



PM report Aug 20, 2008:

- **Reviews**
 - PAC
 - AAP
- **Meetings**
 - ILC08
 - CLIC
- **FALC**
- **Collaborative activities**
 - CLIC
 - XFEL
- **Initiatives**
 - HLRF distribution
 - Min Machine
 - Plug Compatibility
- **Schedule**



Reviews:

- **Project Advisory Committee**
 - Oct 19 – 20, Paris
 - hosted by the chair, Jean-Eudes Augustin.
 - Many will remember him from the Itrp 2004
- **PAC reports to ILCSC and is our primary external review committee.**
 - We hope PAC complements the AAP, about which more below.
 - It is a pretty traditionally 'structured' review.



PAC

- **The review will be 'high level'**
- **with our part lasting ~60% of the total (rest detectors) and our presentations mainly given by Barry, PM, regional directors, etc.**
- **The detailed agenda is now in process, but key topics will include the following:**
 - Organization (many committee members are new to GDE)
 - R&D Plan (this should be the basis for the technical part of the review)
 - Minimum machine design (our approach to project-wide value engineering)
 - Collaborations (including GDE - institutional relations and CLIC, XFEL, etc)
 - Project Implementation (includes technical procurement, governance, siting work,...)
 - AAP - (our internal review process)
 - Resources - (as indicated in the R&D plan, with regional focus)
 - Oversight (FALC, ILCSC - this is necessarily connected to the PAC itself so will be in exec session...)



PAC Agenda

- **The actual agenda is in final stages of preparation and should be released soon.. Although the final agenda has not been completed, we can assume:**
 - Barry - overview
 - Marc - organization and r&d / design overview (this is where CFS / global are)
 - Akira - srf
 - Nick / Ewan machine design and minimum machine
 - Test facility & MDI talks
 - Project Implementation talk
- **The meeting is open.**
 - The closeout is to be completed Monday mid-afternoon Oct 20, two months from today.



AAP

- **This will be completely different.**
- **It is not 'traditionally structured' and is a full-fledged attempt to bring a stronger panel into the process.**
- **As an internal review, we hope for the strongest practical feedback, with meaningful recommendations etc.**

- **(Reminder: for backup info see Barry's directors corners).**

- **The stronger panel arises from 'embedding' the members into our routine management process as observers.**
 - So that, for example, Katsunobu Oide is an observer at the monthly AS webex and attends thematic workshops.
 - Nominally, Eckhard Elsen fulfils this role for CFS / Gbl.
 - As you know, Jonathan also observes the cfs process.



AAP Planning

- **This review is to be held April 17 to 21(?) 2009, 5 days, at kek.**
- **It will be the 'LCWS' meeting, so will include opening and closing plenary sessions.**
- **The 'review' part of the meeting is also expected to be plenary, so that the full panel will see presentations that cover the breadth of our work.**
- **In addition to the 9 AAP members, we expect a few (7?) external members.**
 - AAP is chaired by Bill Willis (Eckhard Elsen helps in this role).



Your part in AAP review

- We will need strong participation by the Technical Groups at the review.
- We call it the 'Technical Design Phase 1 Interim Review'.
- It is broadly based on the R&D plan and emphasis should reflect the goals, schedules, resource commitments, management / technical strategies, issues, etc... listed there.
- **Foremost among these is the goal to have an updated baseline by the end of TDP-1 in July 2010.**
 - There will be a second TDP-1 review in spring 2010 leading up to that point.
- **This AAP review is really the first comprehensive ILC review and is therefore quite important.**



ILC08

- We will use ILC08 to prepare for the AAP review.
- When reading the ILC08 goals, distributed this week, focus on what is to be completed and presented at the review.
- In summary, these goals are:
 - 1) review status and plans,
 - 2) esp for the test facilities,
 - 3) develop goals (milestones) for r&d and
 - 4) discuss collaborative efforts.
- During ILC08, there will be meetings with PM's to underline goals, deliverables and strategy for the AAP review.
- The agenda should be posted soon and parallel session plans should be reported at the next cfs/global webex meeting,



