stakeholder	Funding sources	Macro category	National/Regional Funders
Interest	2	Impact	2	Stakeholder name	National Initiatives/ Programs		
Short description	National Initiatives/ Programs/Projects			Stakeholder needs	Ensure that good use is made of public money		
Stakeholder Interests	Showcase a portal which is user friendly, useful and used in Europe and abroad + ensure that national facilities are visible at EU and global level			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Portal is not known enough yet		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Be capable of showing the national light sources as part of an EU initiative + have all the EU light sources at a glance			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Targeted dissemination with the funding agencies + presence at national conferences		

Table 12 Stakeholder SH12 - Initiatives/Programs on regional level

Code	SH12	Classification	External	Type of Stakeholder	Funding sources	Macro category	National/Regional Funders
Interest	1	Impact	1	Stakeholder name	Initiatives/Programs on regional level		
Short description	Initiatives/Programs on regional level			Stakeholder needs	Ensure that good use is made of public money		
Stakeholder Interests	Showcase a portal which is user friendly, useful and used in Europe and abroad + ensure that national or regional facilities are visible at EU and global level			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Portal is not known enough yet, but it is also not funded by regional initiatives yet		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Be capable of showing the regional/national light sources as part of a broader national/EU initiative + strengthen networks at the EU level			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Targeted dissemination with the funding agencies + presence at regional events		

Table 13 Stakeholder SH13 - SR & FEL & Laser Facilities

Code	SH13	Classification	External	Type of Stakeholder	Funding sources	Macro category	Facilities Funders
Interest	3	Impact	5	Stakeholder name	SR & FEL & Laser Facilities		
Short description	Initiatives/Programs on regional level			Stakeholder needs	Maximize visibility of their facilities and beamlines to attract new users		

Stakeholder Interests	Showcase a portal which is user friendly, useful and used in Europe and abroad + ensure that national or regional facilities are visible at EU and global level	How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Portal is not known enough also inside the facilities
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Increase visibility and accessibility through direct comparison with other facilities/beamlines technical performances	Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Internal dissemination + convincing Facility managers / Directors that the effort is worth it

Table 14 Stakeholder SH14 - ESUO NUO

Code	SH14	Classification	Internal	Type of Stakeholder	Funding sources	Macro category	ESUO
Interest	5	Impact	4	Stakeholder name	ESUO NUO		
Short description	National user organizations (NUO) of the ESUO member states			Stakeholder needs	Increase visibility through the dedicated section on wayforlight		
Stakeholder Interests	Gain number of NUO members and visibility			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Pages are simple and clear and contents are managed by ESUO delegates		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Increase visibility + be able to contact other NUOs from the same webpage			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Ensure that ESUO delegates are nominated by the NUO (where applicable), and that they keep the page up-to-date		

Table 15 Stakeholder SH15 - ESUO

Code	SH15	Classification	Internal	Type of Stakeholder	Funding sources	Macro category	ESUO
Interest	5	Impact	5	Stakeholder name	ESUO		
Short description	ESUO as legal entity (ESUO section at WFL to disseminate ESUO)			Stakeholder needs	Increase visibility through the dedicated section on wayforlight		
Stakeholder Interests	Gain number of ESUO members and visibility			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Pages are simple and clear and contents are managed by ESUO delegates		

What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Increase visibility + be in the same portal as the facilities	Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Ensure that pages are up-to date and that ESUO delegates and ESUO members promote the portal in the whole community

Table 16 Stakeholder SH16 – ESUO NUO

Code	SH16	Classification	Internal	Type of Stakeholder	Community	Macro category	ESUO
Interest	5	Impact	3	Stakeholder name	ESUO NUO		
Short description	National user organizations of the ESUO member states			Stakeholder needs	Increase visibility through the dedicated section on wayforlight		
Stakeholder Interests	Speak as a single voice with all ESUO Delegates			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Pages are simple and clear and contents are managed by ESUO delegates		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Increase visibility + be in the same portal as the facilities			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Disseminate the portal at all Annual Meetings and conferences of these NUOs		

Table 17 Stakeholder SH17 - ESUO

Code	SH17	Classification	Internal	Type of Stakeholder	Community	Macro category	ESUO
Interest	5	Impact	5	Stakeholder name	ESUO		
Short description	ESUO delegates (see also SH37)			Stakeholder needs	Increase the number of users that get in contact with ESUO and with the delegate in person		
Stakeholder Interests	Be able to speak for a larger critical mass of users of European Light Sources			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Pages are simple and clear and contents are managed by ESUO delegates		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Increase visibility + be in the same portal as the facilities			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Keep the pages up-to-date + disseminate the portal (together with ESUO) + plan new contects for the main ESUO page (e.g. links to LinkedIn)		

Table 18 Stakeholder SH18 – Facility Management

Code	SH18	Classification	Internal	Type of Stakeholder	Community	Macro category	Facility Staff
Interest	3	Impact	5	Stakeholder name	Facility Management		
Short description	Facility Management			Stakeholder needs	Maximize visibility of their facilities and beamlines to attract new users		
Stakeholder Interests	Pay as little as possible for new features but be able to showcase them all over the worlds			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Portal is not well known even inside the facilities but thngs are constantly improving. There are plans for developing it further but they will only fly with LEAPS in a few years.		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Have a unique reference portal for technical information about all SR, FEL and Lasers in Europe + platform for current and potential users. Moreover, Facility websites could be more easily up-to-date (e.g. deadlines but also beamlines data) once data are filled on https://wfl.elettra.eu (database) and then exported automatically at every facility website.			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Agree on the list of improvements for the portal in the next years + commit with person-months in-kind to achieve the goals		

Table 19 Stakeholder SH19 - Facility UO

Code	SH19	Classification	Internal	Type of Stakeholder	Community	Macro category	Facility Staff
Interest	4	Impact	4	Stakeholder name	Facility UO		
Short description	Facility UO			Stakeholder needs	Increase visibility of call deadlines and information as well as of beamlines		
Stakeholder Interests	On one hand save time while interacting with users, on the other hand increase the number of proposals received by the facility			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Information about beamlines and call deadlines is standardized and simple, but the portal is not known enough yet.		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Save time in updating eg. call deadlines everywhere on facility website, in the case of automatic import from WFL			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Dissemination has increased in the past months with targeted advertisement; in 2020 T-shirts and stickers will be distributed at all facilities as well as at scientific conferences. Registration of the Trademark needs additional funding and will be hopefully be done in the next years.		

