

2008 ART review: summary

There have obviously been major changes in the scope and goals of the ART program over the past 12 months

In spite of these perturbations R&D progress has been made

You have heard both the ART big picture and detailed L3 system response to these changes

The changed role has been endorsed by P5 and the FY08 presidents budget

The CR looms ominously

2008 ART review: last year

- **Recommendations on ART management from 2007:**
 - *Better definition of R&D milestones tied to stated goals is needed.*
 - *A more developed R&D project schedule is needed.*
 - *The committee would like to see more frequent short assessments of R&D progress, with note taken of any changes to the program or schedule. Such reports should be prepared for the use of interested non-experts. The tracking of costs and schedules on a monthly or quarterly basis should be improved.*
 - *The DOE should make every effort to maintain the ART budget at the level consistent with the R&D requirements and accomplishments.*
 - *The DOE should give guidance for managing the R&D in view of its project management protocols.*
- **We have basically moved in the opposite direction with a softer R&D like management structure rather than a harder construction project like style.**

2008 ART review: committee charge

- **Is the program well integrated into the GDE Technical Design Phase plan ?**
 - We could parse the meaning of 'well' but overall I think the answer is yes.
- **Has the R&D program scope and focus been properly adjusted in light of the recently reduced funding ? Is the plan configured and prioritized in such a way that it can be sensibly adjusted with further changes in the funding level ?**
 - Ditto 'properly', but the program presented is certainly consistent with the \$35M budget. The program can tolerate a certain degree of fiscal change without destroying core goals, additional significant reductions would remove coherence and effectively replace ART with individual R&D topics.
- **Does the US unique expertise in the areas of principle focus ?**
 - SRF & CFS: No though we certainly possess expertise, otherwise the answer is yes (CESR TA, BDS, HLRF, Global systems, electron source, positrons)
- **Does the R&D have utility for other US programs ?**
 - High degree of synergy with Project X (SRF, RF systems, e-cloud, tunnel layout, etc...)
 - SRF gradient/infrastructure helps any SRF related project (ERL based light source, FRIB, CEBAF upgrade)
- **Does the R&D program make effective use of the assets and capabilities of the US facilities ?**
 - I think we do quite well here in alignment with the national labs internal priorities: Fermilab-SRF technology development, SLAC – HLRF, BDS/MDI, simulations, electrons, JLAB – SRF, electrons, BNL – specialized SC magnets, MDI, Cornell – CESR, SRF, Argonne – SRF, simulations