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Subject: Re: talk for CR

Dear Ian,

here in the following my comments/corrections:

1) after slide 9) we should clarify what is the present baseline chamber

design for the RE4.1 case. At least 2 of the 3 baseline dimensions are known

and should be reported. The only one still to be clarified in the thicknes

and I would suggest

to clarify if we can assume at present a similar schematic of RE3.1

presented in slide 6) at least as nominal for the thicknesses and we should

profit to endorse it with the in situ measurement during next YETS, and very

probably this will affect only the FEB positioning in R on the external part

of chambers or could affect also the rest of chamber design. If major

revision will show up, as extreme option we can sacrifie the chamber

overlapping solution.

2) HV slide 11) I would clarify hat this is for both re3.1 and 4.1 and

explain what is existing (rack space, rack slot, cables) and what still to

be installed. For the statement concerning the optimisation I would propose

to clarify why it would be needed and state as â alternative optimised

3) OF slide 13) I would write in the slide title Optical Fibre (OF) at least

once. Also here to clarify what (all) to be installed and nothing existing.

4) Gas slide 14): I think, as suggested by Armando, we should mention here

also the option of new gas, stating that practically no effect expected on

the new infrastructure if we will be forced to go for the new gas.

5) cooling slide 15) I would clarify at the beginning of set slides that

chamber thermal power will be the same for both RE3.1 and RE4.1 (using the

table value). total extra power discussed in muon TCO and communicated the

chamber thermal power will be the same for both RE3.1 and RE4.1 (using the

table value). total extra power discussed in muon TCO and communicated the

CMS cooling group. In addition we will have the two different connections

to existing manifold, separation with bullets the RE3 and RE4 cases and

refer to following slides (21/22).

6) Services summary slide 16) I would clarify what existing and what new

(maybe different color in the text box).

7) Service passage slides 17-18) I would clarify in the title âService

8) slide 18) I would not say problems or fears â¦ I would say âvalidation of

possible RPC induced noise on CSC will be addressed in dedicated test

measurements in 904 lab with real chamber operation in nominal CSC-RPC

9) slide 19: I would quantify our space needs in the cable chain and mention

that this item is being evaluated by the CMS IO.

10) slide 20) also here please mention âstudy done in collaboration with CMS

IO, mention S. Bally or the name of reference person for these studiesâ

have 18 ch and we will need 9 ch and there are 10 available. Not immediate

chamber thermal power will be the same for both RE3.1 and RE4.1 (using the

table value). total extra power discussed in muon TCO and communicated the

have 18 ch and we will need 9 ch and there are 10 available. Not immediate

for not expert to see it with slide like it is now.

12) slide 23) first line: why you say many weeks? the weeks requested are

for the following YETSâcommissioning possible only during

13) slide 24) here I would propose to clearly separate the chamber design

from the services with 2 different bullets. Use one bullet with âchamber

design": re3.1 competed and validated in situ, re4.1 completed but still to

re3.1 and 4.1 services work in progress with CMS IO. last sentence with a

possible RPC induced noise on CSC will be addressed in dedicated test

measurements in 904 lab with real chamber operation in nominal CSC-RPC

9) slide 19: I would quantify our space needs in the cable chain and mention

that this item is being evaluated by the CMS IO.

10) slide 20) also here please mention âstudy done in collaboration with CMS

ciao,

Salvatore