30 April 2010

Summary of the 2nd DT Steering Board meeting

http://indico.cern.ch/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=91663

Participating: Philippe Bloch, Livio Mapelli, Christian Joram, Ferdinand Hahn, Antti Onnela, Diego Perini, Burkhard Schmidt, Joachim Baechler, Paolo Petagna, Paolo Martinengo, Andrea Catinaccio, Mar Capeans, Hans Danielsson, Michael Moll, Leszek Ropelewski, Alan Honma, Paola Tropea, Archana Sharma, Wisla Carena, Werner Riegler, Marzio Nessi, Austin Ball, Werner Witzeling, Duccio Abbaneo, Joerg Wotschack, Veronique Wedlake (minutes)
Excused: Lucie Linssen, Ernst Radermacher

Welcome / Introduction to WP R&D policy/future (Livio Mapelli)

LM welcomes all participants -> meeting not only restricted to Steering Board members
Aim of meeting:

- review progress of the White Paper R&D work
- assess the R&D needs and the priorities of the experiments
- identify needs of generic R&D beyond White Papers (ending in 2011)

Overview of 2009 activities / resource allocation (Christian Joram/Ferdinand Hahn)

See presentation attached 'Overview DT 2009', short version of presentation given at PH Retreat meeting (February 2010).

Comments: Expected evolution of activities (Slide 8) :

- numbers not adapted to new LHC schedule (Running 2010,11 shutdown for 2012) (CJ)

New requests / follow-up of Retreat meeting (Christian Joram)

See presentation attached 'New requests'

The proposed policy "dealing with conflict between LHC/non LHC activities" was endorsed (slide 2).
CJ expects that a detailed list of new activities with realistic resource estimates for all LHC experiments can be established by early Summer 2010.

- Who decides on priorities? Decision making in Steering Board (Livio). A new Steering Board meeting could be called if resource conflicts arise.

Overview of DT WP R&D activities (Christian Joram)

See presentation attached 'R&D Intro Joram'

- define an efficient way to work in the future (avoiding duplicating tasks between different departments etc...) Are there duplicated facilities between DT and the experiments?
- Evolution of White Paper R&D (slide 5) → WP 4 and 5 could split in 3 categories : Detector specific R&D, Generic R&D, and Facilities.

N.B: the existing annual reports describing all Work Packages will be uploaded on PH website.

WP4 (Michael Moll)

See attached presentation 'WP4 Moll' and 'Report 2009'

- strong need to maintain infrastructure and expertise beyond WP4 lifetime.
- very close collaboration between WP4 on one side and ATLAS and CMS on the other side.
- CMS very satisfied with cooperation (Duccio A.)

WP5 (Leszek Ropelewski)

See attached presentation 'WP5 Ropelewski' and 'Report 2009'

- Original technical objectives (mainly related to large GEM/Micromegas technology) largely fulfilled. Future R&D plans need to be revised. ATLAS, CMS and TOTEM priorities, perhaps, not in line with presented projects (Slide 18)
- RD51 common fund approx. 100K/year; CERN contribution to WP5 is 780k. RD51 is network of competence, not of resources. (Ph. Bloch)
- Facilities (gas detector lab, test beam) build up need to be maintained, they are useful for all experiments. Maintaining of gas detector expertise is important. CERN has a long tradition of expertise in this field, which must be maintained (Ph. Bloch)
- Portable multiple DAQ system (page 9) was considered to be to some extent a duplication of EUDET efforts (L. Musa).

WP6 (Alan Honma)

See attached presentation 'WP6 Honma'

- Funding stops end of 2010 (1 fellow extends into 2011)
- Experiments in favour of supporting this activity; should become a facility (service) in PH-DT group.
- Is it planned (possible) to develop standard QA protocols like in space experiments? (M. Moll). An excellent QA was done for LHC, however adding strict protocols with large administrative overhead like in space programs is not considered attractive.

WP7 (Mar Capeans/Michael Moll)

See attached presentations 'Report 2009' , 'WP7 Capeans' and 'WP7 Moll'

- RPC running since 3 years, need to continue 12-18 months. Important to ensure continuation to complete this study.
- CMS has interest in RPC gas flow studies. Important for trapezoidal chambers in the endcap.
- GIF++ implementation will come with AIDA program, funds to be evaluated within AIDA context. (Ph. Bloch)
- Upgrade p/n facilities: East Hall renovation plan. Proposal to be submitted next week to LHCC : real cost difficult to estimate (M. Moll)

→ New PS Layout:

PH Dep. should be involved in definition of new PS layout/infrastructure with EN. Preservation of CLOUD beam line to be checked (Ph. Bloch)

WP11 (Paolo Petagna)

See attached presentations 'Report 2009' & 'WP11 Petagna'

- Very important activity for NA62, strong interest by all LHC experiments, support to ATLAS/CMS cooling systems M&O
- All experiments appreciate new initiatives on CO2 and micro channel cooling.
- WP11 could become a PH Cooling Service (similar to Gas and Magnet Control).
- For Atlas the WP11 activity represents only a fraction of the total cooling activities in ATLAS (M. Nessi)
- Organization: Cooling is collaboration between PH, EN and TE departments. No change for short and mid-term. Longer term organization may be discussed at a later stage.

General discussion / concluding remarks (Livio Mapelli - Philippe Bloch)

→All experiments are asked to send their views/feedback to PH Management in order to plan resources for the future. Please answer the set of questions on the next page.

Questions to the experiments

We expect one reply per experiment. Please address all work packages individually WP4,5,6,7,11.

(1) What is the relevance of this WP fitting for your experimental program?

(2) Are the deliverables expected by end of 2011 meeting your requirements?
   a. If yes, how many of these deliverables should be available and when and what else are you expecting (production, integration, ...)?
   b. If not, what are the extra developments needed and in which time scale?

(3) Which resources are you able to inject in that particular project either to reach completion of new requirements or to customise or to integrate? With which time scale?

(4) How do you see the long term future (beyond 2011) of this WP ? (e.g. extension, reduction, re-focus, conversion to service, absorption in experiment specific upgrade projects, …).

(5) General comments