Table 20 Stakeholder SH20 - Facility Marketing

Code	SH20	Classification	Internal	Type of Stakeholder	Community	Macro category	Facility Staff
Interest	3	Impact	3	Stakeholder name	Facility Marketing		
Short description	Facility Marketing			Stakeholder needs	Increase visibility of the portal and the facility website together		
Stakeholder Interests	Pay as little as possible for new features but be able to showcase them all over the world			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Portal is not well known even inside the facilities but things are constantly improving. There are plans for developing it further but they will only fly with LEAPS in a few years.		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Have a unique reference portal for technical information about all SR, FEL and Lasers in Europe + platform for current and potential users. Moreover, Facility websites could be more easily up-to-date (e.g. deadlines but also beamlines data) once data are filled on https://wfl.elettra.eu (database) and then exported automatically at every facility website.			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Dissemination has increased in the past months with targeted advertisement; in 2020 T-shirts and stickers will be distributed at all facilities as well as at scientific conferences. Registration of the Trademark needs additional funding and will be hopefully done in the next years.		

Table 21 Stakeholder SH21 - Facility Beamline Scientists & Technicians

Code	SH21	Classification	Internal	Type of Stakeholder	Community	Macro category	Facility Staff
Interest	5	Impact	5	Stakeholder name	Facility Beamline Scientists & Technicians		
Short description	Facility Beamline Scientists & Technicians			Stakeholder needs	Increase visibility of their beamlines/instruments and have a reliable portal with all EU facilities together		
Stakeholder Interests	Minimize the time needed to update the beamline's information while maximizing its visibility + Have a powerful search and filter tool to find and compare instrumentation			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	The WFL database interface is user friendly; moreover, Elettra has implemented Application Programming Interfaces (APIs) to export WFL data into any other website (as currently done at Elettra's website). Regarding the search filters, until all datasheets will reach a similar level of completeness they are not fully meaningful.		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Increase visibility of their beamline + save time in updating the datasheets + be part of an EU wide stage			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Inform the BL scientists about the possibility to export the WFL data into their website and about the pilot started by LEAPS WG1 about a "virtual instrument" for Sample Environment.		

Table 22 Stakeholder SH22 - Facility IT staff

Code	SH22	Classification	Internal	Type of Stakeholder	Community	Macro category	Facility Staff
Interest	4	Impact	5	Stakeholder name	Facility IT staff		
Short description	Facility IT staff			Stakeholder needs	Demonstrate that the Facility website is well performing and up-to-date		
Stakeholder Interests	Minimize the requests for changes in the facility website and in the web-based-user-office			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	wayforlight.eu needs to be advertised more on the facility websites. The WFL catalogue interface is currently only being used by Elettra only. The smart WFL catalogue with APIs was requested by other facilities who don't have the manpower to implement it. Also the Proposal Dashboard is only being tested at Elettra, even though it was presented in the CALIPSOplus Description of Work.		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Minimize the time to assist update of facility webpages and develop web-based user office tools related to wayforlight.			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Inform the IT people about the possibility to export the WFL data into their website. Regarding the Proposal Dashboard, discuss and try to implement it at other facilities.		

Table 23 Staleholder SH23 - Facility Business development / liaison offices

Code	SH23	Classification	Internal	Type of Stakeholder	Community	Macro category	Potential Users
Interest	3	Impact	2	Stakeholder name	Facility Business development / liaison offices		
Short description	Facility Business development / liaison offices			Stakeholder needs	Increase the visibility of the facility offer for industries		
Stakeholder Interests	Increase the number of services provided to industry (paid for)			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Industry section imulti-language but not know enough; presently targets mostly SMEs wishing to use SR and FEL sources.		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Increase the number of industries that come into knowing the facility + be part of an EU wide network together with the other facilities (e.g. for combined set of measurements)			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Develop / enrich the industry page following the feedback of industrial liaison offices at the facilities.		

Stakeholder SH24 → Facility User Consortia – not assessed because not clear and superimposed with other staekholders

Table 24 Stakeholder SH25 - Specialized Media

Code	SH25	Classification	Internal	Type of Stakeholder	Community	Macro category	Media
Interest	1	Impact	3	Stakeholder name	Specialized Media		
Short description	Specialized Media, Press			Stakeholder needs	Inform target audience (users, politicians, etc) about new tools and instruments		
Stakeholder Interests	Increase number of people reading the press			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	The portal is not known enough; we published only a couple of articles up to now about the portal itself		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Hard to say; increase the number of readers is a bit ambitious			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Targeted dissemination (as we did with Synchrotron Radiation News)		

Table 25 Stakeholder SH26 - Specialized Media

Code	SH26	Classification	Internal	Type of Stakeholder	Community	Macro category	Political & Science Authorities
Interest	3	Impact	5	Stakeholder name	SR & FEL facility directors		
Short description	Facility Directors			Stakeholder needs	Ensure that good use is made with public money and, more specifically, facility budget		
Stakeholder Interests	Maximize visibility of their facility and be able to demonstrate to e.g. Funding agencies that the facility is part of a much larger system at the EU level. At the same time, spend less money (also including in-kind resources) as possible			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	The portal is starting to be known by facility directors; however, some of them are new and some others have received only partial information from their middle manager consultants		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Have all the EU light sources at a glance; increase visibility of the facility and beamlines and eventually ensure easier update of technical information pages			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Ensure that facility directors are well informed before they are asked to take strategic decisions on the future of the portal.		

Table 26 Stakeholder SH27 - Directors of Universities/ Research centers

Code	SH27	Classification	Internal	Type of Stakeholder	Community	Macro category	Political & Science Authorities
Interest	4	Impact	4	Stakeholder name	Directors of Universities/ Research centers		
Short description	Directors of Universities/ Research centers			Stakeholder needs	Increase scientific collaborations		
Stakeholder Interests	Establish close links with the Facilities			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Presenting all EU light sources at a glance		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Have all the EU light sources at a glance			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Targeted dissemination (e.g. roadshows) of the facilities including info about the portal; creation of tutorials and case studies about research performed. The problem is that all these things require a lot of manpower at the facilities and commitment was never high enough.		

