Injectors Re-commissioning Working Group

Minutes

Date: 27/08/2015

Pages: 4

Authors:	B. Lefort
Revised by:	A. Fabich, V. Kain.
Approved by:	

ATTENDDEES LIST:

Name	**Affiliation**
Bernardini, M.	BE-OP
Eriksson, T.	BE-OP
Fabich, A.	EN-MEF
Gatignon, L.	EN-MEF
Kain, V.	BE-OP
Lefort, B.	BE-OP
Lozano, M.	BE-OP
Pasinelli, S.	BE-OP
Sanchez, J.	BE-OP

INDEX

1 LAST MEETING'S MINUTES

Last meeting minutes approval has been postponed..

2 EXPERIMENTAL AREAS

Adrian Fabich presents the restart of the East and North Area. He mainly focused on the aspects during beam commissioning.

The experimental area (SBA) *restart checks* do not only take place after a long-shutdown but also when applying User changes or Beam changes (ions, secondaries, protons). Some elements are only used for certain configurations.

SBA beam commissioning can only take place after the injector chain is fully in operation.

Some equipment and operational aspects can only be tested with beam (beam diagnostics devices).

It is important to insure that the SBA's beam-commissioning period is included in the schedule.

Beam commissioning is effective only during working days for the availability of the equipment specialists.

Adrian also mentioned the very good experience they had with the SBA controls software after the re-start. He attributed this to the quasi continuous testing of the CESAR software during the shutdown and instantaneous implementation of interfaces already during LS1.

East Area main issues were :

- Unanticipated changes of system responsible
- Feed-back from system responsible somehow missing
- Last minute modification / patch

Not directly related to Experimental Areas, G. Metral says that many problems may have been avoided if the final user would have been consulted before modifying the systems. Software issues could have been prevented centralizing the development in a CO group instead of letting everybody developing.

V. Kain remarked that keeping the systems running or switching them back on as early as possible as suggested by Adrian in his took should be considered where possible. . V. Kain also wondered if there were typical tests associated with the preparation for a User change, which Adrian affirmed

OP INVOLVEMENT DURING DESIGN OF EQUIPMENT INTERFACES

G. Metral says that the OP should be more involved during design in order to be more efficient in case of failure).

FESA equipment should be designed consulting OP for requirements and possible side-effects.

It seems that the software heterogeneity leads to longer OP response time when a failure is detected. Too many properties and too many classes make impossible for a single operator to control all the parameters.

V. Kain insists on the fact that very good products were deployed thanks to the OP – developer collaboration.

S. Pasinelli adds that we need the CO group to take care of standardizing the SW and to take care of some tasks in order to have the modifications done in an efficient, standard and controlled way.

3 AOB

V. Kain reminds the working group members of the deadline of the first version of the checklists as end of September. The final version should be ready by end October