

## REPORT of April 20th MEETING of the FFCC

A videoconference of the Fusion Facilities Coordinating Committee was held on April 20th. The meeting was a follow up to the Budget Planning meeting held in Germantown April 4-6. The participants in the meeting were Rich Hawryluk, Richard Hazeltine, Ian Hutchinson, Jerry Navratil, Martin Peng, Erol Oktay, Mike Roberts, Ned Sauthoff, Ron Stambaugh and John Willis.

The meeting began with a general discussion of the issues associated with the meeting in Germantown. John Willis had previously indicated and reinforced that the facilities project managers should review their "plain English milestones." He felt that the milestones had become more jargon intensive and we had done better last year. **Action: Submit revised milestones by end of May.**

John indicated that in general the presentations by the facilities were on target and a good process is in place to develop the work scope prior to the meeting. The subsequent discussion also made clear that the presentations were more likely to be used as reference documents than the long text, which is submitted. Whether the text can be done in manner to make it more useful, for instance as part of a database, remains an open question. He also felt it was important to define what full utilization of the facilities would entail, recognizing that this might require budgets in excess of \$300M. Information about this had been provided to Warren Marton in response to a question posed previously. John was interested not just in the incremental costs associated with run weeks but the costs associated to make the program effective. For the time being the focus will be on full utilization assuming single shift operation. Full double shift operation would require additional staff, which may not be available. The extent to which full utilization would enable a significant increase in participation by other Universities in the program as opposed to more intensive facility utilization by present participation was briefly discussed and not fully resolved. The simple answer is that both would occur with the balance not clear. **Action: Warren Marton to distribute the analysis for full utilization and provide the facilities an opportunity to review the input.**

If you have not provided information to Willis or your DOE program manager on the "10% cut" case, you are requested to. **Action: Facilities program managers**

The status of the IPPA was given. Drafts of the relevant sections of the document will be available during the upcoming weeks and the FFCC will need to review and provide input.

**The next meeting of the FFCC will be on May 26<sup>th</sup> at PPPL.** In preparation for the meeting, Rich Hawryluk will distribute the proposed Publication Policy and has sent out by fax the list of VLT enabling technology activities. FFCC members who have not received the VLT report should contact Rich. A significant element of the meeting will be a discussion of how the large facilities (national teams, host institutions, and collaborators) are reviewed and evaluated. **Action: The facilities project heads are to develop by May 18<sup>th</sup> draft recommendations on how such reviews should be held and distributed to the entire committee.**

Mike Roberts and Ray Schwartz gave a presentation on the relatively new facilities operating group within OFES. A key objective here is to provide OFES with sufficient information that they can respond to requests for information regarding budget and impact on the budget. A suggestion by Ian and supported by John was that with this information OFES could draft a proposed response and ask the facilities to comment on it with a short deadline for a turnaround. Since OFES is more familiar with the context of the question, they can craft an answer for the intended audience and the facilities program managers can check for technical accuracy or omissions of fact. Some questions are frequently asked and the facilities program managers will be expected to provide DOE with current information and inform DOE of changes to their response. **Action: OFES is to prepare a list of "Frequently Asked Congressional/OMB Questions" by May 26<sup>th</sup>.**

Ray Schwartz described the need for a new committee focused on operations and ES&H issues composed of people actively involved in these issues. While the committee will include personnel from the major facilities, it will also include those from small university projects. This committee will function as a

subcommittee of the FFCC. This group would be a subgroup of the FFCC and focus on the following objectives:

- Share lessons learned and good practices (by for example conference calls, occasional meetings, web sites.

- Foster Continuous Improvement in Operations and ES&H

- Identify a subject matter expert network.

**Action: PPPL to identify someone to lead and setup this committee by May 5<sup>th</sup> and develop a charter by next meeting. Facilities program managers to identify people to participate in this.**

Ron Stambaugh noted that we have a great deal in common with high energy particle physics accelerators, nuclear physics accelerators, light sources, etc. in that we all operate large facilities and we should strive to develop strong ties with these other groups. Richard indicated that it is not good to view us as a set of facilities. Ian indicated that we should see the facilities as resources to do the good science. As a practical matter, we should investigate whether the subcommittee for operations and ES&H issues should develop ties with other national user facilities and if so how. **Action: OFES to coordinate with High Energy and Nuclear Physics and Basic Energy Sciences on accelerator operations to identify meetings on accelerator operations by May 26<sup>th</sup>.**