Table 27 Stakeholder SH28 - Political authorities on EU level

Code	SH28	Classification	Internal	Type of Stakeholder	Community	Macro category	Political & Science Authorities
Interest	3	Impact	5	Stakeholder name	Political authorities on EU level		
Short description	Political authorities on EU level e.g. EC			Stakeholder needs	Ensure that good use is made of public money		
Stakeholder Interests	Showcase a portal created with EU funds and demonstrate that standardization fostered by EC calls have brought benefits for both the facilities and the user communities			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	wayforlight was always welcomed by EC project reviewers and external experts, even if they all underlined lack of dissemination. The problem is that many projects have created many portals with some overlaps		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Have all the EU light sources at a glance			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Understand well on time the trends (e.g. Catalogues of services, EOSC principles adoption) of the EC guidelines to tailor future developments + match this with the user needs		

Table 28 Stakeholder SH29 - Political authorities on national level

Code	SH29	Classification	Internal	Type of Stakeholder	Community	Macro category	Political & Science Authorities
Interest	2	Impact	3	Stakeholder name	Political authorities on national level		
Short description	Political authorities on national level e.g. ministries			Stakeholder needs	Ensure that good use is made of public money		
Stakeholder Interests	Showcase a portal created with EU funds and demonstrate that standardization fostered by EC calls have brought benefits for both the facilities and the user communities			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Wayforlight is probably not know by national authorities in most cases		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Have all the EU light sources at a glance			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Targeted dissemination at national level		

Table 29 Stakeholder SH30 - Political authorities on county level

Code	SH30	Classification	Internal	Type of Stakeholder	Community	Macro category	Political & Science Authorities
Interest	1	Impact	2	Stakeholder name	Political authorities on county level		
Short description	Political authorities on county level, e.g. county public authorities			Stakeholder needs	Ensure that good use is made of public money		
Stakeholder Interests	Showcase a portal created with EU funds and demonstrate that standardization fostered by EC calls have brought benefits for both the facilities and the user communities			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Wayforlight is probably not know by regional authorities in most cases		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Have all the EU light sources at a glance			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Targeted dissemination at national level		

Table 30 Stakeholder SH31 - Political authorities on county level

Code	SH31	Classification	Internal	Type of Stakeholder	Community	Macro category	Suppliers
Interest	2	Impact	2	Stakeholder name	Suppliers		
Short description	Suppliers of services and goods, e.g. IT, Marketing			Stakeholder needs	Increase profit providing services and products		
Stakeholder Interests	Be known by a larger network of facilities + have all EU facilities at a glance			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Wayforlight was developed by Elettra in collaboration with Promoscience s.r.l. In 2018 all the website and server and email accounts have been moved to Elettra, and only graphical and technical assistance on the overall portal is outsourced.		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Be known by a larger network of facilities + have all EU facilities at a glance			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Understand how critical their support is and negotiate long-term flat-rate assistance.		

Table 31 Stakeholder SH32 - Political authorities on county level

Code	SH32	Classification	Internal	Type of Stakeholder	Community	Macro category	Linked projects/initiatives
Interest	4	Impact	5	Stakeholder name	Projects on EU/ national level		
Short description	Projects on EU/ national level e.g. CALIPSOplus (shouldn't we split between those who FUND the portal and those who don't ?)			Stakeholder needs	Ensure that good use is made of public money (if funders like CALIPSOplus) + achieve the promised developments and goals		
Stakeholder Interests	Demonstrate to the funding agency that the portal has an impact on its target audience			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Wayforlight is not much known among EU users but things are fastly improving, especially because BL scientists are now working in person on the WFL catalogue datasheets. Not all of the tools have been implemented yet due to lack to manpower at the facilities; if more person-months would have been available through project funding (a factor of 2) commitment would have been higher.		
What are possible	Demonstrate that the project has contributed to			Which actions have to	Discuss in advance the amount of effort to be put in-kind by the facilities		

benefits for the stakeholder?	develop such a portal + get in closer contact with other communities and project co-developing it (e.g. ELI, Laserlab Europe)	be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	in addition to future EC funding before starting new actions

Table 32 Stakeholder SH33 - Initiatives on EU/ national level

Code	SH33	Classification	Internal	Type of Stakeholder	Community	Macro category	Linked projects/initiatives
Interest	3	Impact	4	Stakeholder name	Initiatives on EU/ national level		
Short description	Initiatives on EU/ national level, e.g. LEAPS, LENS, FEL, HMFL etc. (shouldn't we split between those who FUND the portal and those who don't?)			Stakeholder needs	Use the portal (for light sources) as platform to promote their initiatives; for the others, learn from wayforlight example		
Stakeholder Interests	(for light sources) use the portal to attract new users and train them; for the others, develop similar tools e.g. catalogue, user section, industry section etc			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Wayforlight has increased the number of facilities via a bottom-up approach in the last years, by inclusion of Optical Lasers through the EUCALL EC project.		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Promote its initiatives through wayforlight or establish links with it			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Discuss in advance with the various stakeholder to develop the portal in a coherent way		

Table 33 Stakeholder SH34 - Science societies on EU/ national level

Code	SH34	Classification	Internal	Type of Stakeholder	Community	Macro category	Linked projects/initiatives
Interest	2	Impact	3	Stakeholder name	Science societies on EU/ national level		
Short description	Science societies on EU/ national level, e.g. German DPG			Stakeholder needs	Promote their initiatives + profit from the training materials		
Stakeholder Interests	Increase the number of participants at their initiatives / the level of training of their participants			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	wayforlight is centered around the catalogue + ESUO + industry. The training section has to be developed and the events section does not receive input from the facilities		
What are possible	Increase the number of participants to their			Which actions have to	Plan future developments (e.g. training, partner search) with examples in		

benefits for the stakeholder?	initiatives + have all EU light sources at a glance	be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	mind + disseminate the portal at national/EU level

Table 34 – Stakeholder SH35 - Science societies on EU/ national level

Code	SH35	Classification	Internal	Type of Stakeholder	Community	Macro category	Potential Users
Interest	2	Impact	3	Stakeholder name	Other user communities		
Short description	User communities of other research infrastructures e.g. neutron and ion beam facilities			Stakeholder needs	Learn from the example of wayforlight		
Stakeholder Interests	Share common challenges (e.g. Data, standardized proposal, sample environment description) with light sources			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Wayforlight is centered around the catalogue + ESUO + industry. Standardisation effort was unprecedented and can be an example for other communities		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Use wayforlight as an example + start discussing common challenges			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Present all features of wayforlight to these other communities - something has been done at European User Offices Meetings in the past		

