SB2009 Rebaselining Proposal Document
- How do we get it done? -

2009/10/2
N.Toge (KEK) for SB2009 Efforts
Outline of the Proposal Document

1. Introduction  PM  2 pages
2. SB2009 Overview  PM  4 pages
3. SB2009 Layout  JMP
4. SB2009 Proposal (TAG leaders)
   1. Parameters  PM  2 pages
   2. Gradient Issues  PM (AY)  2 pages
   3. Injectors  JC  2 pages
   4. Damping Rings  SG  2 pages
   5. Bunch Compressors  NS  2 pages
   6. Main Linac
      1. Single Tunnel (Technical) Solution  VK  2 pages
      2. DRFS  SF  2 pages
      3. KCS  Chris  2 pages
   7. BDS/MDI  AS  2 pages
   8. CFS solutions  VK  4 pages
5. Cost Increments/differentials (PHG)  2 pages
6. Risk  PMs  2 pages

• Appendices
  1. Report from Availability Task Force  TMH
  2. Report(s) on Tunnel Safety Concepts  CF/PMs
  3. Risk analysis … (here, or embed elsewhere)

~30 pages
Probably end up with 50-60
Outline of the Proposal Document (2)

• The previous page shows the structure of the “final, completed” document.
• Usually it is not easy to completely pre-define the exact boundary conditions everywhere prior to writing.

• So we are asking the authors to provide us first with your outline on your
  – New system description
  – New layout description
  – Cost implications
  – Identified issues (inc. risk) and/or open issues to address, plus your/our plans of attack during TDP2

(Outline = bulletized list of statements to make with some key illustrations)

• And move on to adding your content text. It is OK to write a bit more pages than what is assigned to you (but not too much), because,
• It would be the job of the PMs and the chief editor to structure the document as per the TOC of the previous page, somewhat on the fly, while interacting with you all.
Here is what I ask you to do

• Leaders for each of the sections, please,
  – Check and document the progress made by your Area Group during ALCPG, i.e. what is “done”, what remains open etc.
  – Confirm the primary author for your section(s) during ALCPG, and inform PMs + Toge,
  – Identify major contributing authors to work with you during ALCPG, and inform PMs + Toge,
  – Produce an outline of your section, and go through it at least once within your group before the end of ALCPG, then send it to us within a week. If you can do this during ALCPG, it won’t hurt.
Here is what I ask you to do (cont.)

– Be prepared for very heavy email traffic in subsequent weeks. You are assumed to be highly responsive.

– Identify the attendance from your group and report to PMs:
  
  • At the DESY (2009/12/2-3) meeting for finalizing the proposal doc
  • At the Oxford (2010/1/6-8) meeting for AAP review.

In case of difficulties you assign the back-up colleagues and inform PMs.

In case of concerns / issues, raise your hand and yell at PMs (or Toge). The sooner, the better.
Here is what I’d like ask PMs to do

- Same for most of the sections assigned to PMs.

- Circulate the basic SB2009 description within a week, i.e. the working assumptions for the proposal document for everyone to look up:
  - Updated parameter list
  - Updated basic layout diagram with rough length parameters, i.e. update of
Here is what Toge does

– Collect the author list info → email list
– Create a web space for file repository → circulate
– Create a zeroth version SB2009 proposal doc, on the basis of inputs from everyone.
– And on and on…

– General traffic control, as found necessary
The Timeline (to be approved by PMs)

- 2009/10/10: Most “outline” pieces posted
- 2009/10/17: First feedback from PMs and the editor to authors
- 2009/10/24: Most zeroth/first-order contents in place, with many holes, perhaps
- 2009/11/4 or 5: SB2009 Rebaseline Webex; Second feedback from PMS and the editor to authors
- 2009/11/14: Most first/second-order contents in place, with much less holes, hopefully
- 2009/11/21: Third feedback from PMs and the editor to authors.
- 2009/12/2-3: DESY meeting. Freeze technical contents.
- 2009/12/24: Freeze textual contents.
Note: What this Proposal Document is for

• We could say that this proposal document is a kind of a system-wide, large-scale, consolidated change configuration request. As such, in it, we should document –
  – What the changes are
  – Why we want to make these changes
  – What the impacts of the changes are
  – What the open issues are, and how we intend to address them and refine the design into the near future

• Differences from the RDR days, however:
  – No CCB process. Instead, PM/EC process with AAP review.
  – It is NOT that we are going to rewrite RDR by the end of 2009.
Note: What this Proposal Document is for (2)

• This proposal document is for us, ourselves. And it had better be written in a way that is understandable to the colleagues who’d work with us into the TDP2 on this (i.e. engineers, tech, post-docs, associates etc).

• Naturally, we somehow need to figure out how to document the new baseline (new-BCD, whatever) eventually. There’d be less major config changes from RDR, also; and updates to Alternative Config cases. However, at this moment, we are not going to directly address any of these.