

Jim's Answers to Questions about SiD CLIC relations.

Here is my current take on this, provided in the interest of contributing to the discussion.

> A. Do we get involved with CLIC?

>

Yes, but without harming the main effort to develop the SiD design. Helping here and there where the SiD efforts can naturally be leveraged. But it should be clear that it is the secondary effort to the needs of SiD.

> 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?

>

Our first responsibility is to develop the SiD design, with R&D and the appropriate engineering. Much of this contributes to the CLIC SiD' design work naturally. Where we must do additional work to satisfy CLIC needs, I think it is up to each individual to judge how much they can contribute without damaging their SiD focus. I don't think we should go so far as to make a joint SiD' committee. That would have the effect of increasing the pressure to favor SiD' needs. Why not discuss issues that might be the concern of the SiD' committee within the SiD exec, with the efforts being carried out by the appropriate task forces - magnet, PFA, etc.?

> C. What do we want from CLIC in return?

>

We should expect CERN folks to chip in on the ILC SiD design work. If this is unrealistic, I have a problem with my response to B above. Why should this not be a balanced exchange of contributions. The SiD' effort has already leveraged enormously from the earlier SiD work.

> D. How does the CLIC CDR acknowledge SiD?

>

If there are authors on the CDR, I think at least those who have contributed to the SiD design should be invited to be listed as authors. This is to acknowledge their work which contributes to the SiD' design.

>

>

>

>