



TEB Webex: 15th October

John Carwardine

- LCWS
- Top-level editing progress
- Update on SCRF issues resolution (Akira)

- Wednesday is set aside for GDE-only sessions on TDR
 - **Three sessions: Morning sessions (two), first session after lunch**
 - **Proposed schedule**
 - Morning session (before coffee): plenary session
 - Morning session (after coffee): three parallel sessions to address open issues
 - SCRF + FLASH, STF, NML
 - Accelerator Systems + CesrTA, ATF2
 - CFS costing (w/Gerry)
 - Afternoon session (before coffee): plenary session
 - Preparation for PAC review in Dec
 - Afternoon session (after coffee): *Higgs session*



Top-level editing progress

- TDR2 (Brian)
 - **Many detailed comments from Brian (Ch1-Ch13)**
 - Spelling, grammar, clarification questions
 - Comments were made on annotated pdfs
 - **SCRF/ML chapter**
 - Many ednotes still to be addressed (Akira)
- TDR1 (Mike, John)
 - **Various spelling and grammatical errors were corrected in TeX**
 - **Several ‘big ednote’ comments on SCRF chapter**

 - **Who will address the increasingly large number of ednotes and other comments??**



Top level editing comments (TDR1) - John

- I don't think we do enough to 'sell' the major achievements
 - **Document should be much clearer about what we consider to be the most significant outcomes from the R&D program**
- The very first word (TDR1/Ch1) is 'Although'
- A stronger Overview section for SCRF chapter would help pull the rest of the chapter together and put the R&D into context
 - **c.f. Overview for the BTF chapter**
- Some important questions are not well addressed, eg
 - **Why DRFS was abandoned in favour of DKS**
 - **We baseline the Tesla cavity shape despite the results reported on alternate cavity R&D (over-selling the alternates?)**
 - **Mitigation of failures encountered at S1-G, NML**
 - **Differences between ILC and EU-XFEL (XFEL section will help)**



Top-level editing comments (TDR1)

- Section 2.3 ('High Gradient SCRF Cavity Yield')
 - **Title and subsection headings don't reflect the content**
 - **It's not obvious what we consider to be the critical outcomes**
 - **The key write-up and data supporting the 90% yield are buried in a sub-subsection (2.3.3.1) – should be highly visible**
 - **The figures showing the yield give the casual reader the impression that we did not achieve the yield**
 - **How we've defined the goal of 90% yield isn't explained**
- S1-Global (Sect 2.5) and NML (Sect 3.4) sections put too much emphasis on cataloging the problems encountered and not enough emphasis on what was learnt and how the work supports our claim of readiness to construct
- Several sections have more detail than necessary for TDR (move to separate ILC reports)



Top-level editing comments

- There are inconsistencies in TDR1 between individual sections and Ch6 'Post-TDR R&D'
 - **Should we allow more items to remain in the individual sections than are presented in Ch6?**
- Ch4 (beam dynamics) is more of a design chapter than R&D
 - **Propose moving it to TDR2**
- TDR1: Ch2/HLRF 'is full of errors' – Chris N and Marc to go through

To-do

- TDR1 + TDR2 contain more than 400 ednotes in the TeX source alone + additional comments from TLE
 - **Some we can leave for now, but many still require resolution**
 - **Who's going to go through these?**
- All placeholders for figures/tables should be replaced with the actual figures/tables
 - **What has to be provided and by whom?**
- Some key figures will need fixing before the draft goes to PAC
 - **Which ones?**