



**Injectors Re-commissioning Working Group
Minutes**

Date: 17/09/2015

Pages: 4



Authors:	B. Lefort
Revised by:	B. Mikulec, V. Kain, S. Mataguez
Approved by:	V. Kain

ATTENDEES LIST:

Name	Affiliation
Bernardini, M.	EN-MEF
Coupard, J.	EN-MEF
Hay, D.	EN-MEF
Kain, V.	BE-OP
Kuchler, D.	ABP-HSL
Lefort, B.	BE-OP
Mcfarlane, D.	EN-MEF
Mataguez, S.	EN-EMF



INDEX

1	LAST MEETING'S MINUTES.....	3
2	EN-MEF INVOLVMENT WITH THE PSB HARDWARE TESTS	3
3	EN-MEF INVOLVEMENT WITH THE PS-TT2 TEST PERIOD	3
4	EN-MEF INVOLVEMENT WITH THE SPS TEST PERIOD.....	4
5	AOB.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

1 LAST MEETING'S MINUTES

Last meeting's minutes are approved.

V. Kain reports on the meeting with the DSO. The checklists were discussed in this meeting. In general the DSO agrees with the structure. The tests of the EIS have to be mentioned. The check lists' goal should also be to be "ready for the DSO test" as well as for beam commissioning.

2 EN-MEF INVOLVMENT WITH THE PSB HARDWARE TESTS

David Hay presents the involvement of EN-MEF during the HW tests.

EN-MEF was mainly involved for schedule, accesses and field coordination. There was a detailed planning reflecting the start-up schedule and the PSB hardware tests.

During the dry runs, during weekday, one PSB operator was available in the CCC from 6h to 21h to ensure support for the hardware tests and the dry runs.

Globally there were very few problems.

In the planning there is clearly a "no-access" period where the electrical tests were performed. All the accesses were managed through IMPACT.

3 EN-MEF INVOLVEMENT WITH THE PS-TT2 TEST PERIOD

Simon Mataguez presents the involvement of EN-MEF during the tests of the PS-TT2 areas.

Not all shutdown work could be finished before hardware tests started in the PS. Hardware testing and access had to be interleaved causing concern due to the lack of safety procedures. Since then an official procedure has been released.

Safety and planning was ensured by OP on shift who were checking the IMPACT validity and the authorised persons list before authorizing the accesses.

Some issues appeared during the CO tests and the TE-EPC tests. CO could not carry out particular tests due to circuits not ready yet and EPC could not carry out tests due to missing FESA classes.

Main relevant outcomes are:

- Dedicated time slots have to be respected. Shutdown work needs to be finished during the shutdown.
- In order to improve the stand-alone tests, some anticipation is needed: test definition, equipment groups, quality plan, rigorous check-out (inverted polarities, faulty instruments...).



- Responsibility and safety procedure for H/W tests have to be sorted out and anticipated.

S. Mataguez point out that there were too many meetings (LEIR, Linac2, Booster, PS...) and that the HW test meeting could have been grouped.

As conclusion, S. Mataguez remarks however that the machine was returned to BE/OP with less than 24 hours delay (compared to the 15 months shutdown).

S. Mataguez says that the hand-over to OP should be done just after the end of the unlocking of the circuits, the start of the hardware tests, to improve the coordination and efficiency.

4 EN-MEF INVOLVEMENT WITH THE SPS TEST PERIOD

David Mcfarlane presents the involvement of EN-MEF during the tests of the SPS areas.

TE-EPC proposed to start testing the auxiliary converters while the machine was still open. This was made possible, but required prior preparations (interlocks, water...). The possibility to start testing when the machine is still open will be incorporated for the next long shutdown planning. It will give more flexibility. Safety aspects will be covered.

After the TE-EPC tests all the IMPACTs were cancelled and 3 new IMPACT periods were created.

During these periods, the access was controlled by OP in the CCC; there were informal morning meetings everyday in the CCC to discuss if and when any accesses could be made. Anybody who required access needed to contact the operators and be present at this meeting.

All tests that were done after the 27th June 2014 were coordinated by BE/OP and TE/EPC. This collaboration ran smoothly.

David also remarked that the checklists should indicate which tests can be carried out when the machine is open and which need a closed machine. Safety aspects and precautions should be covered there as well.