

Technology Committee Meeting November 12th, 2018

Agenda

- Approval of minutes
- Meeting time shift?
- Mapping the Committee members to technologies they represent? any corrections/edits?
- Discussion of the draft list of Fermilab technologies.
- Assign paragraph writing
- Schedule first “technology status” presentation
- IERC presentation (~11:30 am) by Erik G. and Kate S.
- AOB

Minutes

- Previous minutes were reviewed and approved
- Members reminded to vote (Doodle poll) on whether to adopt a new meeting time going forward (change from 11:00 to 11:30).
- Review of FNAL Technology competencies and assignments:
 - Committee members should review the “List of Fermilab Technologies” (located here <https://indico.fnal.gov/event/18693/>) and determine names of “Fermilab Experts” that can assist in an assessment and/or presentation for each topic area.
- Discussion of the draft list of Fermilab technologies:
 - Many questions remain on the classification and grouping of various areas and sub areas, e.g. detector technologies, solid state (how should it be specified?), why not use “semiconductor” instead of “silicon”, noble elements (rather than noble gas), specifics for astrophysics (MKIDS, TES, CCDs etc.), superconducting/quantum sensors -> different categories. It was suggested that the computing list may lack coherence (side note: FNAL excels at exercising large-scale data management).
 - Other questions of structure arose:
 - 1) Should quantum be a thrust on its own? It was voiced that we should be careful to manage overlaps and over specification of areas, lest we be “victims of our success.”
 - 2) Are “Test beams” a category that should be considered or are they more an object of basic infrastructure?
 - We need to emphasize both existing strengths and technologies that should be advanced.
 - It was pointed out several times that we need to be clear on the purpose of the tech-matrix exercise; who does it serve?... primarily the Directorate for strategic planning; help to identify growing areas where FNAL is positioned to capture opportunities, either through strengthening or expansion of core competencies (e.g. quantum, AI, ...). Must be tethered to lab mission, but remain open to new opportunities, even if tangential (e.g. robotics).

- The suggestion was made that we delineate between techs that we “own” (i.e. our core techs and competencies) and those that we are poised to “import” (e.g. from industrial partners)
 - It was suggested that we consider establishing a “Technology Seminar” in which we bring in experts from outside (e.g. tech companies) for a day of talks, meetings tours etc.
- Presentation from Kate S. and Erik G. on the new IERC facility:
 - The presentation can be reviewed here: **(INSERT LINK)**
 - A principal goal is the centralization of activities for major elements of PPD, ND and SCD.
 - Roll many activities up through the PPD/ND facilities pipeline so that old facilities (e.g. in the village) can be retired.
 - It was suggested that Tech. Committee could have some level of input on collaborative spaces, e.g.
 - Another SLI-funded building that targets Accelerator R&D may be on the horizon (sensibly phased with the IERC schedule). The Tech. Committee can play a part in strengthening the case for such a facility.