



Closeout Presentation and Final Report Procedures



(Use PowerPoint / No Smaller than 18 pt Font)

2.1 Use Section Number/Title corresponding to writing assignment list.

List Review Subcommittee Members

List Assigned Charge Questions and Review Committee Answers

2.1.1 Findings – What the project told us

- In bullet form, include your account of factual technical, cost, schedule, and management. Information provided/presented by the Project

2.1.2 Comments – What we think about what the project told us

- In bullet form, include your assessment of project status (observations, concerns, feedback, suggestions, etc.) based on the findings. This section carries more emphasis than the Findings, but does not require an action as do the Recommendations. Do not number your comments.

2.1.3 Recommendations – What we think the project needs to do

- 1. Beginning with an action verb, provide a brief, concise, and clear statement with a due date.**

For Critical Decision reviews, include a specific recommendation addressing how the Committee judged the readiness for the CD, *i.e.*:

- **The project is ready to proceed to CD-2; *or***
- **The project is ready to proceed to CD-2, after addressing the following recommendations**



Format: Final Report

(Use MS Word / 12pt Font)

2.1 Use Section Number/Title corresponding to writing assignment list.

2.1.1 Findings – What the project told us

Include a brief narrative description of technical, cost, schedule, management information provided by the project. Each subcommittee will emphasize their area of responsibility.

Cost and schedule subcommittee should provide attachments for approved project cost breakdown and schedule. Management subcommittee should provide attachment for approved project organization and names of personnel.

2.1.2 Comments – What we think about what the project told us

Descriptive material assessing the findings and making observations and conclusions based on the findings. **The committee's answer to the charge questions should be contained within the text of the Comments Section.** Do not number your comments.

2.1.3 Recommendations – What we think the project needs to do

1. Beginning with an action verb, provide a brief, concise, and clear statement with a due date.
- 2.

Please Note: Recommendations are approved by the full committee and presented at the review closeout briefing. Recommendations SHOULD NOT be changed or altered from the closeout report to the Final Report.



Closeout Report on the DOE/SC CD-3a Review of the

Long Baseline Neutrino Facility/Deep Underground Neutrino Experiment (LBNF/DUNE) Project

Sanford Underground Research Facility

December 2-4, 2015

Stephen W. Meador

Committee Chair

Office of Science, U.S. Department of Energy

<http://www.science.doe.gov/opa/>



1. Is the Far Site Conventional Facilities (CF) design technically sound and sufficiently mature to support proceeding with procurement and initiation of initial civil construction activities? Does the design flow down from the requirements? Have technical risks been appropriately addressed? Has the interface definition between CF and the cryostat/cryogenic systems and CF and the detector, as well as the logistics of excavation, construction, and technical systems installation, been sufficiently developed?
 2. Is the CD-3a scope identified by the project necessary and sufficient to enable installation of the cryostat, cryogenic infrastructure, support systems and detector?
 6. Has the project responded appropriately to recommendations from the last DOE review, in particular, in relation to the Far Site CF?
 7. Is the project ready to seek approval of CD-3a to initiate Far Site construction?
- **Findings**
 - **Comments**
 - **Recommendations**



1. Is the Far Site Conventional Facilities (CF) design technically sound and sufficiently mature to support proceeding with procurement and initiation of initial civil construction activities? Does the design flow down from the requirements? Have technical risks been appropriately addressed? Has the interface definition between CF and the cryostat/cryogenic systems and CF and the detector, as well as the logistics of excavation, construction, and technical systems installation, been sufficiently developed?
 2. Is the CD-3a scope identified by the project necessary and sufficient to enable installation of the cryostat, cryogenic infrastructure, support systems and detector?
 6. Has the project responded appropriately to recommendations from the last DOE review, in particular, in relation to the Far Site CF?
 7. Is the project ready to seek approval of CD-3a to initiate Far Site construction?
- **Findings**
 - **Comments**
 - **Recommendations**



1. Is the Far Site Conventional Facilities (CF) design technically sound and sufficiently mature to support proceeding with procurement and initiation of initial civil construction activities? Does the design flow down from the requirements? Have technical risks been appropriately addressed? Has the interface definition between CF and the cryostat/cryogenic systems and CF and the detector, as well as the logistics of excavation, construction, and technical systems installation, been sufficiently developed?

 6. Has the project responded appropriately to recommendations from the last DOE review, in particular, in relation to the Far Site CF?

 7. Is the project ready to seek approval of CD-3a to initiate Far Site construction?
- **Findings**
 - **Comments**
 - **Recommendations**



4. Are ES&H aspects being properly addressed and are future plans sufficient given the project's current stage of development?
6. Has the project responded appropriately to recommendations from the last DOE review, in particular, in relation to the Far Site CF?
7. Is the project ready to seek approval of CD-3a to initiate Far Site construction?

- **Findings**
- **Comments**
- **Recommendations**



3. Are the cost and schedule for initial far site construction activities credible, with adequate contingencies? Does the project have a credible plan to track performance associated with these activities? Are risks identified and managed appropriately?

6. Has the project responded appropriately to recommendations from the last DOE review, in particular, in relation to the Far Site CF?

7. Is the project ready to seek approval of CD-3a to initiate Far Site construction?

- **Findings**
- **Comments**
- **Recommendations**



PROJECT STATUS		
Project Type	MIE / Line Item / Cooperative Agreement	
CD-1	Planned:	Actual:
CD-2	Planned:	Actual:
CD-3	Planned:	Actual:
CD-4	Planned:	Actual:
TPC Percent Complete	Planned: _____%	Actual: _____%
TPC Cost to Date		
TPC Committed to Date		
TPC		
TEC		
Contingency Cost (w/Mgmt Reserve)	\$	
Contingency Schedule on CD-4b	_____ months	_____ %
CPI Cumulative		
SPI Cumulative		



1. Is the Far Site Conventional Facilities (CF) design technically sound and sufficiently mature to support proceeding with procurement and initiation of initial civil construction activities? Does the design flow down from the requirements? Have technical risks been appropriately addressed? Has the interface definition between CF and the cryostat/cryogenic systems and CF and the detector, as well as the logistics of excavation, construction, and technical systems installation, been sufficiently developed?

5. Is the project being effectively managed? Is it properly organized and staffed to successfully execute project plans, especially as they relate to the initiation of Far Site construction activities?

6. Has the project responded appropriately to recommendations from the last DOE review, in particular, in relation to the Far Site CF?

7. Is the project ready to seek approval of CD-3a to initiate Far Site construction?

- **Findings**
- **Comments**
- **Recommendations**