Table 35 Stakeholder SH37 - Employees

Code	SH36	Classification	Internal	Type of Stakeholder	Community	Macro category	Facility Staff
Interest	2	Impact	3	Stakeholder name	Employees		
Short description	Staff members employed by WFL hosting facility			Stakeholder needs	Minimize extra work		
Stakeholder Interests	Be informed about wayforlight developments but share the workload with other facilities			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Wayforlight is well known at Elettra even if less among the administrative employees.		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Have all the EU light sources at a glance including standardized information and contacts			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Disseminate the portal also among the administrative colleagues - but not only at Elettra		

Stakeholder SH37 – ESUO Delegates → not assessed, please refer to table 39 - SH17

Table 36 Stakeholder SH38 - Facility staff

Code	SH38	Classification	Internal	Type of Stakeholder	Community	Macro category	Facility Staff
Interest	4	Impact	5	Stakeholder name	Facility staff		
Short description	Staff employed by facilities supporting WFL to run the "business"			Stakeholder needs	Minimize extra work		
Stakeholder Interests	Be informed about wayforlight developments but share the workload with other facilities			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Wayforlight is well known at Elettra but also at other facilities more involved e.g. ALBA, ESRF, PSI.		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Learn from other facilities and exchange information e.g. on technical IT solutions for data export / import			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Try to involve all staff and properly train them, e.g. with short business visit of IT colleagues to Elettra		

Table 37 Stakeholder SH39 - Project staff

Code	SH39	Classification	Internal	Type of Stakeholder	Community	Macro category	Facility Staff
Interest	5	Impact	5	Stakeholder name	Project staff		
Short description	Staff employed by projects on EU/national level supporting WFL to run the "business"			Stakeholder needs	Increase visits to the website and impact of the portal as a whole		
Stakeholder Interests	Especially after the end of CALIPSOplus, know in advance which developments will have to be implemented and with which priorities			How WFL performs against stakeholder criteria	Wayforlight has different sections followed by different teams at the facilities.		
What are possible benefits for the stakeholder?	Learn from other facilities and exchange information e.g. on technical IT solutions for data export / import + take part in Project meetings where they can learn about other common tasks			Which actions have to be performed to meet the stakeholder criteria?	Ensure that every facility on wayforlight has one reference person who is in charge of contacting the other colleagues, at the facility, dealing with wayforlight.		

1.4 Annex III – SWOT Analysis

Table 38 SWOT feedback - PSI

Facility	**Paul Scherrer Institut**
INTERNAL FACTORS	
STRENGTHS (+)	WEAKNESSES (-)
• Network building • Proposal deadlines • Training possibilities • Central point for information and access in Europe • Interactivity among users • It provides a way for linking beamline scientists to users and vice versa • It provides a way to build bridges between users and facilities • It offers a great overview of facilities • Linking opportunity to proposal submission • The layout / design is modern and up-to-date • Beamline search	• Lack of awareness: right now it is useful for new users; experienced users usually go directly to dedicated facilities • Not sufficiently used and not so often updated • Lack of a dedicated person with enough time to follow the portal in some facilities • A vast number of industries served
EXTERNAL FACTORS	
OPPORTUNITIES (+)	THREATS (-)
• Internal and external communication and promotion for awareness in order to increase and maximize user feedback • One place to find potential partners for new projects and collaborations • Development into an European helpdesk within the LEAPS initiative • Engage a dedicated person to follow the portal • Provide information and easy access to publications of interest • Dedicated social media channels (Twitter, LinkedIn page, …) • "Good experiences" section featuring users and facilities that have found each other and are carrying out projects together – real concrete examples will highlight the portal's added value • Basis for LEAPS • User statistics • Tighter integration with User offices • Data catalogue integration – EOSC	• Similar portals that are updated regularly {lightsources.org; ISSE – Internal Society for Sample Environment} • Lack of dedicated coordinator in some facilities • Inadequate and untimely overall update of the portal could soon make the portal obsolete • Sustainability • Loss / lack of financial support

• Partnership with neutron community	

Table 39 SWOT feedback – INFN-DAFNE-L

Facility	**INFN – DAFNE-L**
INTERNAL FACTORS	
STRENGTHS (+)	WEAKNESSES (-)
• It is a catalogue including all light sources information and it helps saving time to search for beamlines needed / available for experiments	• Missing information about the portal despite many efforts • Lack of attractiveness for students • Missing training material for users
EXTERNAL FACTORS	
OPPORTUNITIES (+)	THREATS (-)
• Knowing what is available at the different facilities helps moving in the direction of new developments and innovation putting together experts from different fields • Feedback from active users • Adding material for training - including, for example, downloadable lectures	• In the absence of a common project, each research infrastructure will stop updating information and will start focusing on their own web site • Financial sustainability can become an issue in the absence of a common project

Table 40 SWOT feedback - HZDR

Facility	**HZDR**
INTERNAL FACTORS	
STRENGTHS (+)	WEAKNESSES (-)
• Catalogue • Catalogue of SR, FEL BL & lasers good overview for politicians and decision-makers • Modern web site design • Comprehensive information on all European SR & FEL facilities • Very good BL data sheets • Stable operation of WF web site (e.g. less downtime) •	• Missing Social Media • Little awareness of WFL in the user and science community • Are catalogues up-to-date solutions? • Missing future concept of WFL (target audience is not well-defined, intentions of the different facilities with respect to WFL missing, what is the overall vision of WFL of the facilities – only lowest common denominator will be accepted by all facilities) • Lack of a marketing concept
EXTERNAL FACTORS	
OPPORTUNITIES (+)	THREATS (-)

• Integrating interactive trainings for unexperienced users • Whole picture of the European SR, FEL & Laser facility landscape for decision makers	• No social media concept/visibility (for ex. LS.org also @Twitter, @LinkedIn • Privacy and Imprint pages • Umbraco as CMS = Open Source CMS: depending on further development by the Umbraco Community • Focus only on catalogue (are catalogue up-to-date solutions?) • Only less awareness / visibility of WFL in user & science community • End of the SME portal with end of CALIPSOplus • Contact of the users to ESUO will be more directed to the ESUO contact channels (LinkedIn? Twitter? ESUO web site?) with establishing ESUO as legal entity

