

I should have added one further comment. When we present at the RLSR/MPB we need to have at least one option that is affordable. The STFC position might be summarised as:

- If the SSD recovery programme is not affordable it is not an option;
- If the SSD recovery programme does not include support for commissioning on the beam line it is not an option.

## **MICE OsC 21Mar16; close-out**

---

- The committee thanked the collaboration for the updates and the presentations.
- The committee welcomed progress in the RF-power, PRY and the S/w&C projects. The OsC recognised the strong contribution being made to the project by DL — and congratulated DL on this.
- SSD:
  - In the opinion of the OsC, an in-house recovery solution at a US lab is unacceptable unless the US also takes on the responsibility for the delivery, on-site commissioning and operation of the magnet as well as any remediation costs incurred;
  - The OsC believes that the cold-mass only option (i.e. build cold-mass and retrofit in the magnet) increases the schedule risk substantially;
  - The OsC strongly believes that a "build-to-specification" procurement is the preferred solution;
  - The OsC believes that commissioning and operation must remain the responsibility of the group that constructs the magnet;
  - The OsC believes that if a build-to-print option is chosen, the US must retain full responsibility for the commissioning and operation on the beam line as well as any required remedial action.
- The OsC endorses the completion of the Step IV programme to maximise the scientific return of the present configuration.
- The OsC suggests that the STFC weighs the scientific return of Step IV against the risk of failure to deliver the demonstration of ionization cooling.
- The OsC is concerned that the MAP Director, in his new position at BNL, can devote only 15% of his time to MICE.
- The OsC notes the technical issues associated with the LH2 system.
- For the C2C review the collaboration should:
  - Explore the cost of stopping after completing the scientific programme of Step IV;
  - Assess the optimal strategy to minimise cost while maximising the scientific return on the STFC's investment in the project;
  - Consider descope options (such as not doing LH2) that simplify, derisk or reduce cost in the project;

- Since the flat-cash option may be optimistic given the outcome of the CSR, the collaboration should consider descope options that reduce cost;
- In exploring de-scope options, the OsC recommends that the collaboration does not exceed the time taken to deliver the project in the flat-cash option.

it was made very clear that the present STFC understanding is that the present SSD recovery plan is too risky and is likely to be unaffordable.

- We need to consider:
- What if we just continue to run Step IV (this one is damage to science, not really MIPO);
- What if we do nothing and just use SSD as is;
- What if we reconsider the “open-heart” surgery?
- What if we reconsider the “partnership” in which we work through the procurement in such a way as to access more personnel support from outside the US?
- Other scenarios that bring the cost down ...