

Project Managers Report for July 2004

On Tuesday 6 July a meeting of the RSVP leaders met with the new Project Management. Invited and mostly present in person, with some participants on the telephone, were Willis, Kotcher and Firestone from the Project Office, Goldberg representing the NSF, Pile from the AGS, Hebert and Marx from the experiment project offices, and experimenters Bryman, Littenberg, Mincer, Molzon, Nemethy, Sculli and Zeller. The Agenda included:

- **Overview of Roles and Responsibilities**
- **Upcoming Reviews**
- **Logistics of Yearly Funding Allocations**
- **Distribution of FY 2004 \$4.8M**
- **Development of Resource-loaded Schedules**
- **Routing of Money**
- **Team Status, Plans**
- **Governmental Relations**
- **Other Business**

Noteworthy was a lively discussion of the tools to be used for the Work Breakdown Structure and Reporting. Views were collected and after this meeting Kotcher spent some time investigating the options, and a decision was reached that the relatively simple system now in use for the LHC work at BNL will be adapted for RSVP.

It was indicated that a meeting will be needed to clarify the expectations for the WBS, heading toward a Baseline. It was recognized by all participants that this is a major effort. We hope to have this “Baseline Review Expectations” meeting in September, but it is not yet scheduled in early August.

A series of critical technical and management reviews have been scheduled for the remaining months of this calendar year. Priority was given to establishing a review group for the MECO magnet, and it is now scheduled for 10-12 October, since we are very anxious to proceed at the greatest speed possible for this critical item. We do want to put together the best team possible for this group. This is to be a standing committee, the Magnet Oversight Group, which will meet periodically to give the best advice to the MECO team as well as Project Management on technical, procurement, management, scheduling and cost aspects of the magnet system. We sought to find a Chairperson who can spend an adequate effort to structure the work of the MOG and its documentation, and we are happy that Tom Taylor from CERN has agreed to do this job. He has used his personal connections with the other leading experts in the field to put together a group willing to invest their time in this task, though most of them are very much in demand for their own work. We have tentative acceptances from Taylor, Elwyn Baynham from RAL, Gene Fisk from FNAL (who provides continuity with previous MECO reviews), Herman ten Kate from CERN, and Akira Yamamoto from KEK have all tentatively agreed to

serve on the standing oversight committee. The accumulated experience of this group is unparalleled, and we expect that we will gain a lot of value from their work.

Our review of the plans of the AGS is tentatively scheduled in October, after the MOG review. There are a number of issues that will certainly need careful study.

A review of Simulation in KOPIO and MECO is another priority, and we intend to hold a review with the best experts we can get in November. We are determined to ensure that the experiments have simulations of the very highest quality, commensurate with the ambitious goals we have set. First of all, we must be show that the goals are feasible, even under the most demanding scrutiny. The level of detail and precision attainable in the best simulations has reached the stage where they can be validated in detail in experimental control measurements, including the various types of backgrounds. This will allow us to overcome the arguments of skeptics, and more important, ensure that we do not encounter any unpleasant surprises that might impact cost, schedule, or physics performance. We may need to have in mind a standing group in this case as well, depending on the outcome of the first review.

Discussions with members of the KOPIO group indicate that they would appreciate the value added by the efforts of a top group of physicists and engineers to look at their large, low-mass vacuum chamber. This will be essential before we can evaluate the performance, cost and schedule of this critical system in their experiment. Evidently the Simulation of KOPIO cannot be definitive until this device has at least a good conceptual design, carefully reviewed. We are anxious to push this review ahead as rapidly as allowed by the considerations of the experiment and the project office, and we hope to have it in November or December.

Given the high priority of these critical system reviews, we do not think it will be realistic to expect to carry out many of the reviews of the particle detectors, triggers, data acquisition systems and the like that will be needed before we can prepare for a Baseline Review. To move ahead at the greatest speed, we may wish to schedule a trial baseline review in parallel with some of the technical reviews, to determine how well we are progressing on the project management aspects.