Question 1

- The technical panel would like to see more of the board and ASIC specification sheets, which are protected on the CERN EDMS server. TileCal has kindly posted their documents to the NSF review site. It would be useful to see the spec sheets for selected major components for LAr, Muon, and TDAQ.

WBS		ATLAS spec doc posted?
6.4.1	FE Electronics	ADC, docdb #965
6.4.2	FEB2	No ATLAS doc yet (Specs Review 12/19)
6.4.3	BE Electronics	No ATLAS doc yet (Specs Review 11/20)
6.5.1	Main Board	Yes, with technical talks
6.5.3	ELMB MB	Yes, with technical talks
6.5.4	LVPS	Yes, with technical talks
6.6.1	sMDT	Yes, docdb #964
6.6.3	TDC	Yes, docdb #964
6.6.4	CSM	Yes, docdb #964
6.6.5	L0MDT	Yes, docdb #964
6.8.1	L0Calo	No ATLAS doc until PDR Dec 2022
6.8.2	HTT	Yes, in docdb 966
6.8.3	Global Event Processor	No ATLAS doc yet (Specs Review 12/19)

Question 2

- What are the requirements for passing ATLAS PDR, FDR, and PRR? Please provide definition documents for those reviews.
  - We have posted the document describing these reviews on the indico agenda, with the Friday morning executive session

Question 3

- The plenary EPO presentation stated that one work item will be to: "Work with the US ATLAS committee on Diversity and Inclusion on strategies for inspiring and mentoring under-represented groups". What has been or will be the connection between the ATLAS HL-LHC and the US ATLAS Diversity and Inclusion Committee and what are examples of these strategies that the project will implement?
  - The connection between the US ATLAS D&I committee and HL-LHC EPO will mostly be to provide resources and recommendations on best practices for fostering inclusive environments. We have talked to the chair of this committee who is enthusiastic about helping us in this regard, and we have agreed to present our EPO plan at one of their near-future meetings to discuss specific ways they can assist us. This committee contains significant expertise in the challenges faced by URMs and the strategies for creating more inclusive environments. We will discuss specific strategies when we meet with them, that we will also include in the EPO plan document. At the very least, these strategies will be discussed with L2 managers and institutional contacts to ensure they are aware of the issues faced by URMs and how to mitigate insensitive (and often not conscious) behaviours. Ideally, regular (annual) meetings with the USATLAS D&I committee, the EPO coordinator(s), L2 managers, and institution contacts, to discuss any issues and questions, and to reinforce these strategies, would also take place. The feasibility and benefit of doing this will also be discussed at the D&I committee meeting in which we discuss HL-LHC EPO.
  - The bottom line is, the building of this connection is still in its infancy, but the willingness of both the D&I committee and EPO coordinator to structure and implement some meaningful strategies is a promising start. We will duly document details as they emerge.

Question 4

- Some subsystem designs changed between PDR and FDR – what systems might further evolve between now and MREFC, and early in the construction project? (simple table)

WBS		Current version	Design evolution possibility
6.4.1	FE Electronics	Pre-Prototype 3	Small internal changes possible, fall-back to COTS if risk realized
6.4.2	FEB2	Pre-prototype 1	Internal changes
6.4.3	BE Electronics	Pre-prototype 1	Internal changes. Could reduce complexity (and build more boards) if risk concerning LASP power/thermal density is realized.
6.5.1	Main Board	v4	No
6.5.3	ELMB MB	v8.0	Possible but unlikely
6.5.4	LVPS	v8.1	Possible but unlikely
6.6.1	sMDT	Module-0	No
6.6.3	TDC	Prototype v2	No
6.6.4	CSM	Prototype v2	Small internal changes possible
6.6.5	L0MDT	Demonstrator	Internal changes
6.8.1	L0Calo	Phase-1 same design	Small internal changes possible, risk that need active splitting
6.8.2	HTT	Demonstrators in layout	Internal changes
6.8.3	Global Event Processor	Prototype of one alg and framework testbench	Internal changes