

**Report Outline and Reviewer Assignments
For the
Director's CD-1 Review of the Mu2e Project
April 03-05, 2012**

Executive Summary	<u>Elaine McCluskey</u>
<u>1.0 Introduction</u>	
2.0 Accelerator	<u>Paul Derwent</u> <u>Kevin Brown</u> <u>Rich Andrews</u>
2.1 Rings & Extraction	
2.2 Extinction & External Beamline	
2.3 Target, Head Shield & Dump	
2.5 Radiation Shielding	
2.6 Interactions with other projects	
3.0 Conventional Construction	<u>Jesse Adams</u> <u>Damian Dockery</u>
4.0 Solenoids	<u>Joe Minervini</u> <u>Pasquale Fabricatore</u> <u>Akira Yamamoto</u>
5.0 Muon Beamline	<u>Andy Stefanik</u> <u>Jim Kilmer</u>
6.0 Calorimeter, Cosmic Ray Veto	<u>Jeff Nelson</u> <u>Rich Talaga</u>
6.1 Calorimeter	
6.2 Cosmic Ray Veto	
7.0 Tracker/ DAQ	<u>Peter Wilson</u> <u>Paul Padley</u>
6.1 Tracker	
6.2 DAQ	
<u>8.0 Project Management</u>	
8.1 Cost	<u>Bill Freeman</u> <u>Fran Clark</u>
8.2 Schedule	<u>Sherese Humphrey</u> <u>Fran Clark</u>
8.3 Management	<u>Marc Kaducak</u> <u>Elaine McCluskey</u>
8.4 ES&H	<u>Mike Andrews</u>
<u>9.0 Charge Questions</u>	
<u>9.1 Design Review Charge Questions for the Accelerator and Solenoid</u>	
9.1.1 Is the design technically adequate? Is the design likely to meet the technical requirements? Are the physics requirements clearly stated and documented? Have these requirements been	<u>Akira Yamamoto</u> All

translated into technical performance requirements and specifications, if not yet are there plans to do so?	
9.1.2 Can the design be constructed, inspected, tested, installed, operated and maintained in a satisfactory way?	<u>Andy Stefanik</u> All
9.1.3 Is there adequate supporting documentation to support the conceptual design and the transition to developing the preliminary design?	<u>Paul Derwent</u> All
9.1.4 Are the risks (on technical, cost, and schedule basis) of the selected base design approach and alternatives understood and are appropriate steps being taken to manage and mitigate these risks? Have areas been identified where value engineering should be done? If value engineering has been performed is it documented?	<u>Pasquale Fabricatore</u> All
9.1.5 Has the project acceptably addressed the relative recommendations from the independent Director's Conceptual Design Review of Mu2e that was conducted on May 03-05, 2011?	<u>Kevin Brown</u> All
9.2 Cost, Schedule, Management, and ES&H Charge Questions	
9.2.1 Has the Project developed a quality resource loaded schedule? Has all the work been appropriately identified, estimated and scheduled, including the work associated with performing the preliminary design, final design and value engineering activities?	<u>Fran Clark</u> All
9.2.2 Are the estimated cost and proposed schedule ranges realistic, consistent with the technical and budgetary objectives, and justified by the supporting documentation?	<u>Bill Freeman</u> All
9.2.3 Has the Project implemented a Risk Management Process by identifying risks, performing a risk assessment and started developing mitigation plans at an appropriate level for the CD-1 stage?	<u>Marc Kaducak</u> All
9.2.4 Is the Project Team adequately staffed and does it possess adequate experience to successfully carry out the Project?	<u>Marc Kaducak</u> All
9.2.5 Is the current staffing level adequate to complete the work to achieve CD-2? If not, has the appropriate staffing level been identified in the schedule and has a staffing plan been developed to acquire the future staffing needs?	<u>Sherese Humphrey</u> All
9.2.6 Are ES&H aspects being properly addressed given the project's current stage of development?	<u>Mike Andrews</u> All
9.2.7 Is the documentation required by DOE O 413.3B in order and is the Mu2e Project ready for a DOE CD-1 review in June?	<u>Elaine McCluskey</u> All

Note: Underlined names are the primary writer.