Table 41 SWOT feedback – ASTRID2

Facility	**ASTRID2**
INTERNAL FACTORS	
STRENGTHS (+)	WEAKNESSES (-)
• We have a well-established network of the facilities in Europe, which could/should be a solid foundation for future development. • A lot of information altogether in one place. • A common entrance to information about European light sources. • These points are especially important for the future of LEAPS, WFL could be a great asset as the primary web presence for LEAPS, removing the need for duplication of effort.	• Visibility, do the intended audience (users) really know about the site. • Dissemination – not well advertised at the synchrotrons leading to : • Is there really the support/interest needed from the facilities, if it weren't for CALIPSO and CALIPSOplus would this site exist? • Lots of great ideas to improve the information available (training, videos, etc.) on the site, but progress is slow. • If the future of WFL is dependent upon being the major www presence under LEAPS then the inclusion of the Laser Labs could be an issue.
EXTERNAL FACTORS	
OPPORTUNITIES (+)	THREATS (-)
• Expansion of audience – general public and media? This would require a much more active site, daily updates and close contact between communications people in order to advertise the events and latest news at the facilities (as on lightsources.org). • Dissemination through more use in social media arena. • Support from the communications personnel at facilities. • Can be of significant benefit to LEAPS, the continued development of WFL could/should be dominated by the requirements of LEAPS.	• Lack of awareness – so that the site isn't actually being used! Waste of effort then… • Lack of support by the facilities (non-update of information) • Effort involved in utilising features such as using API for generation of webpages too large compared to pay-off, so won't be used. • Limited lifetime without an EU programme providing specific goals to achieve and supporting the networking involved, will LEAPS do the same? If a separate LEAPS website is developed where does this leave WFL?

• More dynamic and up-to-date content included about research highlights and the science carried out at the facilities.	• Site very reliant on Elettra personnel, without them would the site continue? If this really is collaborative project that has a long term future then all facilities should be taking an active role.

Table 42 SWOT feedback - Elettra

Facility	**Elettra**
INTERNAL FACTORS	
STRENGTHS (+)	WEAKNESSES (-)
• We are the unique portal presenting >35 EU lightsources including Synchrotrons, FELs and Lasers in the same virtual place • We are the unique portal presenting in the same place both beamline scientists contacts, Industrial Liaison Office contacts and external expert users (ESUO delegates) contacts • Standardized catalogue of facilities and more than 300 beamlines, with filtering tools and contacts of all scientists 2) Multi-language section dedicated to industry + simplified proposal for SMEs 3) ESUO section presenting all delegates and National User Organisation at a glance • Possibility to export automatically data of the WFL database not only to wayforlight.eu but also to other website --> as if part of the updated, standardized catalogue could be "mirrored" outside • Group together SR, FELs and Laser facilities • Present ESUO to the world • Users of EU facilities come from >50 countries worldwide. Current visitors of wayforlight are U.S.A. (2nd place in top 10) and China (9 in top 10) • Catalogue of EU lightsources beamlines • a core group of proactive people working on the portal • Smart database fostering more regular updates of the data • Unprecedentent experience in standardization shared by the whole CALIPSOplus and EUCALL consortia • Elettra's experience in builidng a smart database behind the catalogue • Standardized catalogue of facilities and beamlines • standardized proposal for SMEs	• Lack of knowledge even within some facilities (still run by user offices), Lack of dissemination actions by the facilities to the outside • Missing tutorials e.g. for browsing the catalogue • Missing examples of facility usage (they were removed because nobody provided updates) • Low number of training events presented (lack of updates) • Number of visits increased from 200-300 to 450/month but still too low • Lack of a dedicated person / team in addition to CB • Continuous change of people at facilities sometimes hinders diffusion of information and best practices • Low number of visits (hundreds / month) • Missing a defined team with enough time to follow the portal • Lack of regular feedback - linked to the low number of visits

• ESUO section •	
EXTERNAL FACTORS	
OPPORTUNITIES (+)	THREATS (-)
• Lack of updates 2) Low or no standardization • Lack of automatic links with facility pages • No comprehensive information • No presence of beamline scientist, TT officers and expert external users (ESUO delegates) in the same website • Develop a catalogue of services with LEAPS and CatRIS • Develop a partner search tool within LEAPS • Develop tailored services for industry • Offer e-tools for training like HERCULES material • Dissemination would hopefully bring more user feedback • Adhesion to EOSC standards needs to be faced • Mutual links with the global Lightsources.org portal • Proper commitment by the represented facilities and ESUO delegates Links with MERIL database, CatRIS project and the EOSC at large are great opportunities for the portal's sustainability • Expansion of the Lasers section by including all LaserLab Europe TNA providing facilities in the nexr 4 years • Youtube video tutorials are being produced, the first one is already available • Promotional gadgets are being produced and will be distributed during 2020 • Advertisement by the represented facilities and the ESUO delegates	• Proliferation of projects creating portals • Proliferation of EC, OECD, ESFRI etc reports with slightly different classifications of e.g. research areas • Lack of legal framework to sustain financially the portal, in case LEAPS does not take over after the end of CALIPSOplus • If Transnational Access will no more receive EC nor facilities support, researchers' mobility • EOSC developments / requirements, Umbraco changes, changes in the links with Promoscience s.r.l. • Little user feedback may cause lack of knowledge of user demand • No financial and human resources provided by the facilities in case no external projects provide funding • Loss of (time of) wayforlight coordinator without proper replacement could slow down or stop developments and maintenance of the portal; in 1/2 year it can become obsolete and jeopardize years of work

Table 43 SWOT feedback - ALBA

Facility	**ALBA**
INTERNAL FACTORS	
STRENGTHS (+)	WEAKNESSES (-)
• participation of most synchrotron and FEL's in Europe	• Manpower in each facility to update the database and other needs of the

• Relationship with LEAPS • One single synchrotron/FEL web for all the users compending info from all the facilities • It represents an initial effort for facilities standarisation user access tools • It is a very good example and visualisation of how the facilities can work together	Portal • Specific resources in Trieste for long term maintenance of the WFL portal • Not easy implication of all scientists in facilities for the update of the database • Not updated information of each facility • Not easy standardization as access policies and safety are very different in each facility/country • The idea of the beamline database is really good but the implementation must be improved: for instance, if you go to 'emission or reflection' discipline, beamlines very different appear since IR to hard x rays) • Disciplines must be revised and improved new filters must be added to facilitate searches, for instance, energy of the beamline, etc. • The info of the beamline should be read directly from the web of the different facilities to avoid not updated of info in beamlines. The same with deadlines of calls. • For the IT people: more flexibility and response time faster if everything is in the facility
EXTERNAL FACTORS	
OPPORTUNITIES (+)	THREATS (-)
• Young researchers easily access to information on facilities and training programs • Synchtron and FEL's lobby versus other communities • Common entrance point for initiative like TAMATA for industrial access • To become the reference web to look for information about facilities: training, courses, news, etc..	• Not used by the user community as they prefer to go directly to each facility web • Not financially sustainable • Access and Safety policies very different in each country/facility • Non-national access can be very different in each facility: quota or not quota for non-national researchers