ILC08 Organization

- **As usual for such large, gde-wide meetings, ILC08 is not thematic and is therefore structured along the lines of our technical groups, with a few important exceptions.**
- **Because of this, special care must be applied by the working group conveners to arrange joint sessions that cover various critical cross-group activities.**
- **For logistical and for practical reasons, there are only 6 working groups.**
- **We intend to be able to accommodate meetings outside of the nominal wg's, and should start discussing these soon.**



FALC

- **FALC is one of our two oversight bodies and is comprised of funding agency representatives from most of our supporting governments.**
- **We look to FALC, perhaps, to be the seed of the funding agency council who will manage the construction of the ILC, eventually.**
- **The group meets twice a year and a report from the ILC is always on the agenda.**
 - The January 2008 meeting was dominated by news of funding cuts in the US and UK.
- **The meeting last month, July 14, was really the first one since the formation of the 'PM team' which could focus on what we are trying to do.**
- **As such, it is the first time where we can find real feedback as to what this group feels it might be able to do.**
 - The situation is somewhat tenuous since there is little precedent, on a global basis, for collaboration at this level.



FALC July 14, 2008 meeting

- There were three discussions at the meeting that are of interest to us:
- 1) The group was quite interested in our intention to develop a 'project implementation plan' pip.
- This should be part of the tdr, to be delivered in 2012.
- The pip will include
 - srf (other high tech) procurement strategies,
 - a funding model and
 - a project schedule,
 - a governance plan, etc).
- It is quite clear to me and to some (all?) members of FALC, that the pip works best if it is based on a consensus developed between the project (us) and themselves.
 - How should this be done?
- It is also clear that we should begin work on it now and that there are links between the pip and present r&d activities.
 - Our attempt to institute a high-tech plug compatibility is an example - if we can have a degree of flexibility in the assembly of srf components, then it may be possible for these sub-components to be supplied from relatively small-scale partners from across the world.
- Of course, FALC will be interested in the funding program etc - items beyond the direct interest of the project managers.



FALC July 14, 2008 meeting (2)

- **2) There is a sub-group, I believe, who would like to look closely at the r&d plan - especially the resource tables and lists of participating institutions.**
 - Ultimately, their scrutiny may help bolster us by lending validity to our plan.
- **In both the US and UK we are faced with funding program officials who are skeptical about contributions from those outside their country.**
- **The linkage with the implementation plan is also clear; namely that the same funding agency groups will need to develop ties to partner agencies and the project itself.**
- **FALC is the only place where funding agencies can speak directly to one another.**
 - Until this last meeting it was chaired by Roberto Petronzio, from the next meeting forward, the group will be chaired by Pierre Coulombe of Canada.



FALC July 14, 2008 meeting (3)

- **3) This meeting included a presentation on CLIC, given by Jean Pierre Delahaye.**
 - Between the Cern director and Jean-Pierre, the CLIC group made a strong 'sell' of their project.
- **Issues include**
 - the relative maturity of the design effort,
 - the nature of the demonstration and systems test to be provided by the test facility and
 - the relative cost vs energy.
- **Because of the tendency of funding groups to react somewhat ambivalently when technical experts disagree, I feel we should work together, internally, to develop common agreed-upon statements on issues such as those listed above.**
- **In this way they can make fair decisions without requiring heavy decision making procedures.**
- **We have always tried, in the ILC FALC presentations, to provide genuine, simple summaries of our status.**
- **The PM and Jean-Pierre have agreed to try to make such common statements which would then, hopefully, be used in our fall workshops.**



CLIC

- **The Cern-based CLIC project will host their annual workshop in mid-October. The charge to the conveners and working group plans have been formulated and distributed. Of special interest to us are the activities to be reported through the CLIC-ILC collaboration working groups.**
 - For us, today, the most important of these are the cfs and cost/schedule groups.
- **We would like to have**
 - 1) consistent reporting of working group efforts during the opening and closing plenaries,
 - 2) consistent (reciprocal is perhaps to rigorous) attendance to the workshop and
 - 3) consistent inclusion in the respective agendas - CLIC workshop and ILC08. There will be no CLIC plenary at ILC08 and no ILC plenary at the CLIC workshop.
- **This should not be too difficult.**
- **I remain concerned about the work done by the collaboration working groups goals, as listed in closing plenaries at the Dubna meeting.**
- **To this end, to counter this concern, we will hold a short 'update-only' teleconference September 19.**
- **Please prepare a presentation for that meeting and circulate it in advance.**



