

SiD-CLIC Relations:

We continued the discussion from last week. Below are some issues/questions raised, this week and last:

A. What acknowledgement does/should SiD get in the CLIC detector CDR? Does CLIC just get to steal our concept and computing infrastructure without a footnote? With all SiD signing? Something intermediary?

B. Should John and Harry check with Ties and hope ILD doesn't like being diverted to CLIC activities any more than we do, and formulate a common response to CLIC? Evidence with PFA and Calice suggests that ILD doesn't mind being diverted at all.

B. Should SiD work on SiD' (the CLIC version of SiD). If we don't, do we have any say? If we do, how to do this? Should there be SiD volunteers for a joint SiD' committee? Doesn't this divert precious resource from what we are supposed to be doing for ILC?

C. Some (most?) feel we must inevitably work with CLIC, or be left out in cold (in so many senses). Lucie told us that there may not be balance between ILD' and SiD' in the CDR if we don't help.

D. Some areas of non-controversial overlap of interests: high energy benchmarks; new SC magnet conductors; push-pull; PFA development for high energies; cal limits at high energy, compact calorimetry.

E. How will CLIC help SiD if SiD helps CLIC? Are they in too much of a panic right now to produce a CDR or short notice to help us? Can't joint work on items in D. count?

HOMEWORK: All EXEC should weigh in on the following questions, plus others if they like:

A. Do we get involved with CLIC?

B. If so, how exactly do we get involved with the CLIC CDR? (assuming that we must at some level)

Minimally: joint work on magnet, push-pull, pfa if possible, cal developments...

More formally: make a joint SiD' committee and meet and discuss optimization of SiD for CLIC

Other?

C. What do we want from CLIC in return?

D. How does the CLIC CDR acknowledge SiD?