Table 44 SWOT feedback DESY

Facility	**DESY**
INTERNAL FACTORS	
STRENGTHS (+)	WEAKNESSES (-)
• European platform, potential for global platform • good search functions for method and beamlines • provides almost all relevant information and links for users	• dependency on input from all sides; due to the fact that most light sources have their own web sites which are kept up-to-date • not all (particular new) users know the portal

• standardized presentation of all beamlines from all European facilities, for easy comparison • change requests (e.g. in data form fields) are possible on short notice	• missing functionality: no option for comparison of beamlines with same energy/method etc • missing functionality: no search option for experiments/detectors/energy ranges • input of beamline parameters has to follow the standardized pattern and not all fields can be adapted to the individual beamline • overlap with other platforms • no central contact for users
EXTERNAL FACTORS	
OPPORTUNITIES (+)	THREATS (-)
• WFL could serve as central hub/data source to other data bases (eg ESC) • WFL could serve as a major entry point to users (Scientific and industrial) to find the most suitable beamline/facility	• who pays for WFL after CALIPSOplus? • depends on updates by many individuals

Table 45 SWOT feedback - Diamond

Facility	**DIAMOND**
INTERNAL FACTORS	
STRENGTHS (+)	WEAKNESSES (-)
• Overview of all SR and FEL's facilities in Europe • Awareness and communications vehicle • Database of instruments	• Not sure who the target audience is (users?) • Having to maintain two websites, facilities own and WFL. • Database information easily outdated • Workflow for proposal submission unclear • All facilities want to attract best science, so to some degree in competition with each other • Each facility has own national requirements for proposals which makes standardised proposal challenging • Not all facilities supportive of unified proposal system • Safety and sample requirements different for each facility/country • Currently no data/analytics on actual activity on WFL, and a question of numbers of users accessing it and actually submitting proposals through it (e.g. volume of hits on the website, by country
EXTERNAL FACTORS	

OPPORTUNITIES (+)	THREATS (-)
• Share news about LEAPS. Unifying communications tool. • umbrella ID now operational	• lightsources.org successfully operates a web platform which has as members a large number of EU facilities, as well as others across the world • BREXIT, UK may not be eligible for EU funding • Funding post CALIPSOplus is not clear • LEAPS now taking IT forward

Table 46 SWOT feedback - SOLARIS

Facility	**SOLARIS**
INTERNAL FACTORS	
STRENGTHS (+)	WEAKNESSES (-)
• specific and detailed technical information about infrastructures • Promotion of particular infrastructure by its profile • single entry point (cooperation with Umbrella) • calendar of open calls	• regional limitation • weak users awareness about the portal
EXTERNAL FACTORS	
OPPORTUNITIES (+)	THREATS (-)
• strengthening ESUO • online users communicator • online guide for beginners about how to apply for the beamtime	• lack of complementarity with other similar platforms

Table 47 SWOT feedback - SOLEIL

Facility	**SOLEIL**
INTERNAL FACTORS	
STRENGTHS (+)	WEAKNESSES (-)
• This platform offers a synthesis of information about synchrotron facilities at an European level • Easy to update and to create new account	• Portal development depends on CALIPSOplus program which is not sustainable • Every facilities has already their own website to update, and WLF is more work to keep it updated • It only covers Europe • It can be redundant with facilities own website and users can get lost between all the existing platforms
EXTERNAL FACTORS	

OPPORTUNITIES (+)	THREATS (-)
• Sustainability of the portal could be ensured by LEAPS program • WFL could represent a window for European industries • Standardized Proposal Format should make it easier for users to go from a synchrotron facility to another • Communications about the portal can be organized during the different synchrotron users meetings • The standardized presentation of all the facilities makes it easier for users to compare them, if efforts are made to keep information up to date	• GDRP • TNA's disappearance • Facilities' access modalities are bound to evolve as data collection times and methods change • Technological evolution: how keep the portal up to date ?

Table 49 SWOT feedback - ESUO

ESUO	
INTERNAL FACTORS	
STRENGTHS (+)	WEAKNESSES (-)
• overview of the synchrotron/FEL/laser facilities available in Europe and in the Middle East and their associated techniques available for the users • centralized information point; browser window by facility, technique , discipline; search tool; presentation of the guidelines for proposal preparation; various contact information • bridge between the user communities and the facilities, including industrial, training and ESUO sections • collaborative work • new dissemination materials recently made available, with the potential to even better promote the portal	• some existing concomitance of information displayed on wayforlight and on e.g. lightsources.org • not an interactive portal • possible lack of awareness of the portal • updated work • developed thanks to the support of the Promoscience colleagues. What would happen if they quit?
EXTERNAL FACTORS	
OPPORTUNITIES (+)	THREATS (-)

• Collaboration with LEAPS • ESUO section with possible outreach to the synchrotron and FEL users; ESUO being in the process to improve its visibility. • offer for extended functionalities	• funding / financial situation after the end of CALIPSOplus • dependence on the support from the colleagues of Promoscience; inability to pursue the collaboration in the future • lack of manpower to maintain / update / develop the portal • lack of interest in the portal by the stakeholders

Table 50 SWOT feedback – MAXI IV

Facility	**MAX IV**
INTERNAL FACTORS	
STRENGTHS (+)	WEAKNESSES (-)
• agreement between all European SR sources user offices • (potential for a) complete set of data • x-rays don't get drowned in other infrastructures • standardization, technical interface /API	• data linking to the individual facility homepages; need to get communications/It to program interface (this is not a technical challenge, but a social one) • users turn to what they know (i.e. not wayforlight) • not sure how relevant link to non-xray sources is (where to draw the line - why would Felix be interesting, but not ELI e.g.) • Not sure how relevant for XFELS - here users shop on the international market and I can't see how the catalog on WFL helps them • Value and support (from different facilities) for common dashboard yet not fully clear to me • Value and support (from users) for unified proposal yet not fully clear to me
EXTERNAL FACTORS	
OPPORTUNITIES (+)	THREATS (-)
• unified information portal for EU SR light sources • integration w/ other research infrastructure portals = keep our backs free • information on beamtime logistics (but needs careful editing = much work)	• focus (see above no-Xray facilities & FELS) • w/o automatic data exchange, catalogue might not stay up to date • SR / IT departments cannot prioritize to get / keep their own systems linked, when updating web, DUO etc. • focus (target groups) - (academic) scientists need very much different information compared to other target groups. • I am not sure WFL is good as a business portal, too instrument -centered

Table 51 SWOT feedback – BESSY II

Facility	**BESSY II**
INTERNAL FACTORS	
STRENGTHS (+)	WEAKNESSES (-)
• Single information point for users. • Facility database	• Not always up to date • Only manual updates possible so far • Perception could be improved e.g. presence at conferences • Knowledge about funding could be provided • Difficult due to different structures of facilities
EXTERNAL FACTORS	
OPPORTUNITIES (+)	THREATS (-)
See above	n.a.

