

Feedback from Oversight Committee

- Committee:
 - ◆ Steve Watts (Brunel).
 - ◆ Craig Buttar (Glasgow).
 - ◆ Alan Smith (MSSL).
- General comments:
 - ◆ Thanks to speakers for clear talks.
 - ◆ “Impressive team of world class ability.”
 - ◆ Good technical progress: ISIS considered to be a worthwhile development.
 - ◆ “Drs Greenshaw and Worm will need to work together to ensure that the Collaboration maintains its current high profile.”
- ◆ LCFI must control costs.
- Comments on Proposal:
 - ◆ Explain need for ISIS and reasons for parallel development of ISIS and CPCCD.
 - ◆ Explain physics and other benefits of ISIS.
 - ◆ Provide risk analysis regarding CPCCD and ISIS.
 - ◆ Review milestones and achievements of last 3 years.

Additional comments made in meeting

- Provide milestones for new project.
- Loss of link to e2v would be a concern.
- Costs of ISIS development must be defined.
- Have all possible measures been taken to shield CPCCD from electromagnetic interference?
- Discussions will take place between PPARC and CCLRC on estimating (RAL) costs at these have proved difficult to predict.
- How will Intellectual Property Rights be handled?
- Please provide list of publications, conference talks...
- Question raised about Full Economic Costing and LCFI proposal – Kim Dollimore replied, “...full economic costing...from 1 September 2005”.
- Paper submissions accepted until 31st March 2005, after that only electronic submissions accepted.
- Next meeting:
8th June 2005, 10.00, Swindon,
LCFI joining for coffee at 11.00.