

General comments

TDR1-1 (Barish & Foster)

Reads fine but not obviously fit for purpose.

“TDR-1 needs a narrative introduction on the primary R&D that is required to demonstrate the technologies of an ILC and then to be ready to move forward with a construction program. I think this should be done, beginning from when the GDE began, so we can take credit for our accomplishments (e.g. gradient, e-cloud, etc), and can set-up discussion for Ch7 of what is the future R&D program.” (BB)

“Overall I wonder about these 4 chapters – I don't get the impression that they are much different from each other particularly the Volume 1 – Volume 2 comparison. There is a lot of repetition of general description of the accelerator. I don't really have a solution but maybe if one thought about what specifically these two chapters should do that are NOT done in the other volume then we could somehow make them more distinctive....”

TDR1-2 (Barish & Foster)

“In particular, Ch 2 seems more like it belongs in TDR-2, not TDR-1.” (BB)

TDR1-3 (Harrison & Yokoya)

“hard to review these sections since so much is still missing” (MH)

“left with the impression that it seemed too open ended. By this I mean there was nice descriptions of the R&D topics and results but there was no overall narrative which said "and this was why we picked this for the baseline design" (MH)

“Overlapping description of many items - Editor's comment sometimes say eliminate them, but this not simple. Should give unified description at one place and refer it elsewhere.” (KY)

TDR1-4 (Walker & Tauchi)

“Overview must describe roles and characteristics of FLASH, NMU and STF (Quantum Beam) with respect to ILC. Also, XFEL should be mentioned as a test facility scaled 10% of ILC, and relation of TESLA type and ILC type modules and cavities.” (TT)

TDR1-5 (Yamamoto & Stapnes)

“hard to understand to what degree the specifications are fulfilled and demonstrated. When the future work is described it is therefore also hard to understand if this is a part of a demonstration of performance parameters, or steps towards a larger technical system.” (SS)

“draft has well summarized the R&D objectives and progress with an appropriate level of the depth for TDR.” (ATF2 – AY)

TRD1-6 (Paterson & Dugan)

Title of 6.1 needs changing. "The text is a series of paragraphs with no subheadings. Each paragraph is clear by itself but the connections between them are not well defined. It would benefit greatly in terms of readability if the paragraphs were grouped into subsections with appropriate titles." (GD)

References. "Very complete and already has been edited" (EP)

TDR1-7 (Barish & Walker)

"This chapter is very important to motivate the continuing R&D program following the TDR. It needs some explanation that key R&D complete to move forward quickly with a construction project, yet the benefits of continuing R&D, especially systems tests, small beam spots, industrialization, etc." (BB)

BF comments subsequent to editing this chapter– all the information required is here but it needs much better organisation and motivation. It has very substantial reporting sections on achievements that should be omitted or shortened where possible. Needs to be more focussed on motivating the future R&D.

TRD1-8 (Barish & Foster)

Not yet available.

TDR2

TDR2-1 (Barish & Foster)

See comments on TDR1-1.

TDR2-2 (Barish & Foster)

See comments on TDR1-2. BF comments subsequent to editing: "basically it is fine and my edits with one or two small questions to be resolved were at the grammar and typo correction level."

TDR2-3 (Harrison & Yokoya)

"We should avoid repetition and reference TDR1 rather than repeat the content from TDR1. This is not a stand alone document and should be no longer than necessary to enhance readability." (MH)

"we need a narrative as to why the baseline design as described was chosen. Generally either cost or technical performance as influenced by the site." (MH)

TDR2-4 (Harrison & Yokoya)

“Better to create one chapter, starting with the motivation of having two different layouts. Then, split into two sections. (This chaptering would also help to avoid “flat” and “mountain” to appear in the top-level titles.)” (KY)

“We need a narrative as to why the baseline design as described was chosen. Generally either cost or technical performance as influenced by the site.” (MH)

TDR2-5 (Harrison & Yokoya)

“Far from the state to start editing. Too many undefined words (LPB, Kamaboko, FBL, MBK)” (KY)

TDR2-6 (Yamamoto & Tauchi)

Reference the R&D that led to changes between RDR & TDR. (TT)

TDR2-7 (Yamamoto & Tauchi)

Both AY & TT comment on the necessity to update/rationalise the figures. Cross-reference to Ch. 3. (AY) Lots of important detailed questions. (TT)

TDR2-8 (Yamamoto & Tauchi)

Well done, could be shortened? (AY) Emphasise role of ATF2 DR as prototype. (TT) Delete DRFS. Lots of important detailed questions. (TT)

TDR2-9 (Yamamoto & Tauchi)

Well done (AY). Add big table with relevant emittance budgets; another with collimators BL elements etc. Lots of important detailed questions. (TT)

TDR2-10 (Yamamoto & Tauchi)

Doesn't exist.

TRD2-11, 12

Don't exist

TDR2-13 (Paterson & Dugan)

“important to emphasize that this is one common multinational project which is flexible and can be optimized for different possible sites” (EP&GD)
Figures should be retained and made bigger/more legible. (EP)
Generally OK – sections need proper numbering. Lots of valuable detailed comments (GD).

TDR2-14 (Stapnes & Paterson)

Doesn't exist

TDR2-15 (Barish & Walker)

Doesn't exist

TRD2-16

Complete – but needs proper cross-referencing/integration (BF)

TRD2-17 (Foster & Ross)

Doesn't exist

TRD2-17 (Barish & Foster)

Doesn't exist

General comments in EC discussion

General feeling that things were in good shape for this point in process and comments not intended to be criticisms.

EC keen to keep involvement – what could they usefully do next?

BF

6/8/12