

- R&D to be resumed!
- Three beam tests planned at Kek,
 - Hybrid target (KEKB Linac)
 - Liquid target (ATF Linac)
 - Boron-Nitride Window (KEKB)
 - (Starting JFY09)
- Possible ART funds in USFY10
- How does R&D contribute to baseline risk mitigation?
- Fall workshops to renew GDE focus on this technically important subsystem.

ic

Renewing the RDR risk register.

- in addition to simple updates
 - Work completed
- to be made uniform through the application of common criteria across each subsystem's risk listing.
 - positron subsection of the register may be difficult
- Standard matrix scoring approach:
- Risk is defined as the probability of failure:
- 6 kinds of failure:
 - basic technology,
 - engineering,
 - production yield,
 - product reliability,
 - existence of a viable backup, and
 - schedule.
- we should consider only the first 2 out of the list above: basic
- technology and engineering.

Decision point 'times':

- The project can respond to perceived risk at any time,
- generally accepted that the penalty for doing so increases with time
- For the TDP-1 evaluation of risk we should adopt our reference point to be the end of TDP-2 (Ewan's time T_1).
 - (to be completed and submitted as part of the SB2009 Proposal Document in mid-December 2009)
- This is justified because we have a comprehensive R & D Plan which includes resource estimates and technical milestones.

Risk Register shows impact

- The perception of risk is derived from a series of simple questions based on present status and plans.
- The anticipated penalty is based on how the project would respond and apply a mitigation strategy once failure is evident or the risk becomes too great.
- Both the risk (probability) and penalty (cost of responding to failure) must be considered in order to gauge the impact.
- It is the 'impact' which is recorded and summarized in the register.

ilc.

Register update process

- the 53 element (10 positron items):
- score each element:
 - based on what has been achieved to date and
 - where we expect to be following TDP-2 using the following questions.
- To Jim Clarke (e+ TAGL):
- A specific request: use the scheme below on the 10 e+ baseline register entries
 - He has agreed
 - (ACD entries, shown to AAP at TILC09, also to be evaluated).
- Will ask the other AS leaders to do the same.
- Akira will likely lead the SRF discussion directly.

Scoring: Basic Technology

•	Within the state of the art?	0
•	One year advancement with minimal resources	1-2
	 (no beam test facility experiments required) 	
•	Two to three years advancement - moderate resources	3-5
	 (BTF experiments may be required) 	
•	More than 3 years advancement -substantial resources	6-8
	 (BTF experiments definitely required) 	
•	New technology required; development cycle unknown	9-10

Scoring: Engineering Development

•	Fully tested, completed production - units on hand	? (0
•	Prototype exists and has been tested		1-2
•	Hardware and software development needed		3-5
•	Detailed design underway, 6	5-8	
	 development task effort not 'scoped' 		
•	Concept defined, detailed design effort not 'scoped	I' 9	9-10

Updating the RR - Step by step:

- 1. Record and justify the scores with a few sentences including a reference to presented or published material.
- 2. Develop a practical mitigation strategy for each of the delineated project stages for each of the failures. What would the project do if progress was deemed unsatisfactory until the end of TDP-2?
- **3.** Estimate the cost for the mitigation effort, using costing guidelines similar to those used for the RDR

- 4. Roll the resulting scoring and mitigation costs up to *create a summary 'risk assessment'* to be entered at the top level of the register as a kind of executive summary.
- 5. Review the most serious register elements in detail to ensure the scoring, mitigation strategy and costing have been done consistently according to basic guidelines. (Perform top-down management review.)
- 6. Identify new register elements that have emerged since 2007 or that were missed in the initial draft.