High level rf distribution proposal

- **In mid-July, the slac group proposed the development of over-moded waveguides for the distribution of rf to the cryomodules as a technical solution that would allow the abandonment of the linac support tunnel.**
- **This should provide substantial flexibility to our design because it makes single tunnel-deep and shallow enclosure systems practically equal.**
 - Using technical advances to level the comparison between sites of very different topographies is one of the primary goals of the Dubna workshop and this proposal could do just that.
- **The executive committee will meet at KEK in early September to consider the impact that diversion of R&D funds would have and try to listen to the pros/cons of the proposal and associated r&d.**
- **It is no surprise that the technology referred to in the SLAC proposal is very similar to that developed for the xband distribution in the nlc.**
- **We will proceed to make a recommendation on the r&d for this proposal.**
- **In addition, we will adopt it as acd and put forth a decision process for adopting it as baseline, as part of tdp1.**



waveguide HLRF distribution

- **Chris Adolphsen - July 21, 2008**
 - hoped-for response from Dubna CF/S strategy
- **Design and Impact presentation for EC Sept 5**
 - Technical (Chris Adolphsen – via telecon)
 - RD Plan (Akira)
 - Value Estimate update (Marc/Peter – via telecon)
 - Aug 11 teleconference (Vic, Mike H, Chris, Marc, Peter)
- **1 M\$ / year total for 2 years (US / Japan) R & D needed for re-baselining process**
 - resonant line powered by one or two MBK's
 - support to be requested from regional directors
 - PM request: EC provide comment on this scheme at KEK meeting
- **XFEL cable-based design?**



Plug Compatibility

- **R&D :**
 - Goal: prove baseline performance
 - Restrict / promote specific R&D actions
 - Establish unified interface conditions
 - Develop specification and supporting documentation
 - Draft release 2008
- **Project Planning:**
 - Develop guidelines as a basis for PIP preparation
 - Goal: PIP delivered in 2012
 - Suggestions (from PM):
 - Define subcomponents – broadly based on interfaces established during R&D
 - Multiple vendors, multiple designs
 - Initial SRF-related PIP preparation guidelines due in 2009



Plug Compatibility

- **Costing based on a single design**
 - Assumption: design differences do not result in substantial cost differences
 - RDR: single vendor with multiple sets of tooling
 - Multiple vendors roughly equivalent
- **Cost engineers (WB, PG, TS) and Kerby to be asked to develop model**
 - PM will specify AAP review goal at KEK EC
- **‘Industrialization’ based on test facilities during TDP**
 - And XFEL



KEK face to face EC meeting

- September 5 and 6 (1/2 day)
- (September 4 – ATF/STF reports and tour)
- (meet with DG morning September 5 – per Yokoya May 15)
- September 8, 9 Nick Marc and Akira meet with KEK staff
- **Agenda – KEK EC PM report:**
 - CFS / Main Linac Integration: waveguide HLRF distribution
 - Project Implementation Plan – preparation process
 - Minimum Machine – parameter plane and approach to options
 - FALC 'RG'
 - response to the CERN / CLIC team
 - Plans for PAC, Chicago and AAP



PM Schedule – through 02/2009

(new items)

- Applied Superconductivity Conference Chicago August 19, 20 (Akira, Marc)
- Fermilab August 21 (Akira, Marc)
- SLAC / LBL August 22 (Marc)
- XFEL CF DESY August 25-27 (Marc, Nick)
- KEK Sept 4-10 (PM)
- JLab Sept 11 and 12 (Akira, Marc)
- JINR / GSPI Telecon Sept 17
- CLIC / ILC Telecon Sept 19
- SLAC / LBL Sept 26 (Marc)
- Linac08 (Victoria-will meet with JINR team), CCAST / ATF2 (Daegu) Sept 29-Oct 3
- CLIC / PAC / TTC Oct 14 – Oct 23
- BARC Oct 24 (Akira, Marc)
- Positron workshop Oct 29-31 (Nick, Marc)
- LCWS/ILC08 Nov 16-20; Project X Nov 21 22 ?
- DESY XFEL technical and CF early December
- KEK ATF project (also BDS?) mid December
- China December 9 - 10, or Dec. 16, 17
- INFN / Spain - Jan 2009 ?