



Argonne
NATIONAL
LABORATORY

... for a brighter future



U.S. Department
of Energy

UChicago ►
Argonne_{LLC}



**Office of
Science**
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

A U.S. Department of Energy laboratory
managed by UChicago Argonne, LLC

APS Renewal Planning Process

Dennis M. Mills
Deputy Director, APS

PUC and APSUO
September 16, 2009

Background

- APS Renewal Plans discussed at User Meeting on May 4-8, 2008
- Science Teams Develop Science Cases by September 15, 2008
- APS Renewal Workshop on October 20-21, 2008
- Instrumentation Open Forum on January 9, 2009
- Summary of Instrumentation Forum presented to SAC on January 20, 2009
- Renewal Discussions with User Community at User Meeting, May 4-6, 2009
- **Submission of CD-0 Proposal to DOE on May 31, 2009**

First Cut at a Refinement of the Beamline Proposals

- To keep up the Renewal momentum while we await the outcome of the DOE review of our CD-0 Proposal, we organized six working groups to flesh out the beamline aspects of the renewal. Their primary role is to develop more detailed plans or options (including better cost/effort estimates) for each of the six categories listed below:

| <u>Category</u> | <u>APS Leader</u> | <u>Outside Co-Leader(s)</u> |
|-----------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| Imaging/Coherence | Barry Lai | Chris Jacobsen & Mark Sutton |
| Extreme Conditions | Malcolm Guthrie | Mark Rivers |
| Ultrafast Dynamics | Eric Dufresne | Paul Evans |
| Interfaces | Paul Zschack | John Budai & Dillon Fong |
| Spectroscopy | Steve Heald | Clem Burns |
| Proteins to Organisms | Stefan Vogt | Jim Penner-Hahn & Malcolm Capel |

- Dean Haeffner had agreed to act as the coordinator for the organization of beamline proposals. His role is to ensure that nothing falls through the cracks of the six categories, sort out duplicate requests, represent any beamlines that do not nicely fit in to one of the categories above and develop a budget and timeline based on the information provided by the Working Groups.

Progress on the Beamline Side

- The six working groups have been meeting over the summer working towards developing a comprehensive list of all the proposals (both for new and renewed beamlines).
 - At this point, nothing has been eliminated, the goal is to make sure we have not missed anything.
 - Preliminary cost estimates have been developed for all the proposed renewals.
- The leaders of the working groups will be presenting their summaries of the beamline renewal proposals to the APS Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) on October 8th.
- To get additional input from the APS and local CAT staff members, we are planning a series of open (“Community Input”) presentations before the SAC meeting.
- Until the CD-0 Proposal has been decided on by DOE, we will keep this process informal. We anticipate these six groups morphing **into technical oversight groups** for portions of the WBS for the renewal project, after we receive DOE

On the Accelerator and Infrastructure Side

- We will soon create similar groups for the other sections of the WBS (accelerator, technical enablers) but these are less urgent since their plans are further fleshed out and preliminary cost estimates have already been made.
- One thing that we do need to do here is to develop a more detailed R&D plan for key elements, such as superconducting undulators, detectors, superconducting rf deflecting cavities for short pulses and develop firm go/no go dates for the decision of their implementation.
- Michael Borland will be presenting the proposed accelerator enhancements to the SAC.
- I will be presenting a summary of the proposed infrastructure improvements to the SAC for their comments and suggestions.

APS SAC Meeting in October and Beyond

- What would we like from the SAC in October? Since it is pretty clear we will not have the funds to do everything, we will be looking for:
 - feedback on the new and renewed beamlines that have been proposed,
 - advice on what cross-cut reviews (or other workshops) to hold in 2010 to make a well informed decision of beamlines to be included in the renewal, and
 - discussions and advice on how best to move forward for developing a Conceptual Design Report (CDR). For example:
 - *After receiving CD-0, launch a more open, inclusive process to develop a priority list of beamlines which should be included in a CDR with more detail on their attributes and how they will enable the science we are proposing in the Renewal.*
 - *We would then develop an iterative process of discussions with the expanded working group and user community to make a second cut at the beamline prioritization for discussions at future SAC meetings.*

Questions???