

Minutes of the 1st DBD Format WG on Dec. 20, 2011

Attending: T. Behnke, J. Brau, P. Burrows, M. Stanitzki,
Y. Sugimoto, S. Yamada, H. Yamamoto

Excused: J. Fuster

1. First the overall structure of the DBD was confirmed.

There will be 2 volumes, Physics volume and Detector/Simulation volume.

The Detector/Simulation volume will contain introductory section and two detector sections. The length of the common introductory section is expected to be less than 50 pages and each detector section is bounded to 150 pages. This makes the total thickness of around 350 pages.

It was agreed that this limit, 150 pages, is for the content part, excluding the reference and author list which may add several pages.

There was a remark on the executive summary which will cover both TDR and DBD, and should be discussed with GDE.

2. Time schedule for preparation was informed by S. Yamada and was accepted.

The final completed draft should be ready by the end of 2012. This is the originally planned target of the LOI process. The printed version will be produced in 2013.

There are following two milestones agreed with IDAG.

- a) Outlines of the detector parts to be submitted to IDAG about a month before ACFA-LC workshop in Korea

(The deadline was set to be in February but may be shifted to March.

S.Y will communicate with the IDAG chair on this. However, despite such delay, each group may need to list up the outline early enough to start preparation for drafting.)

- b) First draft to be given by end September (i.e. a month before LCWS12 in Texas)

3. Writing Tool:

The majority prefers Latex than Word.

It is confirmed that GDE will use Latex and they will soon choose a template to use. Phil, who is on the GDE's TDR editorial group, expects this will be known in a few weeks. The agreement was we like to see it and may wish to use the same template as well. The page layout will be fixed when we decide a template to use.

Related to the tool, views were exchanged about communicators' participation in the edit of DBD. Their involvement will be little for DBD in contrast to the interim report. Thus we may need to take care of technical words or internal consistency ourselves. But DBD can be more technical than the interim report and also certain difference in style between ILD and SiD can be allowed. The communicators may produce an outreach document out of TDR/DBD. This can be discussed separately and later.

4. Editorial group

It was a consensus that a general editorial body is needed and this working group should carry the role.

5. Contents

Discussions were made how to share the contents between the common introduction and the detector parts as well as with the accelerator TRD, e.g. for the MDI matters.

Conclusions were that some key points need to be included briefly in the common introductory part, which may overlap with the physics volume, TDR volumes or our interim report, so that the DBD can be read without looking into the more detailed descriptions of the separate volumes. Also while some items are listed below with consensus for the contents of the detector sections, details can be planned by each group and will be monitored by IDAG.

a) Common introduction

- Physics goal of ILC experiments

- Validation and monitoring by IDAG of the detector/simulation activity

- (The reason why we have two contrasting detectors)

- Common task groups (in general)

- Benchmark definition and Software tools for simulation

- Beam parameters for 1 TeV simulation

- MDI matters (push-pull in particular)

- Detector R&D in general

Regarding who writes this part, the consensus is that the relevant CTG, if there is one, is the best.

As for the Detector R&D, there was an opinion from Felix Sefkow of the R&D CTG that its importance be included in the DBD. While it will be a delicate item to be phrased cautiously, we thought it proper to include such a part in the common

introduction. Needless to say, this part must be consistent with the feasibility and capability description appearing in the detector sections.

b) Each Detector:

Concept

Structure

Detector component

Installation, alignment and calibration

Performance (which physics reaction ?)

Cover consumption

Cost estimate

(memo: regarding the costing the cost WG has been working for about a year so that the both detectors employ a common method. GDE's method was informed and will be taken into account where needed, e.g. adjustment of different currencies or inflation since RDR.)

6 Author list

How to list authors was discussed. It will be considered further about how to organize, separately for each section or combined, where to put and so on. For instance, the RDR author list contains all the authors together, both accelerator and detector people, and is repeated in each volume.

The consensus was to survey the signatories once again without taking the copies of the LOI authors.

7. Acknowledgement

The acknowledgement should be the same or very similar to that of the IR.

8. Coordination with GDE's TDR

Actually we forgot to discuss this in detail. For the moment Phil is the overlapping member of both TDR and DBD. It was already very helpful during the meeting that Phil gave us information about TDR.

We may discuss next time whether we want to have more overlap. Nick once suggested to make a joint contact group between the two editor groups. This is also conceivable if there are matters to be decided jointly.

9. Next meeting

We may wish to meet early next year maybe after GDE knows which template to use.