



CALICE TB Review Meeting



Roman Pöschl
LAL Orsay

- Introductory remarks

CALICE TB Review Meeting FNAL June 2009

Why do we convene here?

- Preparation of the last step of the “physics prototype phase”

Missing Piece: Testbeam with DHCAL physics prototype and combined test with (SiW) Ecal

- Definition of Milestones to follow up the realisation of the last step
- Preparing the “Technological Prototype Phase”
 - Review status of projects
 - Start to define the experimental program of this phase
 - Where do we want to go?
 - What do we want to do with the Physics Prototypes?
 - What are the constraints?
- But also ...
 - Try to reinforce collaboration where possible
 - Try establish new collaboration where possible

Course of the meeting

- First day (Open Session): “Listening and understanding”
Will try to reinforce strictly the allocated timeslots
- Second day closed to Technical board + Yannis (LAPP)
Preparation of proposal to CALICE steering board on
Roadmap for the coming ~three Years
- The TB Review meeting should issue two documents
 - 1) The way towards the DHCAL Prototype (Basically a summary talk)
 - 2) Proposal for a roadmap
(Short) description of project status of plans $\frac{1}{2}$ page/project
Conclusions and Proposals how to proceed

These documents are to be discussed at the
CALICE Steering Board Meeting at the Collaboration Meeting

... and I already worked for CALICE

Justification for Use of Contract Funds

Name of Meeting: CALICE Technical Board Review Meeting

Date(s): 16/6/09 - 17/6/09

Purpose of Meeting:

The CALICE collaboration, consisting of 400 physicists and engineers, is conducting R&D for calorimeters at the International Linear Collider (ILC). The charge of the review is to assess the status of the US DHCAL project and the various technical prototype projects, and to establish a view on the forthcoming developments in terms of production, test, commissioning and integration.

The outcome should provide a basis for the planning of CALICE test beam activities in the next two years.

This review runs over 1 ½ days so coffee service for 25 will be ordered for three separate breaks (2 morning, 1 afternoon). The count for the last break will be lowered to 15. Due to the long sessions the speakers, audience and review panel will need refreshments in the breaks in order to follow the sessions concentrated to the end. The result of the meeting is vital for the programme of the collaboration in the coming years. The cost estimation is roughly 100 US Dollars per break, so 300 US Dollars in total.

I approve the use of contract funds, task R5F121, for this workshop.

Reviewers/Participants (on official travel): 14

Felix Sefkow (DESY, Germany)
Erika Garutti (DESY, Germany)
Karsten Gadow (DESY, Germany)
Niels Meyer (DESY, Germany)
Tohru Takeshita (Shinshu University, Japan)
Jaehoon Yu (UTA, Texas/USA)
Matthew Wing (UCL, England)
Paul Dauncey (Imperial College, England)
Imad Laktineh (CNRS/IN2P3/IPNL, France)
Yannis Karyotakis (CNRS/IN2P3/LAPP, France)
Daniel Jeans (CNRS/IN2P3/LLR, France)
Mickael Frotin (CNRS/IN2P3/LLR, France)
Christophe de la Taille (CNRS/IN2P3/LAL, France)
Roman Poeschl (CNRS/IN2P3/LAL, France)

Fermilab and Local Participants: 8

Jose Repond (ANL)
Lei Xia (ANL)
Qingmin Zhang (ANL)
Gary Drake (ANL)
James Schlereth (ANL)
Jacob Smith (ANL)
Burat Bilki (ANL)
Vishnu Zutshi (NIU)

Roman Poeschl _____
Approver's name

11/6/09 _____
Date

Justification form to get Coffee
and Muffins for this meeting

Justification for use of contract funds for the provision of refreshments: