

A Personal Idea on BCD

Kaoru Yokoya, KEK

During the GG1 session on Aug.16 afternoon, I expressed my idea on the BCD after the presentation by Nick Walker. Following is an itemization of what I said (with some minor addition).

- We are going to choose contentious items in the configuration. The results of the discussion are important for the final design, but the process of discussion itself is also or even more important. BCD should include the detail of the discussion. With such a description everyone in our community, whether present at the relevant sessions or not, would understand what we have done and are going to do.
- BCD is not final word as Nick says. Soon after BCD we have to start discussion on the possible change of configuration. If BCD is documented with a full description of discussion, it would also help the configuration change process greatly. We do not want to repeat the same debate.
- RDR and TDR are something that can be called Design Report. The table of contents will look like overview, layout, parameters, description of individual subsystems, followed by cost and timeline. However, BCD should not be a design report in any sense. It should describe the selected baseline and alternatives together with their pros and cons and the reason of selection. Also the required R&D (not only for alternatives but also for the baseline) should be listed.
- The document style suggested by Nick is something like a skelton of a design report. This sort of machine description might also be needed but it should be part 2 or appendix of BCD. This part will evolve to RDR after a year with an addition of cost section.
- I do not know how big the document will be and should be, but it would be nice if the detail of the selection process is fully described. If one wants a simple document, we can attach a sort of executive summary.