

---

## **Beam Loss Monitor PDR Charge Document**

---

**Preliminary Design Review (PDR)  
10-11 July 2017, Lund, Sweden**

### **Charge for the PDR**

---

#### **Purpose of the PDR**

The purpose of the preliminary design review is to verify that the requirements and interfaces are well understood and documented, and that the conceptual design is well matched to these boundary conditions. Also, the PDR covers planning, risks and safety issues.

Passing the PDR is a prerequisite for expending significant resources on detailed design.

#### **Scope of the PDR**

This PDR covers both the nBLM and icBLM systems. The nBLM system already went through a PDR focussing on the detectors, and the icBLM detectors (LHC style ionization chambers) have been received. Therefore, a primary focus of this review is the electronics design. Relevant topics will be covered, including:

- BLM Requirements
- BLM signal analysis and detector design
- BLM Electronics
  - Hardware
  - FPGA platform

Document Type	Generic Document
Document Number	ESS-0051366
Date	Nov 20, 2015
Revision	0 (1)
State	Preliminary
Confidentiality Level	Internal

- EPICS integration
- BLM electronics performance

Furthermore, the PDR covers the contributions from ICS

- Common Hardware Infrastructure and support
- Integration support
- MPS development and Beam Interlock System

Note that ICS may also choose to hold separate reviews of their deliverables insofar as they are provided by an in kind partner.

### **PDR Committee**

The PDR committee consists of:

- Alexander Zhukov, SNS, External reviewer - Chair
- Andreas Jansson, ESS BI review secretary
- Annika Nordt, Machine protection
- Mamad Eshraqi, Beam Physics/Commissioning/Operation
- Inigo Alonso, ESS Linac Integration
- Lali Tchelidze, ESS AD Safety
- Enric Bargallo, ICS RAMI
- Frithiof Jensen, ESS AD Electrical
- Evangelia Vaena, ESS AD Cabling/Racks
- Matthew Conlon, ESS AD QA
- Marcelo Ferreira, ESS Vacuum
- Daniel Piso/Timo Korhonen, ICS

### **Presenters and Observers**

- Tom Shea, ESS BI
- Thomas Papaevangelou, CEA
- Laura Segui, CEA
- Ryoichi Miyamoto, ESS
- Slava Grishin, ESS
- Clement Derrez, ESS
- Quentin Bertrand, CEA
- Edvard Bergman, ESS
- Timo Korhonen, ESS
- Annika Nordt, ESS
- Yannick Mariette, ESS

Document Type	Generic Document
Document Number	ESS-0051366
Date	Nov 20, 2015
Revision	0 (1)
State	Preliminary
Confidentiality Level	Internal

## Documentation

The supporting documentation will be provided to the committee during the week prior to the review, on the review Indico page (<https://indico.esss.lu.se/event/835/>), which also contains the agenda.

Presentations will also be available on Indico.

## Committee Charge

The committee is asked to consider the following questions. Where appropriate, please organize the responses by component/system, in particular, clearly identifying those that refer exclusively to the nBLM system or the icBLM system.

1. Are the requirements and interfaces properly understood and documented?
2. Is the scope of the system and each component well defined?
3. Is the conceptual design likely to fulfill all requirements and respect all interfaces, and is it mature enough to begin detailed design?
4. Is the interface with ICS well understood and functionality well covered? Is the control integration of the system properly addressed?
5. Is the planning appropriate and consistent with the overall ESS plans and milestones? Are the key interface milestones with ICS properly identified?
6. Is there an acquisition strategy for major procurements appropriate for this design stage, and is the lead time for procurements and contracts properly accounted for in the planning?
7. Is the verification strategy appropriate for this stage of the project?
8. Have potential safety hazards been properly identified and considered in the design choices? If required, is there a mitigation plan?
9. Have reliability aspects been considered in the design choices at a level appropriate for this stage of design?
10. Have the project risks and opportunities been properly identified and their impact considered in the conceptual design? If required, is there a mitigation plan?
11. Were any other issues identified during the review?

The results of the review should be summarized in a short report, outlining the answers to the above review questions and whether the review is considered passed, passed with action items, or failed. The report may also provide findings, comments, and recommended actions. Actions should be clearly categorized as one of the following:

- Must be addressed before PDR is considered closed
- Must be addressed prior to the CDR
- Must be addressed at some time during the project