

## EC Meeting 27-MAY-10

Guest: A. Seryi

Discussion of memo revision by A. Seryi:

- Communications, so far are pretty good. Good contact with Karsten and he has collected info from detector colleagues. Table shows FTEs needed for detectors. A. Seryi will not add machine. Comments in red are edits by Seryi with info he has now. Labs have not verified the numbers – we (GDE) have a factor of 2 (is this okay) and who will contact the labs for permissions/approvals. We need to validate commitments from the labs.
- Should PM's take responsibility or will Seryi do it? PM's and Andrei could do it together. Marc will work with Andrei to validate commitments. Andrei will work with experimentalists to validate numbers. EC members should read this document carefully and respond quickly.
- We should move along and try to be ready by next week. Special EC can happen next week to discuss if possible.

CLOSED Meeting

Public Minutes:

- 24 hours for revisions

Announcements:

- Directors corner
  - o Please see the list and your assigned date.
  - o Barry wrote directors corner this week because assigned article was not done.
  - o It is important to hear from people other than director and once a month is a reasonable time.
- GDE Detector joint group
  - o Confusion as to where this has gone.
  - o SY has nominated 5 people for contact for the BAWs. He specifically said this is not for the general joint group. We need people for the BAWs but how they interact and with whom is not solved. Agreed to concentrate on the two major meetings and defer the general group for the time being. SY has asked BF to nominate people for the BAW group. MCR should do this as he is working on the workshops.
  - o NW talked to Karsten. There was hope by KB that the group would include the MDI issues, etc. but SY wished it only to be concerned with the BAW meeting preparation. SY asked who was going to chair this group.
  - o They need the correct charge. BF will respond to SY and he should contact PMs and JMP.
  - o There is a necessity to have a more general group as BF envisaged in his Beijing talk. BF will continue to work on developing Terms of Reference including SY and J. Dorfan. An EC meeting should happen with experimentalists and JD to further the progress.
- AAP follow-up
  - o Waiting on message from EE.

Reports:

- ECFA – n/a
  
- ALCPG11
  - o Org for this meeting will be traditional as a GDE meeting.

- PIP
  - o Conference call with PMs in a few weeks for discuss framework.
  - o Definite proposal will be presented in Paris
  - o SCRF industrial meeting may have info for this proposal.
  
- Governance
  - o Copy with additions by A. Suzuki has been sent to EC members
  - o A new version now exists in which BF has rewritten the introduction and incorporated the section on site selection I to the introduction. BF would prefer a more detailed separate section on site selection and has asked AS whether he could produce this but the default position is the current draft. AS text mentions handing over the Site Selection definition to ILCSC, which was new at least to BF.
  - o Executive Summary was written by BF. It isn't exactly a summary, recommendations still require reading the body of document.
  - o The suggestion was to change the name to "Summary" or "Overview"

Next step:

- This version has been sent to Suzuki, and will be sent to EC, then approve by next Thursday. At the same time BF asked for approval to send it on to key people such as e.g. R-DH for opinion. Then it will be submitted to FALC for June meeting.

Regional Dir/PM

- Asia
  - o India – No response from India. Waiting for contact for resources. FNAL might be able to assist with contact.
  
- US
  - o Dialogue: what are we going to do beyond 2012?
  - o Presentation by M. Harrison – this was mentioned by Dennis Kovar at Fermilab Annual Users' Meeting, 2june2010.
  - o Program shows as turning down. Should we show a line for CD0?
    - It is said in 2014. Should be added at this point.
  - o We need to understand how this interacts with other potential US projects.
  - o We need a master strategy; we should discuss this more at the Paris meeting.
  - o If we want to bring this project forward we need to make it plausible that a host can come forward.

(under PMs:) For both the BAW and response to the PAC, we need to be preparing impacts of three RF Power scenarios: Klystron Cluster, DRFS and RDR components in a single tunnel. We have people assigned to the first two configuration, but are lacking both definition and a person responsible for the third scenario.