

Don Edwards
August 23, 2003

Comments on Slipstacking Review

1. A Charge to the Committee is necessary. From the discussion with Pusha Bhat on Friday, August 22, I would assume that the Committee is to examine the technical content and costs associated with WBS Item 1.3.1.1, and to report conclusions based on that material. That;s a guess; the Charge must come from management.
2. The number and frequency of reviews requires that they be conducted with efficiency. Formal presentations should be avoided; I prefer a question-and-answer session. In this case, two hours strikes me as adequate, followed by an hour of executive session during which the Committee drafts its report. The Chair has to glue it together afterward, but that is relatively easy.
3. An initial discussion with Ioanis Kourbanis would be useful for me and perhaps for other members of the Committee. I downloaded his DOR Review presentation, and I need help in interpreting a few of the transparencies. This would be an opportunity for him to comment on developments since the DOE Review.
4. It would be useful to see the expansion associated with WBS 1.3.1.1 before the meeting. The M&S item has doubled in the three week interval between the Temple review and the DOE presentation. The only statement in the Kourbanis DOE presentation that I see with clear cost implication is “additional solid state amplifier modules will be needed”.
5. My main problem is my lack of understanding of beam loading compensation . That strikes me as the most interesting question, but that may be a consequence of my unfamiliarity with the subject. Seems to me that it would be good to devote substantial time to the subject with “experts” in the room.