

# Service Coordination Board Meeting Summary

Date: 11 April 2012

Members in attendance:

	Member	In Attendance
AES	Patric Den Hartog*	√
	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 division's top priorities

## Summary of new action Items:

1. Send SCB web page URL to Board members (Davey) - [http://www.aps.anl.gov/APS\\_Engineering\\_Support\\_Division/Service\\_Coordination\\_Board/](http://www.aps.anl.gov/APS_Engineering_Support_Division/Service_Coordination_Board/)
2. Post materials presented by Jacobsen and Borland (Davey)
3. Comment on schemes for setting priorities for proposed projects (Board members to provide to Davey)
4. Board to select scheme for setting priorities for proposed projects at next meeting (Board)
5. Divisions to present three high priority proposals at next meeting (Board)
6. Prior to next meeting provide titles for the three high priority proposals at next meeting (Board)

## Action Items from 4 April meeting:

- Develop a matrix for small/medium/large projects with formalized feedback (Jacobsen & Davey)
- Update membership in Board Charter (Davey)
- In consultation with Den Hartog evaluate SPX requirements and report at next meeting (Nassiri)

- Add ERA effort commitments to the service task table (Ramanatahn to provide ERAs and Davey to update table)
- Provide new project/proposal requests (all Board members)
- Draft a scheme/standard for setting project priorities (e.g., voting scheme) (Borland)
- Look at a sample of proposals (~3) for discussion at next meeting (all Board members)
- Set meeting for middle of the week of 9-13 April Davey

## Summary

SCB web page URL:

[http://www.aps.anl.gov/APS\\_Engineering\\_Support\\_Division/Service\\_Coordination\\_Board/](http://www.aps.anl.gov/APS_Engineering_Support_Division/Service_Coordination_Board/)

The importance of getting to the point of evaluating proposals, setting priorities, and allocating service effort was stressed.

### **4 April action item: Develop a matrix for small/medium/large projects with formalized feedback (Jacobsen & Davey)**

Jacobsen presented a proposed process for handling Engineering support for XSD for small and large projects ([APS\\_1429270](#)).

- “Small projects are those involving less than 40 hours of engineering effort. The goal is to have rapid turnaround on these projects with a minimum of administrative overhead.
- Large projects involving 40 hours or more of engineering effort will involve scheduling by the Service Coordination Board (SCB), and more formal mechanisms for feedback.”

Jacobsen suggested engineering teams could be organized for small projects and that the SCB determine the priorities of large projects. Potential feedback processes for both were included. Following up on the recommendation that additional proposal information will be needed, Jacobsen presented an example of what an expanded, yet brief, description of proposal might look like: *Work project synopsis: transmission x-ray microscope upgrade* ([APS\\_1429253](#)). The expanded description allows for reviewers to be better informed about what is being sought and potential impacts.

The question arose about when forms developed by the MED Group, that capture a clearly defined scope of work and the detailed planning, would be used. The forms would be used for approved projects and if the full scoping identifies that ~30% or more effort will be required than was requested, the proposal should go back to the SCB.

A graded approach is sought, minimizing work on proposals that will not be supported:

- Initial proposals provide short description;
- If a divisions feels that proposal is a high enough priority and has a good chance to be allocated resources, the requesting division may ask for an extended (~1 page) description; and

- If a proposal is approved and there is a need for clearer definition of the scope and/or for detailed costing/scheduling, a detailed plan will be developed.

[Change in Jacobsen's proposal: change from feedback at mid-point of projects that take more than 160 hours to complete to monthly status reporting.]

Jacobsen noted work has been on hold for some beamline work and asked if the small teams could get going now. This led to a discussion about the need to consider the commitment of resources in the context of commitments to the APS-U project. Jacobsen also noted that the ALD recognized that there is an operations budget and an Upgrade budget. It was stated that a significant portion of the operations budget was expended in the first half of the fiscal year limiting what is left for the last half of the year. Evaluations by the SCB will be on-going.

#### **4 April action item: Update membership in Board Charter (Davey)**

The Board's charter has been updated and is posted on the Board web page. Contact Davey if there are additional suggested changes to the charter.

**4 April action item:** Provide new project/proposal requests (all Board members) and look at a sample of proposals (~3) for discussion at next meeting (all Board members)

Ongoing

Action items:

1. Board to select scheme for setting priorities for proposed projects at next meeting (Board)
2. Prior to next meeting provide titles for the three high priority proposals at next meeting (Board)

#### **4 April action item: Draft a scheme/standard for setting project priorities (e.g., voting scheme) (Borland)**

Borland presented three schemes for setting priorities ([APS\\_1429268](#)):

1. Independent Prioritization (the divisions independently rate their resource requests)
2. Proportional Voting (divisions are given a number of votes)
3. Common criteria with public defense

Borland described each of the three schemes and advantages and disadvantages of each.

Action items:

1. Comment on schemes for setting priorities for proposed projects (Board members to provide to Davey)
2. Board to select scheme for setting priorities for proposed projects at next meeting (Board)