Table 52 SWOT feedback - KIT

Facility	**KIT**
INTERNAL FACTORS	
STRENGTHS (+)	WEAKNESSES (-)
• beamline catalogue makes the portal unique • standardization of data	• even the news website is not up-to-date • website content is rather static • activities at the facilities to improve the offer to scientists is not existing (i.e. the JRA program of CALIPSOplus) • there are not many other websites to point towards wayforlight • wayforlight is rather unknown in the community of users at KIT • yet no feedback at all from stakeholders
EXTERNAL FACTORS	
OPPORTUNITIES (+)	THREATS (-)
• a centralized hub for beamtime applications • direct access to specialists, at beamlines, in user offices, to peers • improve access routes to data sets which have been acquired but never exploited • bring together scientists working in the same field • extend scope to machine physicists	• not to be used by the users, the main target group of wayforlight • competition is strong through user meetings, conferences, workshops

1.5 Annex IV – WFL cost estimation – First draft

The following first draft of a cost estimation for WFL is based on the following assumptions_

- Only costs/incomes related to SR & FEL activities on wayforlight are taken into account
- Cost items from EC funded projects or other projects involving wayforlight (e.g. Laserlab V) are not included in this scheme
- All in-kind contributions (e.g. personnel costs, travel costs of the facility participants to meetings, costs related to hosting wayforlight meetings, printing costs of wayforlight marketing and dissemination material have to be taken into account, as they generate cost items at the facility

Table 53 WFL cost estimation: Summary

		Including May to December 2017				Including January 2021 to April 2021
CALIPSOplus Budget	**Description**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**
Equipment	Equipment	3.333,33 €	5.000,00 €	5.000,00 €	5.000,00 €	20.000,00 €
Dissemination	Dissemination	2.500,00 €	3.750,00 €	3.750,00 €	3.750,00 €	15.000,00 €
Personnel Costs	Personnel Costs	23.422,22 €	33.483,33 €	33.483,33 €	33.483,33 €	136.183,33 €
Sum		**29.255,56 €**	**42.233 €**	**42.233 €**	**42.233 €**	**171.183 €**
			Total costs in CALIPSOplus:			**171.183 €**

Table 54 WFL cost estimation - Coordination and support for years 2021-2026.

			LEAPS Pilot+ Other Developments		Including May to December 2021							
WFL Coordination & Support	Description	Scenario 1 Baseline Costs	Scenario 2 WFL 2.0	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total	Facility in-kind contribution	To be financed
ELETTRA WFL support & assistance in 2021	2PM coordination + 0.5PM IT	x		10.000 €						10.000 €	- €	10.000 €
ELETTRA WFL support & assistance	3 PM/year for coordination + 1 PM/year IT support Calculation: 1FTE = 80k€/year	x			26.667 €	26.667 €	26.667 €	26.667 €	26.667 €	133.333 €		133.333 €
Facility WFL Support	1PM/year per facility (16 facilities)	x			106.667 €	106.667 €	106.667 €	106.667 €	106.667 €	533.333 €	533.333 €	- €
WFL Assistanstance	Full-time position		x		80.000 €	80.000 €	80.000 €	80.000 €	80.000 €	400.000 €		400.000 €
												- €
												- €
												- €
												- €
												- €
												- €
												- €
Sum	- €			10.000 €	213.333 €	213.333 €	213.333 €	213.333 €	213.333 €	1.076.667 €	533.333 €	543.333 €

Personnel costs for Elettra have been calculated considering the average costs at Elettra. All other PM estimates have been done taking 1 FTE = 80kEuro as the average amount provided by LEAPS.

Table 55 WFL cost estimation - IT & Technical equipment for years 2021-2026.

IT costs & Technical Equipment	Description	Scenario 1 Baseline Costs	Scenario 2 WFL 2.0	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total	Facility in-kind contribution	To be financed
Main server and backup costs	2 new servers (main and copy)- purchase every 5 years	x			12.000 €				12.000 €	24.000 €	- €	24.000 €
Promoscience Umbraco management update		x			5.000 €	5.000 €	5.000 €	5.000 €	5.000 €	25.000 €	- €	25.000 €
Technical Equipment in total	- €			- €	17.000 €	5.000 €	5.000 €	5.000 €	17.000 €	49.000 €	- €	49.000 €

Table 56 WFL cost estimation - Developments for years 2021-2026.

WFL Developments	Scenario 1 Baseline Costs	Scenario 2 WFL 2.0	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total	Facility in-kind contribution	To be financed
											- €
WFL Development: Catalogue of Services		x		5.000 €	5.000 €	5.000 €	5.000 €	5.000 €	25.000 €	- €	25.000 €
WFL Development: Sample environment pilot		x		11.667 €	11.667 €	11.667 €	11.667 €	11.667 €	58.333 €	33.333 €	25.000 €
WFL Development: Training		x		- €	- €	- €	- €	- €	- €	- €	- €
WFL Development: Virtual Beamline - Sample environment		x		20.000 €	20.000 €	20.000 €	20.000 €	20.000 €	100.000 €	- €	100.000 €
WFL Development: Virtual Beamline - All		x		116.667 €	106.667 €	106.667 €	106.667 €	106.667 €	543.333 €	533.333 €	10.000 €
WFL Development: LEAPS Partner Search		x		53.333 €	53.333 €	53.333 €	53.333 €	53.333 €	266.667 €	266.667 €	- €
WFL Development: INFRAINNOV - Industry W	x		2.000 €	2.000 €	2.000 €	2.000 €	- €	- €	8.000 €	- €	8.000 €
WFL Development: Industry Section @ WFL including TamaTA		x		5.333 €	5.333 €	5.333 €	5.333 €	5.333 €	26.667 €	26.667 €	- €
WFL Developments in total			2.000,00 €	214.000 €	204.000 €	204.000 €	202.000 €	202.000 €	1.028.000 €	860.000 €	168.000 €

The budget requested for training was not included due to several factors: training contents and priorities have still to be defined, particularly within LEAPS. We would expect an estimate from LEAPS working group n.6 “Dissemination and Training” and a share of the related costs.

