

From a.a.carter@qmul.ac.uk Tue Mar 4 16:08:29 2003
 Date: Fri, 28 Feb 2003 16:57:10 +0100
 From: Tony Carter <a.a.carter@qmul.ac.uk>
 To: Mike Tyndel <m.tyndel@rl.ac.uk>
 Cc: Bjarne Stugu <bjarne.stugu@fi.uib.no>,
 Richard Brenner <brenner@tsl.uu.se>,
 Susumu TERADA <susumu.terada@kek.jp>, YoshiNobu Unno <unno@post.kek.jp>,
 Janet Carter <jrc1@hep.phy.cam.ac.uk>,
 Tony Carter <a.a.carter@qmul.ac.uk>
 Subject: US SQ phone meeting of Feb 28th

Dear Mike,

Below are notes on the various items and discussions from the phone meeting of the US Cluster SQ Committee this morning.

Tony and Nobu

Notes from our phone meeting of Friday 28th February:

We noted the progress achieved by Mike T in discussions with Abe Seiden; namely

"....many areas of complete agreement between [US SQ Committee] and the US and we should try and build on these:

- 1) The electrical performance of the modules is crucial and must be closely controlled.
- 2) A high yield is essential and loss of components is unacceptable
- 3) Careful checking during assembly should be continued to catch mistakes and maintain high yield.
- 4) Regular reporting & review of performance is useful - especially now at start-up. ..."

The contents of all four items were welcomed and fully endorsed by the US SQ Committee.

The Committee also welcomed (and commented upon) the further proposals from Abe:

- 1)The US agree to work to the existing (or slightly modified spec along the lines you suggested & to be finalised next week)

Welcomed, and Committee will propose the extended values corresponding to the 'pass' grade of module for discussion and agreement in SCT week.

- 2)The US will attempt to purchase a 2nd smartscope but cannot afford to extend the time scale beyond 1 year.

Welcomed, as positive contribution to project succeeding in quality and timescale.

- 3)As the additional time needed to do the adjustments is ~ 20% another cluster (Japan) should take responsibility for ~200 of the US modules.

The Committee welcomed acceptance of their proposal, and agree to study how to provide the approx. 200 modules from Japan.

4)Any 4 wafer assemblies outside spec are put on 'hold'.

Again, seen as positive wish to collaborate with other Clusters in achieving a uniform and high quality module production.

5)After 100 modules are complete there should be a review looking at progress and performance

Committee would like to modify this to be 100 modules, or in June, whichever is the sooner.

The Committee will meet again on Monday to prepare suggestions to present at the BM meeting on Tuesday. The objective of the Committee is to get agreement by Wednesday on the US Cluster procedures and objectives for Series modules assembly.

28-February-2003

Communication from Mike on Thursday:

> Subject: US Module production
 > Date: Thu, 27 Feb 2003 19:50:34 -0000
 > From: "Tyndel, M (Mike)" <M.Tyndel@rl.ac.uk>
 > To: "'Tony Carter'" <a.a.carter@qmul.ac.uk>, "Nobu Unno" <unno@post.kek.jp>
 > CC: "'Abe Seiden'" <abs@scipp.ucsc.edu>, "Janet Carter" <jrc1@hep.phy.cam.ac.uk>, "Tyndel, M (Mike)"

>
 >

> Dear Tony & Nobu,

>

> I have just had a very positive discussion with Abe in an attempt to
 > understand how we make progress. He and the US are committed to producing
 > 'good' modules for the SCT but are also under a lot of pressure to work
 > within a fixed budget and to meet the schedule.

>

>>From our discussion, I see that there are many areas of complete agreement
 > between you and the US and we should try and build on these:

>

> 1)The electrical performance of the modules is crucial and must be closely
 > controlled.
 > 2)A high yield is essential and loss of components is unacceptable
 > 3)Careful checking during assembly should be continued to catch mistakes and
 > maintain high yield.
 > 4)Regular reporting & review of performance is useful - especially now at
 > start-up.

>
 >

> The only real difference is the need to maintain such a tight specification
 > on the front-back alignment. Abe accepts that this should be resolved in a
 > collaborative spirit and proposes the following:

>

> 1)The US agree to work to the existing (or slightly modified spec along the

- > lines you suggested & to be finalised next week)
- > 2)The US will attempt to purchase a 2nd smartscope but cannot afford to
- > extend the time-scale beyond 1 year.
- > 3)As the additional time needed to do the adjustments is ~ 20% another
- > cluster (Japan) should take responsibility for ~200 of the US modules.
- > 4)Any 4 wafer assemblies outside spec are put on 'hold'.
- > 5)After 100 modules are complete there should be a review looking at
- > progress and performance
- >
- > Mike