



Science & Technology Facilities Council

FEEDBACK AND ACTIONS FROM THE MEETING OF THE MICE OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE HELD ON 24TH APRIL 2014

There had been good overall progress, which was more notable than in the past, with the arrival of a significant amount of equipment had arrived at RAL since the last meeting. The installation of the tracker into Spectrometer Solenoid 2 marked the achievement of a major milestone.

The Committee congratulate the Collaboration on the smooth management transition and welcome the filling of key posts and implementation of new management structure.

The Committee note the recent issues with the 2013/14 finances and welcomed the checks and balances that were now being put in place to make the financial position more transparent and procedures more robust in the future.

The Committee thank the Collaboration for the presentations. In particular members congratulate Roy Preece and Alan Grant on focusing on the significant key topics that were helpful in clarifying a number of issues and alleviating concerns.

The Oversight Committee welcome the alignment of accelerator and science programmes that had been set out in the Programmatic Review (Page 15) and see this as an important recognition of the interplay between the two.

The Committee would prefer future reports to be shorter and less repetitive so that the coherence is improved and the report focuses on the information that is of importance to the Committee. However it is crucial that information was not lost and some of the more vital aspects, e.g. critical path and percentage to completion, should be reinstated. The Committee was surprised to note that the Executive Summary did not include information concerning the US situation and associated risks and ask the Collaboration to be sure that the areas of greatest strategic concern are fully reflected and highlighted in the report.

Action: The Collaboration

The Committee ask that further thought be given to the treatment of contingency and working margin as it notes that whilst the figures included 35% working margin the cost of the risks was not explicit. In addition it is concerned to see the total helium costs in the 2014/15 projection included within the working margin as some of this spend for training the magnets was certain and should be included in the base cost. The Committee feels that only possible additional spend should be called out in this way.

Future financial reports should be solely based on costs including overheads and should include a table showing the total cost to completion (including past spend) to Step V (and Step VI?) for a given set of assumptions.

The Committee remain uneasy about the Focus Coils noting that the operating margin has largely disappeared and would like to better understand the new limit of 160A and how the 0.85 factor was derived. The committee request a short report at the next meeting. In



addition the impact of these changes on the physics outcome remained unclear so the Committee would like a short report and presentation at the next meeting setting out the impact on science of operating at 160A rather than the original specification of 200A.

In particular the committee would like to understand the science impact of one **or** both AFCs operating at 160A, relative to the original specification of both operating at 200A.

Action: The Collaboration

The Committee would like to have an update on progress with Focus Coil #2 in between meetings.

Action: The Collaboration

The Committee again discussed the issues around completion of Steps V and VI and is not convinced of the scientific necessity of Step VI. It notes with concern the potential 6% reduction in the US High Energy Physics budget, the forthcoming P5 review and the possible impact this might have on the US funding of MICE. Given these circumstances the Committee believe that step VI is highly unlikely to be financially viable. At the same time it notes that Step IV is a necessary and essential milestone and so encourages the Collaboration to focus on delivering Steps IV and V to maximise the scientific return on the significant investment that has been made to date by both the UK and US.

To facilitate future discussions the Committee would like to have the cost to completion up to Step V for a flat cash scenario based on the baseline and worst case scenarios (the red & green lines in the present report).

Action: The Collaboration

The Committee noted the £409k overspend in 2013/14 and suggests that STFC considers how to account for it and whether it should be recovered over the lifetime of the project or just added to the total cost of the project.

Action: The Committee

The Committee note that the shipping of the LiH absorber seems to have stalled and that this appears to be a simple issue of communication between the UK and US.

Action: The STFC

A provisional date of Monday 13th of October has been proposed and if unsuitable further possibilities will be sought by doodle poll.

Action: The Committee