

Meeting Invitees	Attended	Meeting Invitees	Attended
Giorgio Apollinari		Young-Kee Kim	
Jeff Appel	X	Elaine McCluskey	X
Greg Bock	X	Randy Ortgiesen	X
Pepin Carolan	X	Gina Rameika	X
Paul Derwent	X	Vladimir Shiltsev	X
Roger Dixon		Ed Temple	
Peter Garbincius		Bob Webber	
Bill Griffing		Vicky White	
Nancy Grossman			
Dean Hoffer	X		
Steve Holmes	X		
Jim Kerby	X		
Bob Kephart	X		

Additional Attendees**ACTION ITEMS AS A RESULT OF THIS MEETING:**

New Action Items	Person Responsible
Find out if NSLSII had a CD-0 review	P Carolan
Provide link to SCMS Office of Science CD-0 Procedure	P Carolan to E McCluskey
Add Bruce Strauss to meeting invitation	S Holmes
Clarify whether 5-year resource/schedule window is correct timeframe, or would whole TPC schedule/cost range be presented?	P Carolan
Talk to Bruce Strauss about CD-0 approval timing and PED funding request for FY11	S Holmes
Try to locate CD-0 approval documents from other projects	E McCluskey/P Carolan
In-progress Action Items	
Determine how quickly NSLS-II has achieved its CD's	D Hoffer/E McCluskey

Agenda and Presentation slides for this meeting can be found at
http://www.fnal.gov/directorate/OPMO/Projects/PX/WGM/2008/09_25/mtg.htm

Handouts: none

1. CD-0 Mission Need Document components and general CD-0 discussion
see Hoffer slides
 - a. Comment that requirements escalation imply that CD-1 requirements almost apply at CD-0 for a project like this
 - b. Question about the time between CD-0 and CD-1 and the 18 month budget cycle for PED funds request. How does this match - not always well. Question whether R&D funds could be used on the project after CD-1, answer is that it seems feasible, but PED is meant to fund preliminary design activities and not have R&D monies used for that.
 - c. Steve asked whether the CD-0 IPR is a physics review and a cost/schedule review? Don't know answer now; try to find out what was done for NSLSII.
 - d. Question of what is highest acceptable cost for the project? P5 report listed \$1B.

- e. Gina and Pepin noted that DOE OHEP is writing their own Mission Need Statements recently and asking for input from the labs. Will try to find other examples of CD-0 approval documents to see what level of detail is included.
 - f. Should Mission Need mention alternatives? Since the cost range is supposed to include alternatives (selection not made until CD-1), probably yes. All assumptions should be documented now, and then this document should be kept up.
 - g. Gina noted that for DUSEL they are being asked the annual operating costs – should life cycle costs be computed, and how does that relate to reuse of the facility in a future time? This ties to Value Engineering/Management and making the design more efficient and attentive to decommissioning.
 - h. Example shown gives 5 year window for cost/schedule. Is this what's required, or do you show full TPC cost/schedule range?
 - i. Discussed costs related to space management (one for one replacement program) – can banked space be gotten from another lab, does the project pay for it, will space need to be demolished on our site, too? Agreed this needs attention soon, since it affects cost estimate.
2. Discussion on Preparations for CD-0 **see Hoffer slides**
- a. ICD (Derwent) will be ready by November for collaboration meeting
 - b. Working on WBS and dictionary (Kerby) in conjunction with cost estimate
 - c. Key assumptions document - should include scope (in/out), lab scheduling information, agreements with program office, and should be controlled document
 - d. High level risks, which leads to developing contingency rules.
 - e. Document contingency process so everyone uses the same approach. Do these get applied to CD-0 estimate? Not necessarily.
 - f. High level schedule (Kerby) is being developed in conjunction with cost estimate. Output is CD dates and schedule range
 - g. Need to have potential scope contingency in mind
3. Other items needed **see Hoffer slides**
- a. From meeting with YKK last Friday, moving toward settling on one scheduling tool.
 - b. Comment that common resource rates to be used for all projects doing estimating would be helpful, as well as escalation rates. Finance section is working on the latter, and the former will be available soon via OHAP.
4. Project Timeline **see Hoffer slides**
- a. It was noted that all CD-0 documentation will need to be in place for the CD-0 Director's Review – February may be difficult.
 - b. Steve will talk with Bruce about the timeline, whether the CD-0 approval timing in summer would affect PED funding request for FY11.

Next meeting will be in approximately one month – still working on finding a set time when everyone can attend.