

# SBS Management Perspective

---

## SBS Collaboration Meeting

- DOE budget proposal
- PAC35 Comments
- Outlook

Kees de Jager

# DOE Funding Proposal

---

- A funding proposal for SBS was submitted on Nov 10 2009 to DOE (Brad Tippens)
- The emphasis (as requested) was on the physics case
- The budget requested was 3.8 M\$, with 1.4 M\$ from JLab
- The request included a reasonable (to us) level of contingency and all overhead
- The budget profile was

FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14
430	1060	1180	830	310

The proposal was then sent out for mail review of its physics merits

# PAC35 Comments

---

- PAC35 evaluated one SBS proposal PR12-10-005 that it deferred because it was worried that “the model of a deuteron as a “simple” bound state of only nucleons would break down at the proposed high  $Q^2$ ”. Although the PAC expected that these model uncertainties would eventually be removed, it did not consider the proposal of high enough priority to run in the first years.
- It also allocated grades and beam time to the three approved SBS proposals. EMFF of the proton and the neutron and their  $Q^2$ -dependence were considered fundamental quantities, the measurement of which a key mission of the JLab program.
- E12-07-109 ( $G_E^p$ ) 45 days with A- (up to 12  $GeV^2$ )
- E12-09-016 ( $G_E^n$ ) 50 days with A- (up to 8  $GeV^2$ )
- E12-09-019 ( $G_M^n$ ) 25 days with B+ (up to 14  $GeV^2$ )
- Larry has assured me that we can ignore the  $Q^2$ -limitations and are free to design the optimal experiment within the beam time allocation

# JLab Commitments

---

- Jefferson Lab management has incorporated the SBS budget proposal into its outyear budget request and presented it as such at its presentation to DOE in early March.
- Mike Syptak recalculated the SBS budget in accordance to JLab rules. All funding received by JLab has to include the ~38% overhead, but all funding then reassigned to Universities is identified as one large contract per University for which only 19 k\$ of overhead is allocated.
- The new SBS budget is thus 4.4 M\$

FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14
340	1220	1390	840	560

The outcome of the mail review is unknown, as is that of the budget request, but we could not have hoped for a stronger support from JLab management.

# SBS Technical Review

---

- The report of the second Technical Review has been circulated
- The main conclusion is that “the SBS experimental design has a very high probability of meeting the experimental requirements”
- Also, the SBS collaboration has the required expertise to carry out the project within the time schedule presented
- Performing experimental tests of background rates and electronics performance under similar conditions (as the real experiments) should be carried out as soon as possible
- The reliability of the tracking and DAQ simulations should also be improved as soon as possible. Members of the review committee have agreed to a mail review this summer of the results of such a simulation.
- Budget needs to be worked out in more detail

# Summary

---

- The SBS project has made major steps towards a successful implementation
- In the immediate future efforts should be focused, less on additional physics, but on simulation (experimental and computational) efforts, budget details and Q&A for production
- Engineering design should be initiated, as well as preparations for the University contracts
- Hall A welcomes two engineers:
  - Robin Wines and Whit Seay