

Service Coordination Board Meeting Summary

Date: 4 April 2012

Members in attendance:

	Member	In Attendance
AES	John Maclean	√
	Geoff Pile	√
ASD	Michael Borland	√
	Ali Nassiri	√
XSD	Mark Beno	
	Chris Jacobsen	√
Upgrade Project	Tom Fornek	√
	Mohan Ramanathan	√

* Den Hartog standing in for Pile as an AES ADD during Pile's assignment to the APS Upgrade Project -(corrected 8 May 2012)

Secretary: Steve Davey

Agenda

- Review action items from last meeting
- Evaluate service priorities focusing on AES Mechanical Engineering & Design (MED) Group

Summary of new action Items:

1. Develop a matrix for small/medium/large projects with formalized feedback (Jacobsen & Davey)
2. Update membership in Board Charter (Davey)
3. In consultation with Den Hartog evaluate SPX requirements and report at next meeting (Nassiri)
4. Add ERA effort commitments to the service task table (Ramanatahn to provide ERAs and Davey to update table)
5. Provide new project/proposal requests (all Board members)
6. Draft a scheme/standard for setting project priorities (e.g., voting scheme) (Borland)
7. Look at a sample of proposals (~3) for discussion at next meeting (all Board members)
8. Set meeting for middle of the week of 9-13 April Davey

Action Items from 19 March meeting and status:

- Find a larger room to meet and schedule longer time for Board meetings (Davey & Pile)
 - Every other Wednesday 11:15 – 12:45, B4100
- Send out definitions of small, medium, and large projects (Jacobsen)
 - Included with 19 March meeting summary

- Distribute MS Project table to Board members (distribution: Davey and Citrix access to MS Project: Maclean)
 - E-mailed 2 April in MS Project and Excel formats and AES-MED as a .pdf
 - Citrix XenApp login page: <https://metis.aps.anl.gov/Citrix/XenApp/auth/login.aspx>
- Confirm status of AES-ERA (Ramanathan)
 - No significant changes
- Board members to comment on draft charter (see Attachment 2) (comments to Davey)
 - Open
- Review effort requests for SPX at next meeting (Nassiri)
 - Open
- ASD & XSD to review priorities for projects (ASD & XSD Board members)
 - Open
- ASD & XSD to provide what projects/AIP/capital are approved (Borland & Beno)
 - Open

Summary

Jacobsen: Look at what feedback would be useful. Action item: develop a matrix for small/medium/large projects with formalized feedback. An tool that is part of the APS project proposal system could be considered.

The draft charter was included with the last meeting summary and no comments were received. Borland expressed a concern that the charter seemed to imply that the final authority rested with the Board. The draft charter language:

“If there is a consensus of the Board of on which tasks/projects/assignments should be supported /approved or rejected, the Board requests endorsement by the Division Directors (DD) and APS-U Director.

If there is not a consensus of the Board on which tasks/projects/assignments should be supported, the Board requests the DDs/APS-U Director to arbitrate.”

Borland thought that was acceptable but will re-review. Comments on the draft charter from Board members to Davey within a week.

SPX

Nassirri: allocations of support for SPX is an internal Upgrade Project issue. However there are questions of the sort of Ben Stillwell assignment to sector 2 or the Upgrade.

Pile: the problem is with named resources.

Nassiri: P6 plans show that 4879 hours of mechanical engineering support (not including designers) is needed for SPX but only ~1700 hours have assigned.

The general question was posed of how are requests for services made?

Pile: there will be inefficiencies when new or less experienced personnel are assigned to task and that projects may be required to add time to compensate.

Pile & Ramanathan: the Upgrade Project has been under spending.

Jacobsen: this is the domain of the Upgrade Project and not under the SCB purview. In that the Board does not have a lever/control on the Upgrade; it's not a topic for the Board.

A discussion followed about how services for the Upgrade and operations are interrelated and coupled issues.

Pile: we need to be aware of issues related to providing services.

Jacobsen: there is a clear charge from DOE we need to keep operations going.

Ramanathan: the APS needs to complete CD-2.

There was a discussion if the Board should set just set priorities for projects or should consider named resources (e.g., a generic engineer v. a specific person).

Nassiri: wants to know who is assigned to what.

Action item: In consultation with Den Hartog evaluate SPX requirements and report at next meeting (Nassiri)

Project status/tracking is still to be developed.

Action item: Add ERA effort commitments to the service task table (Ramanatahn to provide ERAs and Davey to update table)

Action item: provide new project/proposal requests (all Board members)

Schemes for rating proposals, across the divisions, was discussed.

Jacobsen: it will be sorted out best when we look at real projects and, a sampling of proposals in the APS Project Proposal system indicates that there is a need for more of an explanation/justification for proposal in the system.

Action item: draft a scheme/standard for setting project priorities (e.g., voting scheme) (Borland)

Action item: look at a sample of proposals (~3) for discussion at next meeting (all Board members)