Table 57 WFL cost estimation - Marketing in the years 2012-2026

WFL Marketing	Scenario 1 Baseline Costs	Scenario 2 WFL 2.0	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total	Facility in-kind contribution	To be financed
Marketing Technology costs	x		3.400 €	3.400 €	3.400 €	3.400 €	3.400 €	3.400 €	20.400 €	- €	20.400 €
Collateral Material costs	x		8.323 €	1.030 €	1.030 €	1.030 €	1.030 €	1.030 €	13.473 €	- €	13.473 €
Public Relation costs	x		4.707 €	5.707 €	3.707 €	3.707 €	3.707 €	3.707 €	25.242 €	- €	25.242 €
WFL marketing activities, programs & service	x		9.530 €	12.570 €	12.570 €	12.570 €	12.570 €	12.570 €	72.380 €	- €	72.380 €
Registration as trade mark	x		5.291 €						5.291 €	- €	5.291 €
Other marketing costs	x		700 €	950 €	950 €	950 €	950 €	700 €	5.200 €	- €	5.200 €
Marketing costs in total			**31.951 €**	**23.657 €**	**21.657 €**	**21.657 €**	**21.657 €**	**21.407 €**	**141.986 €**	**- €**	**141.986 €**

These costs were all included in the so-called “baseline” scenario since dissemination and promotion are among the crucial issues for the portal.

Table 58 WFL cost estimation – WFL general travels in 2021-2026.

WFL General Travels	Description	Scenario 1 Baseline Costs	Scenario 2 WFL 2.0	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total	Facility in-kind contribution	To be financed
WFL participation @ ESUO events	WFL representative als speaker at yearly ESUO Annual Meeting to promote WFL, to train ESUO delagtes on WFL features, to evaluate user needs on WFL portal	x		- €	620 €	620 €	620 €	620 €	620 €	3.100 €	- €	3.100 €
WFL participation @ Events on the European level	WFL representation at networking/strategy events on the European level, e.g. to evaluate future funding options (2 events per year starting in 2022)	x		- €	620 €	620 €	620 €	620 €	620 €	3.100 €	- €	3.100 €
WFL Technical Support Travel	WFL technical support provided to facilities by ELETTRA IT staff	x		- €	1.500 €	1.500 €	1.500 €	1.500 €	1.500 €	7.500 €	- €	7.500 €
WFL General Support & Assistance Travel	WFL support & assistance provided to facilities by ELETTRA WFL coordinator or WFL assistance	x		- €	1.500 €	1.500 €	1.500 €	1.500 €	1.500 €	7.500 €	- €	7.500 €
WFL Meetings with EC funded projects w/o ELETTRA participation	WFL representation in EC funded projects where ELETTRA as WFL hosting facilities is not involved	x		- €	1.000 €	1.000 €	1.000 €	1.000 €	1.000 €	5.000 €	- €	5.000 €
WFL Meetings with EC funded projects with ELETTRA participation	WFL representation in EC funded projects where ELETTRA as WFL hosting facilities is involved: Travel costs included in the budget of the respective project	x		- €	- €	- €	- €	- €	- €	- €	- €	- €
WFL Meetings with National Authorities	WFL representation to national authorities	x		- €	620 €	620 €	620 €	620 €	620 €	3.100 €	- €	3.100 €
WFL General Travels in total				**- €**	**5.860 €**	**5.860 €**	**5.860 €**	**5.860 €**	**5.860 €**	**29.300 €**	**- €**	**29.300 €**

Table 59 WFL cost estimation - Regular meetings in 2021-2026.

WFL Regular Meetings	Description	Scenario 1 Baseline Costs	Scenario 2 WFL 2.0	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total	Facility in-kind contribution	To be financed
WFL Annual Technical Meeting	WFL Annual Technical Workshop (Lunch - to Lunch meeting hosted by one of the SR & FEL facilities (19 participating facilities including SESAME & TARLA + 2 participants from the WFL coordination team))	x		- €	15.435 €	15.435 €	15.435 €	15.435 €	15.435 €	77.175 €	58.900 €	18.275 €
WFL Annual Strategy Meeting	WFL Annual Strategy Meeting (Lunch - to Lunch meeting hosted by one of the SR & FEL facilities (19 participating facilities including SESAME & TARLA + 2 participants from the WFL coordination team))	x		- €	15.435 €	15.435 €	15.435 €	15.435 €	15.435 €	77.175 €	58.900 €	18.275 €
				- €								- €
												- €
												- €
WFL General Meetings in total				- €	30.870 €	30.870 €	30.870 €	30.870 €	30.870 €	154.350 €	117.800 €	36.550 €

Table 60 WFL cost estimation – Total costs for the different WFL operating scenarios

WFL costs per year	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	WFL costs in total 2021-2026	Facility in-kind contribution	To be financed	Comments
WFL costs in total 2021-2026 (Baseline costs + WFL 2.0 developments)	43.951 €	504.720 €	480.720 €	480.720 €	478.720 €	490.470 €	**2.479.303 €**	1.511.133 €	**968.169 €**	Includes real cost for services, equipment, marketing & other costs as well as in-kind contributions from the facilities
WFL costs in total 2021-2026 - scenario 1 "Baseline costs"	43.951 €	212.720 €	198.720 €	198.720 €	196.720 €	208.470 €	1.059.303 €	651.133 €	408.169 €	Includes real cost for services, equipment, marketing & other costs as well as in-kind contributions from the facilities to **operate WFL (without further WFL developments wrt to current situation)**
WFL costs in total 2021-2026 - scenario 2 "WFL 2.0"	- €	292.000 €	282.000 €	282.000 €	282.000 €	282.000 €	1.420.000 €	860.000 €	560.000 €	Includes real cost for services, equipment, marketing & other in-kind contributions from the facilities to **operate WFL and develop what was already planned)**