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Purpose of this review

The system review is meant to look at the Spoke RF cell interlock including all supporting systems prior to the start of installation. The goal of the review is to ensure that the Spoke RF cell interlock as a whole is a well thought out, consistent design that will meet its operating requirements. As such, it examines the final technical design of the integrated system with an emphasis on interfaces between components and subsystems and controls integration including local interlocks and links to the Machine protection System. It is not meant as a detailed design review of the individual components as that is dealt with during the subsystem PDRs and CDRs.

The purpose of this mini-review is to look at the local protection system for the Spoke RF power transmitters and RF cell.

**Charge to the Committee**

The Review Committee is composed of the Chairman and members as identified in Appendix 2. This list also shows reviewers, who provide comments and review but are not on the formal committee and presenters.

The Review Committee is asked to:

1. REVIEW: Scrutinize and assess the deliverables listed in Appendix 1, presented through the material presented and discussions, at the System Review. Note that the presentations themselves are means of communication only, and it is the documentation which must be reviewed.

2. ANSWER: Answer each question listed in Appendix 3.

3. DECIDE: The Review Committee is to elaborate and deliver at the conclusion of this review, a clear recommendation to ESS about the ability of the RF cell including its associated systems to meet its requirements.

Suggested forms for the decision are:

* Approved, without qualifying comments or further actions.
* Approved, but with recommended actions and or clarifications.
* Not approved, but with recommended actions, for further inputs and activities, and a proposal for a follow-on review.

4. REPORT: The Review Committee is to document in a short report to be delivered as soon as possible after the System Review, its recommendation and any specific actions and other guidance for assisting planning and future success of the Work Unit in for its scope and deliverables.

If the System Review is “Approved but with recommended actions”, there shall be a summary list of requested actions defined .

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix 1  **Scope and Deliverables for Review** |
|  |
|  |

Scope

The system under review is defined as:

* RF Interlock System for the Spoke RF power stations and RF cell
* Controls and connection to higher level accelerator control system

Deliverables for System Review - Information to be reviewed

The information identified below is to be described and communicated through presentation at the System Review, and the source information is to be available to reviewers for reference during the System Review.

The RF group and associated work packages should deliver to the Review Chairman for distribution to the Review Committee and other reviewers, an agreed subset of the following information for pre-review and comments no later than Five (3) working days prior to the Review.

1. Mechanical design at a sufficient detail to answer interface, performance, alignment and installation questions below.
2. Electrical design including: single line drawings, instrumentation lists, cable designs and connector pin outs, calibrations etc.
3. Integrated controls system design and documentation sufficient to answer charge questions.
4. Copies of reports of the previous applicable design reviews
5. System Verification Plan
6. Preliminary Installation Plan
7. Hazard analysis
8. Preliminary Work Safety Coordination Plan
9. Description of relevant MPS links and limits.
10. Results of relevant component and subsystem testing
11. RAMI report and list of needed spares for start of operation

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix 2  **Review Committee and other Reviewers, Presenters and Observers** |

The System Committee conducts this review of design with the authority of ACCSYS Project Leader, Mats Lindroos, and ESS Chief Executive Officer, John Womersley.

The Committee serves in an advisory capacity to:

* the ACCSYS WP 8 and WP17 Leaders, and
* the ACCSYS management team

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Organisation | Appointment for IRR |
| John Weisend II | ESS, ACCSYS Deputy Project Leader | Chairman of the Review Committee |
| Enric Bargallo | ESS, RAMI | Review Committee member |
| Annika Nordt | ESS, ICS, MPS leader | Reviewer Committee member |
| Szandra Kövecses | ESS, ICS, MPS Lead Integrator | Review Committee member |
| Riccard Andersson | ESS, Protection systems, PhD student | Review Committee member |
| Timo Korhonen | ESS, ICS | Review Committee member |
| Anders Johansson | Lund University, LLRF lead | Reviewer |
| Anders Svensson | ESS, Master Oscillator | Reviewer |
| Morten Jensen | ESS, WP8 Work Package Manager | - |
| Anders Sunesson | ESS, RF group leader | - |
| Rutambhara Yogi | ESS, RF Distribution Lead | Presenter |
| Paulo Jose Torri | ESS, WP 17, Spoke power | Presenter |
| Carlos Martins | ESS, WP 17 Work Package leader | Presenter |

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix 3  **RF Cell System Review Charge Questions** |

1. Will the Spoke RF cell interlock function as a logical integrated system with optimized requirements, and integrate with the rest of the Spoke cell?
2. Will the system meet its technical specifications? Do we know how to verify this?
3. Are the interfaces between the various components and subsystems that compose the interlock system completed defined in terms of: a) physical connection – location and type of mating flanges, location and type of power and cable connections, support stands etc. and b) physical parameters (flows, pressure, temperatures, current, voltage, data acquisition formats and rates etc.)
4. Have all interfaces between this system and other systems been completely defined and agreed. Are all the connections on the ESS site in place? This applies to physical connections, physical parameters (flows, pressure, temperatures, current, voltage, UPS requirements) and data exchange.
5. Has an integrated control system (both hardware and software) been developed and tested that permits control of the system, collection of data and integration of this system into accelerator operations?
6. Are all needed connections to the Machine Protection System defined and agreed to? Have all MPS trip and permit levels been agreed upon
7. Have all safety issues been defined and dealt with? Are additional separate safety reviews or inspections required?
8. Have all QA/QC plans been defined and implemented?
9. Will the system fit within its allocated space and can be transported there within the give transport path (height of doors, pass by other equipment) with the available transport means?
10. Are the alignment requirements agreed upon and can the system components be aligned within these requirements?
11. Is the preliminary installation plan for the system adequate? Have all tools, including cranes, movement devices, stands, alignment fixtures etc. been defined. Has the staff for this work been identified? Is the installation sequence consistent with the overall installation plan?
12. Has the reliability and maintainability of the system been optimized? Have all the spare parts required from the first day of operation been identified and procured?
13. Have all recommendations from component design reviews been addressed?